

# THE BIBLE IN COURT

OR

## TRUTH vs. ERROR

### A BRIEF FOR THE PLAINTIFF

BY

STEPHEN D. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

A Member of the Detroit Bar

Published at the request of the Men's Bible Class of  
Calvary Presbyterian Church of Detroit, Michigan

---

DEARBORN BOOK CONCERN  
DEARBORN, MICHIGAN

Copyright, 1925  
Dearborn Book Concern

BT  
1101  
2655

## INTRODUCTION

---

My attention was first called to some legal aspects of the Bible by an address given on the illegality of the trial of Christ, a number of years ago, by Professor J. C. Knowlton, acting Dean of the Law Department of the University of Michigan. This caused me to wonder how the legal rules of evidence and construction would apply to the whole Bible. It occurred to me that, inasmuch as the Book was said to be the Law of God, such rules of evidence and construction ought to apply to it the same as to any constitution, statute, or legal instrument; that the severe tests to which the said rules have been put from time immemorial, and the universal favor with which they have met among the best minds the world has produced, ought to afford a safe standard by which to test the veracity of the Scriptures as an ancient document. I then decided to put this venerable instrument to such test, to the best of my ability. I accordingly prepared what might be called a *brief* on the subject. About that time, my friend, Mr. S. H. Meyers, assistant to the pastor of the First Presby-

35409

terian Church of Flint, Michigan, the Rev. H. D. Borley, invited me to make a series of addresses before the men's class of the church, and I decided to accept his invitation, and expound the brief I had prepared. A moot court was accordingly convened with the Hon. Mark W. Stevens, Circuit Judge, presiding, and Mr. Black, a prominent attorney, consented to take the other side, in a friendly way, to bring out the facts in the case. A bill in chancery was filed, under our methods of procedure, enjoining Mr. Meyers from teaching the Apostles' Creed, upon the grounds that he was teaching a false religion contrary to public policy, and the terms of the lease upon which he depended to supply him with a suitable room to teach in. An answer to the bill was filed, denying that the Apostles' Creed was false and its teaching against public policy, and alleging that it was true and conducive to the public good. This raised every question desired in order to give the matter a fair test. All the legal points that could be thought of were raised and passed upon by the circuit judge, who sustained our contention throughout. Many of the leading business and professional men of the city were present, and expressed their pleasure over the proceedings.

From this moot court trial came the title "The Bible in Court." We afterwards enlarged upon this brief and delivered the addresses before the men's class of Calvary Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich., who requested their publication. They were recently given before the men's class of the First Presbyterian Church of Ashtabula, Ohio, and the request to have them published was repeated there. We hope that they may be read and passed along to help "the other fellow."

STEPHEN D. WILLIAMS.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### DIVISION I.

The Bible in Court—Rules of Evidence Applicable to Ancient Manuscripts—The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts as Evidence—Burden of Proof Rests on Bible Opponents—Rule of Evidence Applied to Book of Mormon as Illustration.

### DIVISION II.

The Credibility of Witnesses—Professor Greenleaf's Rule—Burden of Impeaching Credibility Rests on Objector—Tests of Credibility Named by Professor Jones—Memory, Motive, Intelligence, Means of Information, Bias, Candor, Fairness, Consistency of Testimony, Interest in Result—Miracles and the Law of Evidence.

### DIVISION III.

Severest Tests of Credibility—Prediction and Fulfillment—Moses and Science—Certain Branches of Science not Infalible—Moses and Aristotle Compared—Tendency to Discard Proven Witnesses for Mere Theory—Destruction of Jerusalem Foretold by Moses, Isaiah and Jesus—Credibility Established by Severest Tests Possible.

### DIVISION IV.

Construction of the Law and What It Establishes—The Rule of Construction and Application of the Same—Position of Modernists Stated by Unitarian Laymen—The Argument—Not Permissible to Carve Out Portions of Law or Legal Documents ad Lib.—Broad Investigations Sometimes Needed to Discover Intent of Maker—Result of Elimination of Account of Virgin Birth and Miracles—The Doctrine of the Trinity—True Rule of Construction Applied—Powers of the Trinity—God's Majesty—The Son's Reverence and Obedience.

### DIVISION V.

Construction of the Law as to the Divine Sacrifice—Why the Sacrifice Was Made—Intent of the Law-Giver—Application of the Legal Rule in This Case—The Natural Law in the Spiritual World—The Law of Degeneration and Reversion to Type Given by Professor Drummond—Its Application to the World at the Time of Christ—The Argument—The Active Opposing Principle of Salvation Applied.

### DIVISION VI.

The Construction of the Law as to the Reclamation of Mankind—The Principle of Salvation—The Modus Operandi of Salvation—Redemption—Justification—The Discussion by Paul and James—Remission, Ransom, Atonement, Regeneration, Sanctification.

### DIVISION VII.

Res Judicata of the Trial and Conviction of Jesus—The Reply—Assignments of Error—Statement of the Facts—The Question of Jurisdiction—The Hearing before Pilate—Was the Crucifixion of Jesus an Execution of the Law, Justifiable Homicide, or Plain Murder?

### DIVISION VIII.

Proof of the Resurrection of Jesus—Greenleaf's Definition of Evidence—The Crucifixion—Establishing the Corpus Delicti—Did Jesus Simply Swoon?—Either Resurrection or Fraud—Modernists Rob Him of His Divinity, Clothe Him with Imposture, and Then Ask the World to Sit at His Feet with Them.

### DIVISION IX.

The Advocate—Construction of the Law—The Roman Advocate—Official Character of Jesus in the Great Plan of Human Redemption—John's Understanding of It.

### DIVISION X.

Construction of the Law as to Judgment—Punishment and Reward—Emerson and the Law of Compensation—Intent of the Law-Giver.

## THE BIBLE IN COURT

### DIVISION I.

#### THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SCRIPTURAL RECORD

For the purpose of this discussion, let us assume that we have the original manuscripts which compose the Scriptures, bound in one volume, in a court of law, and that the question of the veracity of the document has been raised, in a trial in which it is involved. We will assume that objection has been raised to its admission as evidence, and that opposing counsel must present their arguments to the court in favor of or against such admission. Probably the objector would insist that the whole document would be irrelevant, incompetent and immaterial for the reason that no living witnesses were to be had who could be introduced for the purpose of examination and cross-examination, under oath, touching the question or questions involved in the suit. Such objection would be likely to be sustained unless counsel could find some rule or authority which would permit its admission. Thus the point would become of vital importance.



Undoubtedly the court would ask for authorities on the question raised, and counsel for those who would sustain the veracity of the document could do nothing better than cite as his authority Professor Simon Greenleaf, of the Harvard Law School, whose treatise on the "Testimony of the Evangelists" bears directly on that subject. Among the legal profession, Professor Greenleaf is regarded as one of the greatest authorities who has ever written on the law of evidence, in any land where the English jurisprudence is in vogue, and his volumes may be found in every well selected law library, whether public or private.

Reading from the authority cited, counsel would quote as follows:

"That the books of the Old Testament, as we now have them, are genuine; that they existed in the time of our Savior, and were commonly received and referred to among the Jews as the sacred books of their religion; and that the text of the four Evangelists has been handed down to us in the state in which it was originally written, that is, without having been materially corrupted or falsified, either by heretics or Christians, are facts which we are entitled to assume as true until the contrary is shown.

"The genuineness of these writings really admits of as little doubt, and is susceptible of

as ready proof, as that of any ancient writings whatever. The rule of municipal law on this subject is familiar, and applies with equal force to all ancient writings, whether documentary or otherwise; and as it comes first in order, in the prosecution of these inquiries, it may for the sake of mere convenience be designated as our first rule.

*"Every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it to be otherwise.*

"An ancient document offered in evidence in our courts, is said to come from the proper repository, when it is found in the place where, and under the care of persons with whom, such writings might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found; for it is this custody which gives authenticity to documents found within it. If they come from such a place, and bear no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes that they are genuine, and they are permitted to be read in evidence, unless the opposing party is able successfully to impeach them. The burden of showing them to be false and unworthy of credit is devolved on the party who makes the objection. The presumption of law is the judgment of charity. It presumes that every man is innocent until he is proved guilty; that everything has been done fairly and legally until it has been proved to

have been otherwise, and that every document found in its proper repository, and not bearing marks of forgery, is genuine. Now this is precisely the case with the Sacred Writings. They have been used in the church from time immemorial, and are thus found in the place where alone they ought to be looked for. They come to us, and challenge our reception of them as genuine writings, precisely as Domesday Book, the Ancient Statutes of Wales, or any other of the ancient documents which have recently been published under the British Record Commission, are received. They are found in familiar use in all the churches of Christendom, as the sacred books to which all denominations of Christians refer, as the standard of their faith. There is no pretense that they were engraven on plates of gold and discovered in a cave, nor that they were brought from heaven by angels; but they are received as the plain narratives and writings of the men whose names they respectively bear, made public at the time they were written; and although there are some slight discrepancies among the copies subsequently made, there is no evidence that the originals were anywhere corrupted. If it should be objected that the originals are lost, and that copies alone are now produced, the principles of the municipal law here also afford a satisfactory answer. For the multiplication of copies was a public fact, in the faithfulness of which all the Christian community had an interest; and it is a rule of law that

*"In matters of public and general interest, all persons must be presumed to be conversant, on the principle that individuals are presumed to be conversant with their own affairs."*

"Therefore it is that, in such matters, the prevailing current of assertion is resorted to as evidence, for it is to this that every member of the community is supposed to be privy. The persons, moreover, who multiplied these copies may be regarded, in some manner, as the agents of the Christian public, for whose use and benefit the copies were made; and on the ground of the credit due to such agents, and of the public nature of the facts themselves, the copies thus made are entitled to an extraordinary degree of confidence, and, as in the case of official registers and other public books, it is not necessary that they should be confirmed and sanctioned by the ordinary tests of truth. If any ancient document concerning our public rights were lost, copies which have been so universally received and acted upon as the Four Gospels have been, would have been received as authority in all the courts of continental Europe, upon much weaker evidence of its genuineness; for the integrity of the sacred text has been preserved by the jealousy of opposing sects, beyond any moral possibility of corruption; while that of the Roman Civil Law has been preserved by tacit consent, without the interest of any opposing school, to watch over and preserve it from alteration.

⊕ "The copies of the Holy Scriptures having thus been in familiar use in the churches from the time when the text was committed to writing; having been watched with vigilance by so many sects, opposed to each other in doctrine, yet all appealing to these Scriptures for the correctness of their faith; and having in all ages, down to this day, been respected as the authoritative source of all ecclesiastical power and government, and submitted to, and acted under in regard to so many claims of right, on the one hand, and so many obligations of duty on the other; it is quite erroneous to suppose that the Christian is bound to offer any further proof of their genuineness or authenticity. It is for the objector to show them spurious; for on him, by the plainest rules of law, lies the burden of proof. If it were the case of a claim to a franchise, and a copy of an ancient deed or charter were produced in support of the title, under parallel circumstances on which to presume its genuineness, no lawyer, it is believed, would venture to deny either its admissibility in evidence or the satisfactory character of the proof. In a recent case in the House of Lords, precisely such a document, being an old manuscript copy purporting to have been extracted from ancient journals of the House, which were lost, and to have been made by an officer whose duties were to prepare lists of the peers, was held admissible in a claim of peerage."

Concerning the credit which should be given to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, Greenleaf goes on to say:

"Proceeding further, to inquire whether the facts related by the Four Evangelists are proved to be competent and satisfactory evidence, we are led, first, to consider on which side lies the burden of establishing the credibility of the witnesses. On this point the municipal law furnishes a rule which is of constant application in all trials by jury, and is indeed the dictate of that charity which thinketh no evil:

*"In the absence of circumstances which generate suspicion, every witness is presumed credible, until the contrary is shown, the burden of impeaching his credibility lying on the objector.*

"This rule serves to show the injustice with which the writers of the gospels have ever been treated by infidels; an injustice acquiesced in even by Christians; in requiring the Christian affirmatively, and by positive evidence, aliunde to establish the credibility of his witnesses above all others, before their testimony is entitled to be considered, and in permitting the testimony of a single profane writer, alone and uncorroborated, to outweigh that of any single Christian. This is not the course in courts of chancery, where the testimony of a single witness is never permitted to outweigh the oath of even the defendant himself, inter-

ested as he is in the case; but, on the contrary, if the plaintiff, after requiring the oath of his adversary, cannot overthrow it by something more than the oath of one witness, however credible, it must stand as evidence against him. But the Christian writer seems, by the usual course of the argument, to have been deprived of the common presumption of charity in his favor; and reversing the ordinary rule in administering justice in human tribunals, his testimony is unjustly presumed to be false, until it is proved to be true. This treatment, moreover, has been applied to them all in a body; and without due regard to the fact, that, being independent historians, writing at different periods, they are entitled to the support of each other; they have been treated, in the argument, almost as if the New Testament were the entire production, at once, of a body of men, conspiring by joint fabrication, to impose a false religion upon the world. It is time that this injustice should cease; that the testimony of the evangelists should be admitted to be true, until it can be disproved by those who would impugn it; that the silence of one sacred writer on any point should no more detract from his own veracity or that of other historians, than the like circumstances is permitted to do among profane writers; and that the Four Evangelists should be admitted in corroboration of each other, as readily as Josephus and Tacitus, or Polibi<sup>us</sup> and Livy."

To make a case parallel with the one cited, in the matter of the English peerage, we could, in all probability, if the case were one of sufficient importance to warrant the effort, secure the ancient Sinaitic manuscript, now in the custody of the church authorities of St. Petersburg, Russia, discovered by Dr. Tischendorf, an expert authority on ancient documents, in 1844, in a convent on Mt. Sinai. It contains the entire New Testament, as we now have it, together with the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament. This expert witness, and others like Wescott and Hort, testify that the date of this manuscript cannot be later than 350 A. D. Suppose that this venerable document should be brought into court, could there be any question about its admissibility as evidence under the rule mentioned? Certainly not. A careful comparison of the manuscript with any of the copies of our Bible, in use in any of our churches, of whatever denomination, discloses the fact that these recent copies of the Scriptures have been made with a fidelity so striking as to challenge the admiration of friend and critic alike. If the Sinaitic manuscript were copied from the preceding one or ones with as much fidelity to truth and accuracy as the present ones have been copied from

it and its contemporaries, it is practically a perfect copy of the original manuscripts written by the apostles themselves. The presumption is that it was so copied, and the burden of proof lies with the critic to show that it was not.

The Vatican manuscript is even older than the Sinaitic. Dr. Roberts, the expert, testifies that the letters used in its making bear a striking resemblance to some of the Greek rolls found at Herculaneum. All other features which it presents testify to its great age. Herculaneum was destroyed in A. D. 79.

Says a noted authority:

"We have, then, two Bibles which have come down to us from the days of Eusebius, who died A. D. 340. He and they were contemporaries. It cannot be said that he never read or saw them. They are over fifteen hundred years old. They date back at least to within about two and one-half centuries of the death of John. The style of their letters dates back to a period previous to this event. That is, we have copies of the Bible which were in existence as near the time of Christ as we are to the time of the landing of the Pilgrims. The authority of the books contained in these copies rests on the ground of the consensus of the church of the first three centuries. It cannot be shaken by the tread of criticism." (Blake.)

Thus this venerable Sinaitic manuscript, being found in a convent on Mount Sinai, where it had been kept from time immemorial, was contained in a proper receptacle. It was in the hands of monks and nuns, and was thus in proper custody. It bore upon its face no evident marks of forgery, and, therefore, as a matter of law, it must be accepted as genuine. The burden of proof rests upon those who attack its authenticity to prove that it is not genuine, and that must be done by a preponderance of evidence.

We are assuming at this time, that the point is raised, to the effect that the same rule of evidence would establish the authenticity of other documents for which divine inspiration or origin is claimed, such as the Book of Mormon, and others. To this, it is replied, that each claim must stand upon its own foundation, and unless it meets the requirements, it must fail.

The Book of Mormon is a plain illustration of this fact. It was not written by Joseph Smith, nor by any other accredited witness. (See *Britannica Encyclopaedia* on Mormons.) Smith claims he had a "vision" in which it was revealed to him, that the book was buried in the earth near Manchester, New York. To this

spot, Smith claims he went and had delivered into his charge, by an angel of the Lord, a stone box, containing a volume six inches in thickness, made of thin gold plates 7 by 8 inches in size, and fastened together by three gold rings. He alleged that the plates were covered with small writing in the "reformed Egyptian" tongue, and that a pair of supernatural spectacles accompanied the box, consisting of two crystals set in a silver bow, and called "Urim and Thummim." With these spectacles the mystic writing could be read. These plates bore the signatures of no author or authors, and were anonymous so far as human authorship was concerned. Being almost illiterate, Smith employed as amanuensis a man by the name of Oliver Cowdry, to whom, from behind a curtain, he dictated a translation, which was printed in 1830, by the aid of money furnished by a farmer by the name of Martin Harris, under the title of "*The Book of Mormon*." To this translation was attached the affidavit of Oliver Cowdry, David Whitmer, and Martin Harris, in which they testified that an angel of God had shown them the plates from which the translation had been made. The said plates suddenly and mysteriously disappeared, and the three witnesses

later testified that they had sworn falsely, thus leaving the authenticity of the gold plates to depend solely upon the single statement of Joseph Smith, the associate of confessed perjurers.

It must be obvious, that the Book of Mormon has no standing in law in any court of competent jurisdiction, unless those gold plates can be authenticated. Furthermore, the most that can be said of the Book of Mormon is that it is a copy of the original. But this copy was made by a confessed perjurer, whose confession is a matter of record, and under the legal maxim "falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus," it would be unworthy of credence.

So far as the alleged gold plates are concerned, they could not be classed as ancient documents, because there is no testimony as to how long they had been in existence beyond the statement of Joseph Smith, and he declared that their whereabouts had not been disclosed to him until four years before they were presented to him by an angel. This would not make them *ancient*, and they could not have been introduced in evidence as such without other testimony than that, had the matter been tested in court before their mysterious disappearance. There is a wide difference

between a document which purports to deal with ancient matters, and one which is itself ancient. The authenticity of those alleged gold plates depends upon the uncorroborated testimony of Joseph Smith, his associates having confessed that they were perjurers. Taking his statement for it, they were buried in the earth by unknown hands, in a remote spot in the earth. This does not constitute such a "receptacle" as the law contemplates. In fact, they were in no custody at all.

It might be claimed that the alleged gold plates were in the custody of an angel. No one saw such a personage but Joseph Smith, and the question can well be raised as to the qualifications of Joseph Smith to judge who was or who was not an angel. However, if it were true, still it would not make the plates ancient. That alone would not qualify them as ancient documents, and they could not be introduced in evidence as such. Their authenticity must rest upon other grounds than their age.

They must bear upon their face no evident marks of forgery. No one ever saw them to judge them as to that matter but Joseph Smith, and he chose to secrete himself behind a curtain to read them to his amanuensis

whom he induced to perjure himself in order to furnish corroborative evidence to his own statement. The presumption is that his own standing in the community as to truth and veracity was such that corroborative evidence was needed to carry conviction. The difference between him and Jesus Christ, touching that matter, is, that when the latter needed corroborative evidence, He walked on the water, turned water into wine, fed five thousand people with a few loaves and fishes, or raised the dead, instead of professing to read from mysterious plates from behind a screen.

Now, since the originals "mysteriously disappeared," and could not be produced in court, a case for the Mormon faith would have to be based upon the copy of the same, and this was obtained from dictation behind a curtain, to a copyist who acknowledged himself to be a perjurer and faker. The Mormon faith has the disadvantage of not being based upon an "ancient document" nor upon a credible copy of one, and that there is not "an absence of circumstances which generate suspicion" in the origin of the Book of Mormon.

Lastly, the Book of Mormon is further differentiated from the Sinaitic manuscript by the fact that it does not contain the evidence

of presumptive innocence, nor is it sustained by positive evidence aliunde. We place up against the claim of authenticity for that book the testimony of credible witnesses to the effect, that

"In reality it was written in the year 1812 as an historical romance by one Solomon Spaulding, a crackbrained preacher; and the MS. falling into the hands of an unscrupulous compositor, Sidney Rigdon, was copied by him, and subsequently given to Joseph Smith. Armed with this book and with self-assumed divine authority, the latter soon began to attract followers." (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*.)

It may be stated with the utmost confidence that the Book of Mormon, as an authentic document, would have no legal standing in a court of law, if the issue were properly raised, and, while we have not the time to discuss it here, the same thing may be said of the Koran, the book of Mohammedan faith.

## DIVISION II.

### THE CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES

We will now take up the subject of the credibility of the witnesses. The Scriptural record discloses a number of them, and it becomes pertinent to inquire into the matter of who they are and what weight they carry in their testimony. Their evidence will be of little use to us unless we find that it carries with it probative force. Whether it does or not, depends upon several things. Their testimony having been admitted, the legal presumption is that they told the truth, and the burden of proof is shifted to the shoulders of those who attack their credibility to show that it is not the truth. In this connection, we again refer to that great authority, Professor Greenleaf, who says:

"Proceeding further to inquire whether the facts related by the Four Evangelists are proved by competent and satisfactory evidence, we are led, first, to consider on which side lies the burden of establishing the credibility of the witnesses. On this point the mu-



nicipal law furnishes a rule which is of constant application in all trials by jury, and is indeed the dictate of that charity which thinketh no evil.

*"In the absence of circumstances which generate suspicion, every witness is to be presumed credible, until the contrary is shown, the burden of impeaching his credibility lying on the objector.*

"This rule serves to show the injustice with which the writers of the Gospels have ever been treated by infidels; an injustice silently acquiesced in even by Christians; in requiring the Christian affirmatively, and by positive evidence, *aliunde* to establish the credibility of his witnesses above all others, before their testimony is entitled to be considered, and in permitting the testimony of a single profane writer, alone and uncorroborated, to outweigh that of any single Christian. This is not the course in courts of chancery, where the testimony of a single witness is never permitted to outweigh the oath of even the defendant himself, interested as he is in the case; but, on the contrary, if the plaintiff, after having required the oath of his adversary, cannot overthrow it by something more than the oath of one witness, however credible, it must stand as evidence against him. But the Christian writer seems, by the usual course of the argument, to have been deprived of the common presumption of charity in his favor; and reversing the ordinary rule of administering jus-

tice in human tribunals, his testimony is unjustly presumed to be false, until it is proved to be true. This treatment, moreover, has been applied to them all in a body; and without due regard to the fact, that, being independent historians, writing at different periods, they are entitled to the support of each other; they have been treated, in the argument, almost as if the New Testament were the entire production, at once, of a body of men, conspiring by joint fabrication, to impose a false religion upon the world. It is time that this injustice should cease; that the testimony of the evangelists should be admitted to be true, until it can be disproved by those who would impugn it; that the silence of one sacred writer on any point should no more detract from his own veracity or that of other historians, than the like circumstances is permitted to do among profane writers; and that the Four Evangelists should be admitted in corroboration of each other, as readily as Josephus and Tacitus, or Polibi<sup>us</sup> and Livy."

It will be noticed that Professor Greenleaf is careful to state the rule to be that "in the absence of circumstances which generate suspicion, every witness is to be presumed credible."

To illustrate this, the Book of Mormon and the Scriptures may be compared. There is nothing to generate suspicion attached to the

writing of the Scriptures. It was done openly and boldly by the men whose names they bear, and they gloried in the publicity given of everything they did, while Joseph Smith dictated to his amanuensis from behind a curtain which shut out all observation from the outside, he reading through a pair of alleged supernatural spectacles, whom nobody but himself ever saw, which disappeared along with the alleged plates as soon as he was through with them. There is no presumption that such a witness is credible, for the circumstances generate suspicion of an unmistakable character, and the burden of proof is placed upon his own shoulders to show that he is a credible witness. Under the rules of evidence, no one is obliged to accept as true any statement contained in such a document.

Let us now assume, that we are in a court of justice, and that sufficient doubt has been created to overcome the presumption of credibility on the part of the witnesses to the Messiahship of Jesus. Can we summon sufficient support to sustain them in such a case? We think it can be done beyond a reasonable doubt.

Professor Jones of the law department of the University of Wisconsin, in his fine work

on the law of evidence, states a rule applicable in this case, as follows, to wit:

*"So the jury may take into consideration the memory, the motives, the intelligence and the appearance of the witness on the stand, his means of information, his evident bias or his candor or fairness, as well as the consistency of his testimony and the interest or want of interest in the result. In all these matters, the jury may be instructed to this effect."*

We will now take up for discussion the different points of the rule mentioned, in the regular order in which Professor Jones presents the matter.

(1) The memory of the witnesses. There is nothing in the writings of the Old Testament which indicates that anything beyond normal memory was required, and this the witnesses unquestionably had. The circumstances of the giving of the Ten Commandments to Moses were such as not to involve the matter of memory, beyond a normal degree, in him. We are not now taking into consideration the matter of inspiration, but simply apply to these witnesses the ordinary rule. So far as the writing of the epistles is concerned, it required only that soundness of memory necessary in producing a logical and thoughtful letter containing the relation of incidents which a sound

memory would retain. Paul narrates his experiences with about the same degree of particularity that any good writer would in indulging in reminiscences of his past. His clearness of speech and reasoning indicate that he was a man of very sound mind. The same thing may be said of the other writers of the epistles, though possibly in a lesser degree with some of them. So far as the Four Gospel writers are concerned, it must not be forgotten that they were conscious of the fact that they were listening to a great teacher whose word was law to them; they dwelt upon his words and treasured them. It is a fair presumption, that as they realized the importance of His utterances, they reinforced their memories of the same in practical ways, such as the use of memoranda. We have now in our possession copious notes of the utterances of teachers, which we made in the class room thirty years ago, as they were delivered to us, and from them could, if called upon, reproduce practically the entire discourse of that particular teacher. Those men knew how to write. These Gospel narratives indicate clearly that the writers were men of strong mentality, and while it may be urged that such narratives were not reduced to writing for many years

after the occurrence of the events spoken of, there is nothing about them as far as the narration is concerned, to indicate that they could not be duplicated, by a bright student, under the inspiration of such a teacher, who would take the trouble to make copious notes of the discourses.

(2) The motives of the witnesses. It is hard to ascribe to the Old Testament writers anything but lofty motives in what they did. Moses was the leader of his people, and the logical person to give them, in the absence of any other law-making body, a code of laws for their government. His acts were consistent with the position which he held, and there does not appear to have been any ulterior motives actuating him. The prophecies were nearly always made in the face of adversity or popular drift, and against the line of least resistance.

So far as the New Testament writers were concerned, there appears to be no wrong motives in what they did. They were not following the lines of least resistance in an effort to gain something for themselves. Paul was a Roman citizen. The presumption is that he could better serve his own ends by remaining quiescent and in har-

mony with the established order of things, than to sacrifice his citizenship and standing in the community by championing an unpopular heresy, for which he was promised persecution in advance. Matthew was a trusted official in the local government, and Luke was a physician. The same reasoning applied to the case of Paul holds equally true of them, as well as the others. It must be borne in mind at all times, that the burden of proof is upon those who attack the credibility of these witnesses to show that they had any but the best of motives. Paul had helped to persecute the Christians, had stood by when Stephen was stoned to death, and encouraged the act. He knew that the leader of the movement had been crucified as a malefactor, and that that stigma had been attached to all of his followers. He knew that he must not only bear that stigma, but that he would be denounced as a traitor by his associates and influential friends who had been partners in the deed. What had this despised sect to compensate him for such a sacrifice? What had it to compensate Matthew and Luke for their material losses?

It must be remembered that these epistles and gospel narratives were not written in advance of these persecutions and losses when

there was an opportunity to indulge in optimism. The record shows that in the hour of his greatest worldly triumph, on the one side, and in one of the darkest periods of persecution on the part of the followers of Jesus, on the other, Paul left the popular side, with its personal gains and emoluments, and became a champion of the despised. The same principle holds true of all of the rest. They had notice in advance that persecution would be their lot, and that worldly gain should be denied them, for the record states:

"If the world hated you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me." John 15, 18-21.

If these followers had expected worldly gain through the great power of their leader during His lifetime, their minds were disabused of the thought by His repeated warnings and plain denial of that intention. There being no

worldly motive apparent in the record, by the simple process of elimination, there could be only one left, and that a conscientious one which is a requisite of credibility. The witnesses fully qualify under this head.

(3) The intelligence and appearance of the witnesses on the stand. We have already spoken of the intelligence of the witnesses. Luke being a physician, under the Jewish regulations governing the profession, must have been an intelligent man. Paul and Matthew were public men, and the presumption follows that they were men of intelligence. Their writings, together with those of the other writers of the New Testament, show them all to have been exceptionally intelligent men. They went about in plain apparel, known to and identified by all of their acquaintances, for there is no record of any attempt on the part of any of them to counterfeit or pretend to be any one other than themselves. On the contrary, except in the one instance when Peter was badly frightened by the mob at the time of the betrayal, they openly and proudly proclaimed their allegiance to their Leader, which allegiance they held to be more precious than any other thing. This is indicated clearly by the open letter which that same Peter sent

to the "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." In it he says to them:

"The trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet.1,7.

The intelligence and upright conduct of these witnesses must be conceded, as they fully meet the requirements of credible witnesses in this respect. The fact that they were Hebrews, writing in Greek, controverts any claim that they were without learning.

(4) Means of information. These writers were in a position personally to know of the matters concerning which they spoke. This is true both of the Old and New Testament writers. Concerning the latter, it is needless to say that they were the friends and associates of their Leader, and in a position personally to observe what was going on about them. They are not heresay witnesses, but eye witnesses of the facts which they relate. Concerning this, the witness John says:

"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye may also have fellowship with us." 1 John 1, 3.

Peter, James, John, and Andrew were with Jesus on the Mount of Olives, and personally asked Him what He meant by certain sayings which they had heard. Luke indicates in the commencement of his testimony that he had witnessed and heard many of the things of which he wrote, and had obtained the rest from eye witnesses. Running all through the Four Gospels, are references to the presence of the disciples, with their Leader, when He made His statements and performed His wonderful deeds. Such experts as sceptic Renan, Professor Fisher, and others are agreed that the Four Gospels are authentic. Concerning Mark, this noted sceptic says:

"In Mark, the facts are related with a clearness for which we seek in vain amongst the other evangelists. He likes to report certain words of Jesus in Syro-Chaldean. He is full of minute observations, coming doubtless from an eye-witness. There is nothing to prevent our agreeing with Papias in regarding this eye-witness, who loved him and observed him very closely, and who had preserved a lively image of him, as the Apostle Peter himself."

But whether it be true or not that Mark witnessed the things of which he writes, it is now well settled that Peter dictated to Mark the second Gospel, and he was as familiar with all

of the acts and words of Jesus as was Matthew or John. There is no reason to suppose that the two did not collaborate in the production of that Gospel and that it is their joint testimony.

Renan also declared Matthew to have been an eye-witness and personal observer of the things concerning which he writes. He says:

"On the whole I admit as authentic the four canonical Gospels. All, in my opinion, date from the first century, and the authors are, generally speaking, those to whom they are attributed; but their historic value is diverse. Matthew evidently merits an unlimited confidence as to the discourses; they are the Logia, the identical notes taken from a clear and lively remembrance of the teachings of Jesus." 1 Intro. Vie de Jesus.

It must be admitted that these witnesses had the means of informing themselves concerning the matters of which they wrote, and are fully qualified under the rule now governing us.

(5) The evident bias or candor or fairness of the witnesses. It has been alleged that these witnesses were not reliable because they were biased by their friendship for their Leader. As bias, candor, and fairness are not synonymous terms, we will discuss them separately. (a) Webster defines bias as "to in-

cline to one side; to give a particular direction; to prejudice; to prepossess." But bias is a thing which affects judgment rather than truth. To illustrate this, we may take for example two witnesses, one of which we know, respect, and in whom we have an interest, and the other is an entire stranger. If the two should testify to facts diametrically opposite to each other, in the exercise of our judgment as to which was right, our bias would incline us towards our friend. But if the case were ex-parte, and the testimony of the friend stood alone, the recital of what he said and did would not be a matter of judgment but rather one of fact. The correct recital of that fact would involve the question of truth, veracity, and memory. We have already discussed the matter of memory, and there is only remaining the question of truth and veracity. Were these men true or false witnesses? There is no middle ground upon which to stand. They testify to matters and things which they allege they saw and heard, and they were things which they could comprehend. They allege that they heard Jesus deliver the sermon on the mountain, in plain, simple language which they could understand. They allege they saw Him raise Lazarus from the dead; that they knew

the latter was dead, because his body was wrapped in his grave clothes, and that decomposition had set in so that his body stunk. They could comprehend these things because they pertained to the natural senses. They allege that they saw Him walk on the water, and they knew whether He did or not, it being a simple fact. To say that He did, when He did not, would constitute a plain untruth—a conscious untruth. There is no polite way of apologizing for the weaknesses of these men, if they had any. They either told the truth or a falsehood. They knew He claimed to be the promised Messiah, and Peter, speaking for himself and the rest of them (for he spoke in their presence without objection), admitted that He was and accepted Him as the Christ. Mark 8, 29.

Further than this, their Leader had enforced upon them the observance of the Commandments; had promised punishment to those who would not keep the law, and charged them that there should not be made one change of a jot or tittle in it. Matt. 5, 18.

Now, since the only hope of reward held out to them by their Leader was in a strict observance of His mandates, one of which was that they should tell the truth though the heavens

fall, is it reasonable to suppose that they would jointly and severally endeavor to foist upon the world doctrines which were never taught them, manufacture wholesale untruths, and die with a lie upon their lips? That they believed implicitly in their Leader is attested by the fact that they suffered untold persecution and death for His sake. To allege that men would deliberately lie about their acknowledged Messiah, for the purpose of deceiving others, and expect a heavenly reward for so doing, is to affront common sense.

(b) Candor is in contrast with bias. Webster defines it as "openness of heart; freedom from prejudice or disguise." Were the writers of the Scriptures open of heart, and free from prejudice and disguise? The answer is, yes. Nowhere, in either the Old or New Testament does there appear to be any attempt to conceal material facts. When it became a duty to narrate the injustice which king David did to Uriah, it appears to have been done with great fidelity to truth, although it related to a great and favored king. That is simply one of a thousand illustrations which may be found in the Old Testament, of the frankness and candor of the writers. So far as the New Testament is concerned, there could not possibly be

a more pronounced illustration of it than in the case of Peter who, in Mark's account (Chap. 15) of the scene in the garden at the time of the betrayal, dictating the account of himself, tells of his Leader's complaint against him for falling asleep while He was in peril. A further account of Peter's unfaithfulness is given in denying his Leader at the time of His betrayal, as follows:

"And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the Maids of the high priest: and when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him and said, and thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth. But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew. And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, this is one of them. And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, surely thou art one of them; for thou art a Gallilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto. But he began to curse and swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak. Mark 16, 66-71.

The recital of this discreditable conduct was not necessary in order to give an adequate description of the seizure of Jesus by the officers. Nor would it have been given, had there been a conspiracy among His followers



to make out a false case, for it was a serious reflection upon the integrity and character of one of the leaders. However, candor required its narration, and it was given with astonishing fidelity. Is it possible to conceive a fairer illustration of candor than that?

(c) As to the last mentioned qualification, fairness, Webster defines it, as applied in this case, as "honesty, as of dealing." The word to some extent is synonymous with candor. In other words, have the witnesses in this record given all the persons of whom they testify honest treatment? The writers of the Old Testament appear to discriminate against no class of persons, either high or low, rich or poor. The transactions of king Saul are given the same kind of consideration as that of the Witch of Endor. The short-comings of the mighty are narrated with as much particularity as those of the less favored. In the New Testament, the reporters have not failed to record the petty disputes among themselves concerning which ones should most enjoy their Master's favors, (Mark 10, 35-42, Matt. 20, 20-25), the belief of the relatives of Jesus that He was mad, (Mark 3, 21), and have recorded, without evidence of malice, vindictiveness, or resentment, the facts concerning the cruel in-

justice done Jesus by both Herod and Pontius Pilate. Like the honest, fair, unbiased reporter of the trial of a suit at law, they let the facts speak for themselves. Their statements are simple and direct, and private opinions nowhere appear to enter into them. No unprejudiced judge of intelligence, could complain of the statement of facts as given by these reporters in the trial of Jesus before the Great Sanhedrin or Pilate, and, yet, if ever there was cause for complaint, it was there.

6. The consistency of the testimony. Webster defines consistent as "having agreement with itself at different times, or harmony among its parts." Are these witnesses consistent, and is there harmony in their testimony? Let us see.

The Old Testament was written, part by part, covering a period of about fifteen hundred years, and the writing of this was followed by the New, several hundred years after the last writer of the Old had completed his work. It cannot be said that there was any conspiracy consummated in the work. The Old Testament writers testify of the things done in their day, and they go a step further when they testify as to the things that are to happen in the future. As this testimony cov-

ers centuries of time, these witnesses are thus subjected to the severest tests of credibility, because as the centuries have passed, time and events have proven their truthfulness and reliability. This is a very critical position in which to place any witness. But when we examine the record, we find their testimony verified by a long line of events which have happened in perfect harmony with the testimony of the witnesses. The record abounds in illustrations of this, but time and space will not permit of lengthy discussions of it. One of the many examples of the point in question, is found in the 28th Chapter of Deuteronomy, in which the siege and capture of Jerusalem, by the army of Titus, is foretold with the most exact precision.

Again, the greatest harmony prevails between the predictions made by certain witnesses of the Old Testament, and the records of the New, concerning the happening of the greatest event foretold in the Old. In the LIII chapter of Isaiah, the witness specifically describes the coming of a great Character, the nature of His work, and the matter of His death. The Gospel writers of the New Testament give the biography of such a person, and His birth, life, and death are found to be in

perfect accord with the testimony of the witness Isaiah. The harmony is most striking, indeed.

So far as the consistency of the witnesses in the New Testament is concerned, it may be said that from the beginning to the end of their testimony, without deviation therefrom, they cling to the statement that there was born into the world, through supernatural agencies, a great Leader, Who announced that He was the promised Messiah of Old Testament prophecy; that He performed miracles; that He was kind, generous, and loveable; that He was crucified, dead, and buried; that He rose from the dead on the third day; dwelt among them for a time; that He told them that He was going away, but would return again and that He was caught up out of their sight, in the heavens. Their faith in the story they tell, is attested by the persecutions which they suffered on account of it. Upon this main proposition, there is perfect accord. The other details are of minor importance.

Being in harmony and accord on the major proposition just mentioned, let us turn our attention for a short time to the harmony of the testimony of the writers of the Four Gospels.

We have thus far tried to discuss this subject from a legal standpoint, and have not availed ourselves of the claim that the writers were inspired to state particular things. It is universally agreed among Bible scholars that the Four Gospels were written by the men whose names they bear, each one by itself and at a different time from the others, but all within the first century. Observing this, some critics have discovered what they allege to be discrepancies. But Dr. Blake (*The Book*, p. 267) answers this with the following explanation:

"It is alleged that the discrepancies are such as to impair the force and truthfulness of these books. But, in the first place, the narratives of the Gospels bear no evidence of collusion. For if the authors had written in concert they would have told the same story in exactly equivalent terms. On the contrary, there is every evidence that each man wrote independently, stating his own observations, or impressions, or understanding. But, in the second place, only a captious criticism can make anything out of the alleged discrepancies. In spite of them, the great facts stand. Whatever differences there may be are only those incident to independent narration, by different eye-witnesses, recording events without collusion.

"It is significant that these books were ascribed to the men whose names they bear very early in the history of the church. For nearly eighteen centuries the Scriptures have been subjected to rigid cross-examination of critics and yet nothing has been discovered which can possibly brand them as forgeries. They agree or disagree as we should expect any truthful narrative made by independent observers and narrators do. Besides, these discrepancies, on careful study, disappear, and a complete and natural agreement is found between all parts of the Scriptures. The discrepancies have been reduced chiefly to minor differences in readings, which cannot at all affect the story. From first to last we find a unity of design and impression which cannot belong to forgery."

7. Interest or want of interest in the result. These four Gospel writers were strangers whom Jesus had attracted to Him as He had gone from place to place teaching and doing His work. If they ever had any hope of financial gain, it had long since vanished, since their Leader had died penniless, and they, themselves, had been persecuted for many years before they fully reduced their testimony to writing. Time only increased their faith in Him. Decades could not blot out the memory which they treasured nor loosen the

grip which He had upon them. After His death, and all hope of pecuniary reward had fled, there could not remain any interest in the results of His teachings, as the law here contemplates, such as would tend to destroy the credibility of these witnesses. The same answer is given to the claim that the Gospel narratives are forgeries. Concerning this Dr. Blake has well said:

"The utter lack of motive does not admit of the supposition of forgery. If the writers were forgers, they were bad men. But bad men certainly would not, could not forge books so utterly foreign to their characters as the books of the New Testament. No man can have any possible motive to do wrong, and in the very act deliberately condemn himself by setting forth principles which would fix ignominy upon him for all time. If the Bible is a forgery, the forgers have written their own sentences of condemnation. A good man would least of all have reason for attempting to palm off upon men spurious writings as genuine. If he should write a volume, and it were received with universal favor, he would have no good motive for denying it; least of all for assigning it to some one not its author. In neither case can a claim of forgery, as applied to the authorship of the books of the New Testament, be supported by sufficient motive.

Then we must claim that the names appended to the books are not fictitious."

It may be added in conclusion, on this point, that the burden of proof is upon the critic, to show by a preponderance of the evidence, that the names are not genuine and that the books are forgeries.

Lastly, we assume that the objector has raised the question of want of credibility, basing it upon the grounds that the witnesses are discredited by circumstances which render their statements improbable. The four Gospel writers all testify of things which were out of the ordinary or natural realm of life. They testify of the raising of the dead by their Leader, of His resurrection and ascension, as well as other things commonly called miracles, and the objector insists that the witnesses are not to be believed because they testify of impossible things. But what is a miracle? Webster defines it as: "Specifically, an event or effect contrary to the established constitution and course of things; a supernatural event." Since it is a matter of judgment as to what is and what is not "contrary to the established constitution and course of things," the failure to understand what Jesus did may be a want of knowledge of what actually constitutes an

"established course of things." No one has been able to satisfactorily define electricity. And yet who will deny its existence as a fact? A witness could not explain its mysteries, but he could testify that it lighted cities and moved vast machinery. What court would refuse the testimony of a competent electrician regarding the power of that mysterious thing simply because he could not define the thing itself?

Again, any good farmer could testify as to the quality of the soil in a particular farm. Suppose one such were on the witness stand, and his testimony were objected to upon the ground that he could not tell where the earth came from? Would any court disqualify him because he could not tell? He might be able to explain the accepted nebular hypothesis of the world's creation, and state that geologists hold that the space now occupied by the solar system was once filled by ancient fire mist; that some power set it revolving, and that as its speed became accelerated a rim was detached, and then another, and so on, each rim breaking up and its parts forming a ball which continued to revolve in the same direction; that this process kept up until all the planets of the system were detached; that the earth finally became cool enough to contain

life, and that man finally was created as the most complete type of animal life. After he had finished this recital, suppose the opposing counsel should ask him where that fire-mist came from, and who set it in motion? Would an expert farmer be disqualified to testify as to the character of the soil, i. e., as to whether it was clay or sand or whether it would grow good wheat or corn, or even testifying that it was soil at all simply because he could not tell the origin of the fire-mist and who set it in motion?

So far as man is concerned this earth is a miracle, because its formation is a mystery, impenetrable to him, and he cannot tell whether or not it was according to the "established constitution and course of things." Its formation is beyond the ken of men, to say nothing about being beyond their power of duplication. But that will not prevent their testifying to the fact that it is here. In other words, it is of supernatural origin, the same as the making of the loaves and fishes which fed the multitude. Both were facts concerning which men could testify, and no discredit attaches to any witness because he could not explain the *modus operandi*.

These are credible witnesses, and to discredit them places the burden of proof upon those who oppose them, to show that the miracles to which they testify were impossible of performance by Jesus.

## DIVISION III.

SEVEREST TESTS OF CREDIBILITY—PREDICTION  
AND FULFILLMENT SUGGEST THE  
SUPERNATURAL

In the last division we referred to the severe tests of credibility of the witnesses due to the nature of their testimony. There may be nothing beyond the ordinary in a witness who tells a consistent story of what he has seen and heard. But we must take cognizance of one who goes far beyond that and tells of things which are to take place hundreds of years in the future, whose predictions are fulfilled to the minutest detail. As was previously stated, to attempt to foretell what is to take place hundreds of years in advance, is a very critical position in which to place any witness. This will be appreciated most by those who have made a study of the law of evidence and who have seen it applied in the trial of cases.

However, we are not surprised by the predictions made by masters of the subject concerning which they testify. It all depends on the character of the witness. We may be ig-

norant of the subject of explosives and may deny their great power. But an expert chemist will tell us that if we subject nitro-glycerine to sufficient concussion it will tear asunder mountains by its explosion. In other words, such an expert is able to tell what will happen if certain other things are done. It is a prediction based upon expert knowledge which may transcend that of our own. But there is no gainsaying it on that account. The credibility of such a witness is established by demonstration, and if he makes such demonstration fully and clearly, he must be believed. By the same rule we test Moses and the prophets.

Moses was the great *expert* of his time. His Instructor was Jehovah (Ex. 19, 17-25), so the record states, and he narrates his own experience in the chapter just cited as well as in many others. From such a witness as that, we are justified in expecting a wonderful testimony. In searching the record for it, we are not disappointed, for we find the evidence of it clearly set forth. In other words, Moses had a personal experience with Jehovah, peculiar in its character, entirely out of the ordinary, which qualified him to testify concerning Jehovah's processes of creation and to look far into the future to determine coming events.

Let us now examine that wonderful testimony.

The first part of it is to be found where one would expect to find it, in the first chapter of the record. He there testifies of the creative work of Jehovah. Let us now test the credibility of this witness by the light of present-day science.

There is probably no expert better qualified to pass judgment upon that testimony than Professor Alexander Winchell, late professor of science in the University of Michigan. Concerning it, he says:

"The author of Genesis has given us an account which, when rightly understood, conforms admirably to the indications of latest science. At the same time, he has not attempted to write a scientific history of creation. It possesses a simple, though a sublime, style, and is clothed in the thoughts and molded in the structure of oriental poetry. While poetical, it is not an aimless reverie; while unscientific, it does not depart from the truth. While we have to interpret it in the light of modern science, we have no occasion to reject it as simply an Eastern myth, of no more significance than the legends of the Ganges or of Yucatan. We can show that it exemplifies a most impressive harmony between the utterances of trusting inspiration and the generalizations of rigorous science." (Reconciliation of Science and Religion, p. 358.)

Aristotle, the most far-famed scientist the world had produced, up to his time, having had the benefit of the study and investigations of the scholars of a thousand years after Moses' time, taught that the world was the center of creation, and the sun and planets revolved about it. If Moses had made that statement, he would now be the subject of derision the world over. Aristotle's works are still respected by a large number of men. If he is entitled to such respect, what about Moses? Of all the writers of contemporary nations, Moses stands alone unimpeached by modern scientists.

Consider further his marvellous testimony:

"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day (meaning time) that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.

"And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground." Gen. 2, 4-5.

There is no evidence extant that Moses had ever studied the nebular hypothesis of the world's creation. Who told him that there was a time that rain had not fallen on this earth, or that rain and this earth were not co-exist-

ent? Scientists now agree that there was such a time.

But consider his testimony further:

"But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground." Gen. 2, 6.

Why did not Moses say, "And the Lord God opened the flood gates of heaven and the rain came pouring down"? If he had given that testimony, he would have subjected himself to endless jeers, and, yet, some expression akin to that would have been the natural way for a less scientific or less informed man to have stated the matter. But Moses says, "there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground." Scientists now say that the earth was surrounded by mists in those days; that they rose to the cold strata above, were congealed and fell again; that they were driven back by the heat of the earth, to continue over again and again, each time coming a little nearer to its surface until the condensed moisture in the form of rain finally struck it. It was the first rainfall upon the earth, and as all the earth was surrounded by those mists, the rain, when it finally came, "watered the whole face of the ground." Nothing like that is known ever to have been taught

by either the Hebrews or Egyptians among whom Moses lived. Of whom did he get that doctrine? If that is not most remarkable evidence of the credibility of the witness, what can be? He claimed to have been inspired. The evidence indicates it.

Let us stop here long enough to point out the danger of disregarding the evidence of a credible witness. To this end, we will compare again the witness Moses with the learned philosopher, Aristotle. What the latter believed and taught are now of quite common knowledge, but to refreshen our memories, we will quote from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. II, page 520:

"Physical knowledge was in its infancy; Aristotle could only start where his predecessors left off; he laid the foundation of many sciences, and wherever simple observation was adequate—as, for instance, in politics and in some parts of natural history—his achievements were complete and surprising. But for the greater realms of science he had no starting point and no appliances; he could only slightly modify the almost childlike views of the Greeks, and rest content with such unverified hypotheses as seemed to him best to cohere together, and to explain the nature of things. Thus, it is not to be wondered at that he considered the earth to be stationary and the



center of the world, with the seven planets (including as such the sun and moon) moving round in oblique courses to the left, while the outer heaven or sphere of the stars—composed not of perishable matter, but of divine ether—he thought to move from left to right, with perfect and regular motion returning on itself, deriving its motion from the encompassing Godhead—that essence which moves things, but is not moved itself. Such was, according to the belief of Aristotle, the framework of the universe; and the order of his physical treatises corresponds with the filling up of this framework. Of his methods it may be said, in one word, that no one was ever more keen than he to make ‘fact’ the basis of every theory. It is not to be supposed for a moment that he attempted to explain nature by means of the syllogism. But, on the other hand, the art of experimenting, and the exact quantitative record of observations had not been developed. So Aristotle was often quite destitute of the appropriate ‘facts’ for a particular inquiry, and sometimes deceived in the ‘facts’ upon which he founded. And his training as a dialectician was in some respects a disadvantage to him, as it led him to depend too much on the evidence of language in forming his theories of nature.”

The mistakes of Aristotle, as stated by his biographer, in the above quotation, are apparent and pronounced. They stand in great con-

trast with the testimony of Moses, his predecessor of a thousand years, and they should teach us to beware of the practice of discarding the evidence of a proven witness for that of the one who comes to us with only a theory. As an example of this, we may refer to what took place as late as the thirteenth century, related by Dr. White in his *Eighteen Christian Centuries*, page 297. He speaks of the progress of enlightenment during the thirteenth century; the rise of commercial cities, the introduction of learning of the Saracenic schools, and the growth of universities for the cultivation of science and language. Then he goes on to say:

“But an increase of mental activity had at first its usual regrettable accompaniment in the contemporaneous rise of dangerous and unfounded opinions. Philosophy which began with an admiration of the skill and learning of Aristotle, ended by enthroning him as the uncontrolled master of human reason. Wherever he was studied, all previous standards of faith and argument were overthrown. The cleverest intellects of the time could find themselves no higher task than to reconcile the Christian Scriptures with the degrees of the Stagyrte, for it was felt that in the case of an irreconcilable divergence between the teachings of Christ and of Aristotle the scholars of

Christendom would have pronounced in favor of the Greek. A formulary, indeed, was found out for the joint reception of both; many statements were declared to be 'true in philosophy though false in religion,' so that the most orthodox churchmen could receive the doctrines of the church by an act of belief, while he gave his whole affection to Aristotle by an act of the understanding."

There is a noticeable tendency at the present time to swap the testimony of Moses for the theories of students called scientists, who, like Aristotle, may be worshipped today, but discredited and discarded tomorrow. Like the people of the thirteenth century, we may learn much which we will have to forget, by following their example. At least, we owe to the generation of children now in our custody, the duty of giving them the evidence of proven witnesses rather than the speculative testimony of theorists handed to them as "facts." To the latter we would repeat the admonition of the witness Paul:

"Despise not prophesyings. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. 5, 20-21.

We will now turn our attention to the subject of the credibility of the witnesses as established by the fulfillment of predictions. The record abounds in such, but it is too volumi-

nous to discuss all of them contained therein at this time. It ought to be sufficient if we discuss a few of them to establish our point.

In the previous division, we spoke of the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy as a profound example of the truthfulness and reliability of the witnesses depended upon to support our contention. We are again referred to the witness Moses who predicts what is to happen to the Hebrews provided that they do not heed his admonitions. He is careful to state, in the beginning of his testimony, that his prediction is of supernatural origin, and he states it as follows:

"And it came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month, that Moses spake unto the children of Israel, according to all that the Lord had given him in commandment unto them." (Deut. 1, 3.) Further along in his testimony, he says:

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken:

"According to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not.

"And the Lord said unto me, they have well spoken that which they have spoken.

"I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all I shall command him.

"And it shall come to pass, that whoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." (Deut. 18, 15-19.)

Here is a promise to send to the Hebrews another great leader like the witness Moses, after he is gone, with a warning that his counsel must be heeded or stern punishment will follow. This presents a severe test of the credibility of the witness. We could hardly expect to find a more exacting one, and we anxiously search the record to see if the proof is there. We do not look in vain for we find it, but while searching, we discover other portions of the record which explain what is meant by the warning words, "I will require it of him." A complete explanation of this sentence is found in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth chapters of Deuteronomy, and in the latter chapter the terrible details are given of just what will occur if the warning is not heeded. That an awful calamity is to befall them, is to be seen from the following excerpt of the testimony:

"Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee." (Deut. 28, 45.)

Enumerated among the curses, are to be found the following:

"The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand;

"A nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor shew favor to the young:

"And he shall eat the fruit of thy cattle, and the fruit of thy land, until thou be destroyed; which also shall not leave thee either corn, wine, or oil, or the increase of thy kine, or flocks of thy sheep, until he have destroyed thee.

"And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedest, throughout all thy land: and he shall besiege thee in all thy gates throughout all thy land, which the Lord thy God hath given thee."

Then comes the terrible prediction that the woman shall eat the flesh of her own child as the result of the awful sufferings of the siege,

and the testimony of the fearful chapter is closed with the following:

"And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone." (Deut. 28, 64.)

"And the Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you." (Deut. 28, 68.)

It will be observed that no definite time is given for the taking place of the events predicted, because time alone could demonstrate whether or not the Hebrews would observe the warning which Moses had given them. If they heeded it, they were to have peace and prosperity (Deut. 28, 1-14), but if they disregarded it they were to suffer the penalties above stated. They were thus left with their free moral agency in consonance with the whole plan of creation governing mankind.

The record discloses the fact that centuries of time must elapse before the result of this prediction could be determined, as it was given about 1451 B. C. As though it were not enough to have given it once, it must be repeated cen-

turies later with the same great authority behind it. This time it came from another than Moses, but with no less authority, for the record states:

"The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.

"The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.

"Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward.

"Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint.

"From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.

"Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour

it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers." (Isaiah 1, 1-7.)

From this testimony it may be seen that the Hebrews did not heed the admonition of Moses and that the fulfillment of his prediction was certainly coming. The veracity and reliability of the witness is slowly but surely being proven. Moses testified first that an enemy of Satan, the child of a woman, should bruise his head. (Gen. 3, 15.) Then later he testifies that a great prophet shall be raised up whose voice they will disregard at their peril. Thus far we have given to us but a vague description of that wonderful character. But the witness, Isaiah, now adds another touch to it in the following:

"Moreover, the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also?

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall be known to refuse the

evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken by both her kings." Isaiah 7, 10-16.

Beginning with a vague reference to this great prophet, by the witness Moses, the description of his personality and character becomes clearer as the witnesses continue their testimony. Briefly referring to the afflictions of the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, the witness Isaiah adds a further touch to the picture of the mysterious One in the following language:

"For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isa. 9, 5-6.

After thus far portraying this wonderful character, this remarkable witness, apparently catching a glimpse of the future, as it is unfolded to him, foresees the rejection of that great prophet, which he describes as follows:

"Who hath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?

"For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

"He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

"Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

"But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

"All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath lain on him the iniquity of us all.

"He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

"He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

"And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had

done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

"Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.

"He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

"Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." Isa. 53.

Having selected the testimony, from the record, desired to prove our contention, we will now apply to it the severest tests of credibility at our command.

We have already pointed out the remarkable character of the Mosaic account of the cosmogony of the universe. It lays the foundation for an abiding faith in the credibility of that witness. It should take strong proof to shake our faith in him. Let us now analyze the testimony.

The first thing to be noted is the prophetic

allusion to one who should be the triumphant enemy of satan, and that he should be the seed of *woman*. Nothing is said of *man*, and this is so out of the ordinary custom and practice of the Hebrew nation that it suggests *virgin birth*. This theory is strongly supported by the witness Isaiah who testifies:

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

The next point to be noted is that the prophet to be raised up, spoken of by Moses, was to come from the midst of the Hebrew people, that is, a commoner, and He was to be like Moses. The character of Moses combined four qualities which differentiated him from all other men of his time, (a) he was a commoner, (b) he was very meek, (c) he was a lawgiver, and (d) he was a prophet. Therefore, if we wish to find in this record the character to whom Moses referred, we must discover a man born of a virgin, of humble birth, a lawgiver, and a prophet. We search the record in question as well as that of the Hebrew race and we are able to find but one character that meets the requirements—Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary. Concerning Him, the record states that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and

born of the virgin Mary (Matt. 1, 18-21), and it goes on to state:

"Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of by the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." Matt. 1, 22-23.

Let us discuss the common points. (a) He was of humble birth, being born in a stable (Luke 2, 7), and whose foster father was a carpenter (Matt. 13, 55). (b) He was meek and lowly (Matt. 11, 28-30). (c) He was a lawgiver, and this is the law He gave:

"These things have I spoke unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.

"This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.

"Greater love hath no man that this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.

"Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my father I have made known unto you.

"Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and

bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it to you.

"These things I command you, that ye love one another." John 15, 11-17.

"A new commandment give I unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.

"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have loved one another." John 13, 34-35.

"How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the shew bread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him!

"And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath:

"Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath." Mark 2, 26-28.

(d) He was a prophet, and the following is one of his prophecies, as reported by the witness Matthew:

"And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to shew 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." Matt. 24, 1-2.

"And when he was come near, he beheld the

city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes.

"For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. Luke 19, 41-44.

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto.

"For these be the days of vengeance, that (Isa. 5, 12-15) all things which are written may be fulfilled.

"But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.

"And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles, until the times of the gentiles be fulfilled." Luke 21, 20-24.

The critic may say, with reference to these



closely related prophecies, that Isaiah plagiarized Moses, and that Jesus plagiarized both. An examination into the facts proves that that position is untenable. Moses did not say that the prophet alluded to by him *would* be rejected by the Hebrews. He describes what will happen in case they do reject him. Isaiah goes far beyond that, declares that he *will be* rejected, and gives a detailed statement of the treatment accorded him, in addition to the prediction that Jerusalem would be destroyed and the land laid waste. Neither Moses nor Isaiah enter into a minute description of the destruction of Jerusalem. But Jesus does. He tells how that it will be encompassed by an army which will throw up entrenchments about it, batter down its walls, raze the buildings to the ground, put a portion of the inhabitants to the sword, and carry the remainder into captivity among all of the nations of the earth. The three predictions studied separately show the results of the developments of time, as the end approaches.

This brings us now to the consideration of the matter of the rejection of the prophet alluded to by Moses. We think that, up to this point, we have proven that Jesus has met all of the conditions named by Moses, and that

thus far the credibility of the latter, as a witness, is sustained.

The next point to be considered is, first, was Jesus rejected by the Jews, second, was He rejected in the manner predicted by the witnesses, and, third, did the calamities befall the Jews as the witnesses Moses, Isaiah, and Jesus foretold?

First. There are several things to be noted in the prediction made by Isaiah as to the rejection of Jesus. (a) He was to be a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. The proof of this is that He wept over the grave of Lazarus. He grieved as He came from the Mount of Olives and beheld Jerusalem which had rejected Him. He was persecuted from pillar to post. He suffered great agony in the garden of Gethsemane; the humiliation and distress of being betrayed by one of His chosen friends, and at last the torture of crucifixion on the cross. (b) He was to be wounded, bruised, and scourged for the sake of the people whom He defended. The proof of this is in the recorded fact that spikes were driven through His hands, and He was wounded by a Roman soldier who thrust a spear into His side (John 19, 34). He was bruised by a ruffian who hit Him over the head with a reed (Mark 15, 19),

while others struck Him with their hands (Matt. 26, 67). He was striped with a scourge in the hands of a Roman soldier (John 19, 1). (c) He was oppressed and afflicted, yet remained mute. The proof of this is in the recorded fact that Jesus made no defense of Himself whatever in His trials. Before Herod He uttered not a word. (Luke 23, 9.) (d) He was to be taken from prison and from judgment. The recorded facts prove that He was taken from judgment; that His trial from beginning to end was illegal, and a travesty on justice. This will be discussed later at length in a separate division. (e) He was to make His grave with the wicked and the rich in His death. The recorded facts prove that He was crucified between two thieves and was buried in the tomb of the rich man, Joseph of Arimathea. (John 19, 36.) (f) He was to be guilty of neither violence nor deceit. The proof of this lies in the recorded fact, that after hearing all of the evidence His enemies could produce, Pilate found Him innocent of wrong doing. (Luke 23: 14, 15, 22.) From the foregoing, it is to be seen that He was rejected by the Jews.

Second. Was He rejected in the manner predicted by the witness? The record just

cited above shows that He was, even to the minutest detail.

Third. Did the calamities befall the Jews after the rejection of Jesus, as predicted by Moses, Isaiah, and Himself? The proof as to whether or not they did is not to be found in the Scriptural record, but in authentic history, and to this we resort for our facts. We will now turn to a few pages of the accredited historian, Josephus.

The testimony of this eminent man, who was an eye witness to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Titus, occupies all of Book VI of his historical works, and presents too voluminous a record to be given here verbatim. We will reduce it to narrative form.

First, let us give the testimony of Josephus as to the Roman preparation for battering down the walls of Jerusalem, as predicted by Jesus.

"Now, as Titus was upon his march into the enemy's country, the auxiliaries that were sent by the kings marched first, having all the other auxiliaries with them: after whom followed those who were to prepare the roads and measure out the camp; then came the commanders' baggage, and after that the other soldiers, who were completely armed to support them; then

came Titus himself, having with him another select body; and then came the pikemen, after whom came the horse belonging to that legion. All these came before the engines; and after these engines came the tribunes and the leaders of the cohorts, with their select bodies; after these came the ensigns with the eagle; and before those ensigns came the trumpeters belonging to them; next these came the main body of the army in their ranks, every rank being six deep; the servants belonging to every legion came after these; and before these last their baggage; the mercenaries came last, and those that guarded them brought up the rear."

The Romans were prepared to do business. They approached and surrounded the city, throwing up entrenchments about it and hemming in the thousands of visitors who had come there to attend the feast of the Passover,—the very condition against which Jesus had warned them thirty-seven years before. (Luke 21, 20-24.) But they heeded Him not, although they had knowledge that the Roman armies were at that moment operating against other cities in Palestine.

The degeneration of Jewish officialdom, against which Jesus had declaimed, had grown from bad to worse, and now the city was in the hands of robbers calling themselves zealots and masquerading as patriots. Many of the

more intelligent and reasonable Jews were aware of the futility of opposing the Roman government, for they knew the invincibility of the Roman armies, and they were not aware that their conduct during the last half century justified the robber zealots in believing that Divine intervention in their behalf would be forthcoming. Among these was Josephus who appeared before the walls of the city several times to exhort his people to obedience to the Roman government. But it was to no purpose. Mad folly must run its course. The rejection of his overtures by the Jews only maddened the Roman soldiers the more.

The battering rams pounded against the outer wall incessantly for fifteen days, when it yielded, and the legions, pouring through the breach, took it. They closed in on the town and commenced battering away on the second wall. In five days they took it. They were repulsed, but in five days they retook it and leveled it with the ground. There was a cessation of five days during which the legions paraded before the city in their glittering armor. The poor people were filled with terror and despair. Gaunt famine stalked the streets. Hundreds daily were dying of it. What little they had left was ruthlessly taken

from them by the robbers who controlled the city, one, the like of which, they had released thirty-seven years before when they crucified the Prophet foretold by Isaiah and Moses. In the midst of this fearful retribution, the old men must have recalled their heartless cry: "Crucify Him! Crucify Him! His blood be on us and on our children!" As they had crucified Him, so they, in turn, were crucified by the soldiers whom they had incited to do the brutal act. As they stole out of the city into the valleys to forage a handful of green herbs, the Romans caught them and crucified 500 of them a day before the walls, until they could find no more wood from which to make the crosses.

To make escape impossible and to further tighten their grip upon the city, the Romans surrounded it with a high wall which they built in three days, and increased their efforts to take the place. The Jews were slowly but surely losing ground, the conflict grew more horrible, and the outlook more hopeless. Strange sights and signs pointed to their coming doom. The famine and plague grew worse. Thousands were dying and the highways and byways were piled with decaying corpses, which, for sanitary reasons, were thrown over the walls into the Roman camp. Their hun-

ger became so great that men ate their shoes like starving beasts. Among the hunger crazed throng, was Mary, the daughter of Eleazer, of the village of Bethesud, a woman of means and social standing who had fled to the city, taking many of her effects with her. These the rapacious villains, who had taken possession of the government of the city, had stolen from her. She was left without food for herself and child. Crazed by her hunger and the awful scenes about her, she snatched up her little son, an infant at her breast and said: "O thou miserable infant! for whom shall I preserve thee in this war, this famine, and this sedition? As to the war with the Romans, if they preserve our lives, we must be slaves! This famine will also destroy us, even before that slavery comes upon us; yet are these seditious rogues more terrible than both the other. Come on; be thou my food, and be thou a fury to these seditious varlets, and a byword to the world, which is all that is now wanting to complete the calamities of us Jews." Upon saying this, she slew the babe, roasted and ate one-half of him. The other half she soon after exhibited to the villainous guards who had helped to drive her to her extremities.

At last, the fatal day came. The legions had

advanced to the walls of the temple which Titus had sought to save. But a soldier, without orders, seized a fire brand, and, being lifted up by a comrade, set fire to a golden window on the north side. As the flames went up the Jews, filled with horror at the sight, ran to extinguish it. Titus was notified at once and he ran to the scene to quench the flames; but the soldiers did not hear what he said by reason of the great din. The legions came rushing in, distracted with fighting and crazed with passion, and nothing could restrain their violence. "As for the seditious," says Josephus, "they were in too great distress already to afford their assistance (toward quenching the fire); they were everywhere slain, and everywhere beaten; and as for a great part of the people, they were weak and without arms, and had their throats cut wherever they were caught. Now, round about the altar lay dead bodies heaped one upon another; as at the steps going up to it ran a great quantity of their blood, whither also the dead bodies that were slain above (on the altar) fell down." The conquest was complete. The city, her walls leveled to the ground, lay in ashes. The Prophet's voice had not been heeded, and the Mosaic dispensation had come to an end.

The siege lasted 134 days, and during that time 1,100,000 Jews perished, and 97,000 were carried into captivity, and in this connection it is interesting to know what became of them. Let Josephus testify: "So this Fronto slew all those who had been seditious and robbers; but of the young men he chose out the tallest and most beautiful, and reserved them for the triumph; and as for the rest of the multitude that were above seventeen years old, he put them into bonds, and sent them into the Egyptian mines." Deut. 26, 68.

As we contemplate these happenings, we are filled with awe and amazement as we read again the testimony of Moses:

"And the Lord said unto me, they have well spoken that which they have spoken.

"I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all I shall command him.

"And it shall come to pass, that whoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Deut. 18, 17-19.

Had the Jews accepted that Prophet, with His known policy of peace, and His plan of rendering unto Caesar the things which were Caesar's, and unto God the things which were

God's, there would have been no war with Rome and no destruction of Jerusalem. (Luke 20, 19-26.) How strangely and powerfully is the testimony of the witnesses verified. Who can say that they are not credible witnesses?

However, it has been claimed that the prediction of Moses cited does not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus, but to the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar. A careful analysis of the record does not bear out that claim. We should not be misled by the similarity of circumstances.

(1) The nation which was to destroy them was to come from far, "from the end of the earth." The Babylonians were a neighboring people, with whom the Jews had had much intercourse, while the boundaries of Rome extended as far as the limits of the known world on the north and west. (2) They were to come as "swift as the eagle flieth" (a figure of speech). The Roman legions always carried the eagle at the head of their columns and were noted for their swift marches, such as that of the Pro-consul Nero in the defeat of Hasdrubal, the brother of Hannibal, at the battle of the Metaurus river. (3) It was to be a nation whose tongue they did not understand. This could not apply to the Babylonians for

they were, like the Hebrews, of the Semitic race, and their tongue was not unknown to the Jews. (4) The soldiers were to be of fierce countenance. There never was an army of harder visage than the old Roman. (5) They were to be hardhearted who should "not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young." The Greeks had what we call *sentiment*, but the Romans had none. Cicero was laughed at for his grief at the death of his daughter. They had but one word (*hostis*) for strangers and enemies. In the destruction of Jerusalem they were merciless to all alike. (6) They were to lay the whole land desolate. The Romans did this, but the Babylonians did not. In fact, they left many of the Jews there and put a governor over them to manage their affairs and cultivate the ground. (Josephus.) (7) In their distress, the Jews were to eat the flesh of their own children. There is no such thing recorded in the capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, but it was literally fulfilled during the siege by the Romans. (8) There was to be a general dispersion over all the earth of the Jews who survived the destruction. The Babylonians carried the larger part of the Jews into captivity at Babylon, but they did not disperse them over all the earth. How-

ever, the prediction was literally fulfilled by the Romans. (9) They were to serve unknown gods. The Babylonians did not take from them the privilege of worship, and the gods of the Babylonians were not unknown to the Jews. But they were strangers to the pagan gods of Rome whom they were compelled to worship or suffer persecution. (10) They were to be carried into Egypt in ships and kept in slavery there. The Babylonians did not do this as the two kingdoms were rival enemies at that time. In fact, a considerable number of the Jews under the leadership of Johanan fled to Egypt for protection, taking Jeremiah with them against his will. (Jere. 42.) But there was a literal fulfillment of the prediction by the Romans as shown by the passage from the testimony of Josephus quoted: "So this Fronto slew all those who had been seditious and robbers; but of the young men he chose out the tallest and most beautiful, and reserved them for the triumph; and as for the rest of the multitude that were above seventeen years old, he put them into bonds, and sent them into Egyptian mines."

In view of what the foregoing discloses, what reasonable mind can doubt that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army

was foretold first by Moses, next by Isaiah, and lastly by Jesus. And what reasonable mind can doubt that such destruction was the result of the rejection of Jesus as the Prophet foretold by Moses? Was there ever more wonderful testimony given than this? Is it possible to find more credible witnesses than these?

During our investigation of this record, we have discovered other remarkable testimony to which, we feel, we must give some attention in order to complete our task. Many times the question has been suggested to us: was the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews to be the closing act of this great tragedy? The witnesses say *not*.

We will first analyze the testimony of Moses on that point. It follows almost immediately after that given concerning the destruction of Jerusalem. His meaning is not obscure and his words are of obvious intent. Referring directly to what he has already told them concerning the punishment to come upon them, he says:

"And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou, shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee,

"And shalt return to the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul;

"That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee." Deut. 30, 1-3.

"I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live:

"That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him: for he is thy life, and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them." Deut. 30, 19-20.

In this last paragraph, he testifies of the Sinaitic Covenant between God, and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob which he, himself, had recorded. That covenant contained the promise, that if these fathers and their seed should keep its provisions, they should conquer their enemies and have the homeland as an everlasting possession. (Gen. 17, 1-9.) They did not keep that covenant and they have not had sover-

eign ownership of the land for two thousand years.

In the quotations above given, Moses fixes some conditions precedent to such occupancy and ownership. They are plainly stated and cannot be misunderstood. To realize the promises of those covenants, the Jews must comply with their requirements. They flouted the commandments of Moses, and terrible retribution followed. Surely they sometime must learn the folly and uselessness of continuing it.

What are the conditions precedent to a full restoration of the love and protection of God named by Moses? The answer is, They are several in number. First, They must "call to mind," that is, recall the conditions and restrictions placed upon them by God through the messages delivered to them by Moses, among all nations wherever they are. That is the first step to be taken. Second, They shall make a complete surrender of their wills to that of God so that they may "obey His voice according to all" that was commanded of them,—*all*, not a part of it. In that *all* is the acceptance of Jesus, the Prophet foretold by Moses which they rejected, and by reason of which they were dispossessed of their land and deserted by their God. Third, It must be a



whole hearted, whole souled return to God, and not an attempt to climb up into His graces by some other way. (John 10, 1) Then may they expect Him to turn their captivity, and be gathered by Him from all the nations whither He has scattered them, to the land of their fathers, as an everlasting possession.

Palestine is a British possession, and the Zionist movement today is by British permission under British rule. The union jack and not the flag of David waves over it. What a different political question it would present if Zion were Christian, in harmony with the ruling power and proud of her achievements. Britain would shed the last drop of her blood to protect her. What a wonderful light she would be in that benighted country. She would then be given her place in the British constellation by the side of Canada and Australia, organically a sovereign state. Zion would then come into possession of her own and the restoration would be complete. One would think the joy bells of heaven would ring at such a consummation, and the whole world would wait for the next disclosure.

## DIVISION IV

### A CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAW AND WHAT IT ESTABLISHES

Having established the veracity of the Scriptures and authenticity of the record, the next step in the regular order of inquiry is to determine what it proves or endeavors to establish. In doing so we should be guided by the highest principles of fairness, honor and integrity as well as the most certain methods at our command of ascertaining the truth. This record is found to contain a great body of laws and legal maxims, and rules of conduct permeate the entire document.

For the purpose of arriving at a sound conclusion, influenced in no way by previous discussion of any kind, suppose we assume to have before us, bound together in one great document, the original manuscripts which compose the Scriptures, and that we are called upon to construe them for the first time. The first requisite step to be taken would be to read that document carefully, without bias or preju-

dice. The first thing we would be apt to discover would be that it contained sixty-six different parts, written by forty different persons during a period of about 1600 years; that these persons had employed the aphorisms peculiar to their day; had written in different languages, and had been influenced in so many ways that the most careful comparison of their writings would be necessary in order to enable us to place a sound construction upon the document. We find it in one volume, in the proper receptacle, bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, and purporting to be of divine origin. We can claim no right to take liberties with such a document as that. The most certain rules of construction ought to and must be used. The document itself enjoins this in the following language, to wit:

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5, 18.

#### THE RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Probably no rule of construction has been developed with greater care or based upon more tangible or solid experiences than that adopted by the American courts in construing

constitutions and statutes, and there is every reason why it should be used here. Years ago, the greatest jurists found that haphazard methods of analysis and construction led to injustice and chaos, and we are prone to feel that want of the use of such rules has led to confusion and error in the religious world. The rule of construction is as follows, to wit:

"Nor is it to be inferred that any portion of a written law is so ambiguous as to require extrinsic aid in its construction. Every such instrument is adopted as a whole, and a clause which, standing by itself, might seem of doubtful import, may yet be made plain by comparison with other clauses or portions of the same law. It is therefore a very proper rule of construction, that the whole is to be examined with a view of arriving at the true intention of each part; and this Sir Edward Coke regards as the most natural and genuine method of expounding a statute. If any section of a law be intricate, obscure, or doubtful, the proper mode of discovering its true meaning is by comparing it with other sections, and finding out the sense of one clause by the words of obvious intent of another, and in making this comparison it is not to be supposed that any words have been employed without occasion, or without intent that they should have effect as a part of the law. The rule applicable here is, that effect is to be

given, if possible, to the whole instrument, and to every section and clause. If different portions seem to conflict, the courts must harmonize them, if practicable, and must lean in favor of a construction which will render every word operative, rather than one which may make some words idle and nugatory." Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, p. 71.

#### APPLICATION OF THE RULE

With this rule before us, and examining the document as a whole, we find three transcendent characters described therein, whose offices and functions are more or less clearly defined. These three are denominated God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son, and the Holy Ghost. A partial reference to them is as follows, to wit:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Gen. 1, 1. "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propiation for our sins: and not for ours alone, but for the sins of the whole world." 1, John 1, 1-2. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28, 19.

A careful examination of the document discloses the fact that the three named constitute a great triumvirate, whose origin is so con-

cealed in impenetrable mystery that it cannot be determined definitely from the document itself, and there is no proof outside of it which can be summoned to help us solve it. This document further states that in some inexplicable way God is TRIUNE, for he is spoken of in some instances as one and in others as three. Ge. 1, 26; Gen. 2, 6-7; Is. 48, 16; Is. 34, 16; 2 Cor. 13, 14; John 14, 23; Matt. 28, 19; 2 Thess. 3, 5; 1 John 5, 7; Acts 5, 3-4.

Under the rule of construction adopted and governing us, we cannot tear these parts asunder and cast them aside as meaningless. We know that the earth and heavens are here, and that they must, in some manner, have been created by some power. This document states, that some mysterious person, character or thing, which it denominates God, did it. We readily admit that the origin of the earth and heaven is a mystery. Should we hesitate to admit that the origin of the maker of it is equally so? One mystery may not explain another but it may account for it.

In further examining this document, we discover that God is at the head of this tribune, as the maker of heaven and earth, and is spoken of first, with the Son second and Holy Ghost third in their order. God appears to be

the great transcendent character of the first part of this document, while running through it are references continually to be found of one who should come later to save the people of the world from some great peril which threatened them, and he is spoken of as "Our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is his name, the Holy One of Israel." Isaiah 47, 4; 53. This same "Redeemer" is the great central figure of the second part of the document, called the "New Testament," and was called by those who knew him Jesus of Nazareth. A more or less complete biography of this central figure is given in the document, and reference is made to his supernatural character and origin.

But just at this point of the examination, rules of construction are either forgotten or thrown to the wind, parts of the document are torn bodily from it, considered separate from the rest, in a seeming effort to disharmonize instead of harmonize, with resulting chaos. In the midst of the confusion created, we hear one statement, in substance, of the construction which certain ones have placed upon the document, reported as follows, to wit:

"In the second sermon upon the series upon 'Religious Convictions of a Unitarian Layman,' Rev.— spoke on Jesus: Our Brother,

Our Teacher and Our Guide,' at the Unitarian Church Sunday morning.

" 'What shall I do with Jesus?' The Jewish mob to whom Pilate addressed the question did not leave him long in doubt as to what they would have him do with Jesus, Mr. — said. They cried 'away with him; crucify him.' The authors of the traditional theology entertained no doubt as to what they should do with him. As the second person in the God-head he had come down to earth in order to be offered as a sacrifice to himself and so appease his own wrath. All that was required of his followers was that they should accept this sacrifice which he had made on their behalf.

"Neither of these answers have proved acceptable to the Unitarian laymen. With them, God is not a king to be placated or a judge to be appeased. He is a father and a friend, whose tender mercies are over all His works, while underneath are the everlasting arms. In the same way, Jesus is not God, of the same substance and power as the Father. He is a human being like us in all but our imperfections and weaknesses, a child of the same Father and therefore our brother.

"The second affirmation of Unitarian laymen is, 'we are disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, teacher of the love of God, and of the way of life.' To be a disciple of Jesus means to sit at his feet, and learn of him how to be a Christian and to live the Christian life, the life of un-

selfish love and self-forgetful service as proclaimed and exemplified by Jesus. . . . .

"To the Unitarian layman a Christian is one who accepts Jesus as his brother and teacher and guide and follows reverently in his steps."

An analysis of this statement discloses the fact that the Unitarian laymen hold that this document does not state plainly, fairly and distinctly that Jesus was of supernatural origin, that He was the only begotten Son of God; that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary; that He was the second member of the Triune, and that He did offer Himself as a sacrifice and was sacrificed for the sins of the world.

#### THE ARGUMENT

As construers of a written document, it becomes our duty now to ascertain what its plain statements and provisions are concerning these points. Theories have no place in the course of procedure at this time.

First, what are the plain statements or exact language used in describing the origin and character of Jesus? We will gather them as far as possible from the whole document, or as many of them as are needed for the purposes

of securing a faithful construction of the same. they are as follows, to wit:

"Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 1, 18.

"And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found faovr with God, and, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing that I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke 1, 30-35.

"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.

"The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Mark 1, 1; "Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of

man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Matt. 14, 61-62.

"For unto which of the angels said he at any time, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. And again when he bringeth in the First begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels worship him." Heb. 1, 5-6.

"And he saith unto them, but whom say ye that I am? and Peter answereth and saith unto him, thou are the Christ, and he charged them that they should tell no man of him." Mark 8, 29-30.

"For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." Job 25, 19.

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." Isaiah 7, 14.

"Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted, God with us." Matt. 1, 23.

Applying the rule of construction, given by Justice Cooley, to these sections taken, from the whole document, that no words quoted are used without occasion, "or without intent that they should have effect as a part of the law," but one interpretation is possible, and that is, that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost;

was the direct offspring of God the Father, and therefor of supernatural origin, being thus differentiated from all other men. He cannot be "a human being like us in all but our imperfections and weaknesses." Such a construction cannot be placed upon this document without eliminating altogether the words and sentences quoted from it, and no court of law, with any regard for its standing among civil institutions, would countenance such a proceeding. There is perfect consistency and harmony there without rendering one word idle and nugatory. Any argument, that Jesus was simply a good man, only better than the rest of us, based upon this record or document, made before any competent judicial tribunal would fail as it ought to fail before any solid-thinking judges. We have no right to detach parts of this document from the rest and say that they are true and the rest false. One part is as well authenticated as the others, and it must stand or fall as a whole. To entitle one to discard a part of the document as unworthy of consideration and belief, he must assume the burden of proof of showing that it is spurious. Where are the proofs? Dogmatic statements are neither constructive efforts nor proof of spuriousness, under such circum-

stances. They are themselves "idle and nugatory." It is little wonder that the world refuses to accept such construction. It must be borne in mind that preconceived notions have no place in the construction of constitutions, statutes or other laws, under the rules which now guide us. It may be necessary sometimes to make a broad investigation into the many provisions of written instruments, in order to learn the true *intent* of the maker thereof, that a proper interpretation may be made of the words used, but under no circumstances will the rules permit one to carve out of such instrument, at his own discretion, words, sentences and sometimes whole sections unless he can prove them to be spurious. And as to that, in particular with reference to ancient statutes and documents, the burden of proof rests upon the objector, if they are found in proper custody, in the proper receptacle, and bear on their face no evident marks of forgery, to prove them to be spurious.

But suppose that in this case, we concede the right to the Unitarian laymen, to strike from this document the first chapters of Matthew, Luke and John, and all reference to the supernatural character of Jesus in the rest of the document, what would there be left upon

which could be predicated the assertion that Jesus "was like us in all but our imperfections and weaknesses?" His biography would be gone, the miracles which He performed would be eliminated (because they are the testimony of His supernatural power) and the account of His resurrection and ascension would be stricken out. There would be left but a meager history of a man called Jesus of Nazareth, either of unknown or illegitimate parentage, who claimed that He was the promised Messiah, the Christ of the Old Testament, who went about Palestine rehashing the sayings of the Hebrew prophets and revamping the philosophy of Socrates and Confucius. This is the man at whose feet the Unitarian laymen would sit, and "learn of Him how to be a Christian."

Finally, if the Unitarian laymen construe this document to mean that Jesus had no "imperfections and weaknesses," it must follow that He was morally perfect. But what is perfection? Webster says:

"Moral perfection, is the complete possession of all moral excellence; as in the Supreme Being; or the possession of such moral qualities and virtues as a thing is capable of."

If Jesus had no imperfections, He must have been capable of possessing all of the moral

qualities of the Supreme Being, that is, He was infinite as a moral man and the equal of God. There is no difference on that point between the Unitarian laymen and those whose construction of the document is expressed in the "Apostles Creed." With that admission, the deity of Jesus is half conceded, at least.

But if Jesus were perfect in His moral nature and the equal of God, can any construction be placed upon this document to support the presumption that He was not spiritually perfect and the equal of God? The document states that He was and the burden of proof rests upon the shoulders of those who dispute it to show that He was not. In what paragraph, section or part of this document does such a presumption arise?

Again, the document discloses an account of a conversation which Jesus had with a Samaritan woman at a well called Jacob's well, in which he said to her:

"God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," to which she replied: "I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things," to which Jesus replied: "I that speak unto thee am he."

A further examination of the document re-

veals the fact that the Messiah of the Jews was to be their great deliverer, the annointed one of God. Dan. 9, 25-26; Ps. 2, 2; I Sam. 2, 10. If Jesus were a perfect man, He would not and could not deceive this woman. This being true, as a matter of logic, He was the promised Messiah. But if He were not the Messiah, He deceived the woman, was not a proper exemplar of morals, and few would care to dispute with the Unitarian laymen the privilege of sitting at His feet to learn of Him as a teacher "how to be a Christian."

### THE TRINITY

In the quotation taken from the statement made with reference to the "Religious Convictions of a Unitarian Layman" are found these words:

"As the second person in the God-head he had come down to earth in order to be offered as a sacrifice to himself."

Does a sound construction of the document before us support that statement? This question leads to a discussion of the Trinity and we at once consult the contents of the instrument to see what it contains concerning it. In doing so we find this clause:



"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

But what and who are these three characters? We consult the document to find out, and we discover that it alleges that:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," and that "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Gen. 1, 1-2. That "God is a spirit." John 4, 24.

"Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 1, 18.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28, 19.

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." 1 John, 5, 7.

By comparing the word "Word" in this citation with the same word in John 1, 1-17, it will be seen that it refers to Jesus Christ the Son, who is the second person of the Trinity.

The Trinity, then, is composed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are declared to be one. According to the rule under which we are working, it becomes our duty to compare these and other sections of

the document to see if a harmonious construction can be had. How can three persons or entities be combined in one? It may be very difficult to answer that question, but we have no right to carve these words and sentences from the document, and cast them aside, simply because some cannot or are not disposed to harmonize them, but we are under obligations as honest judges to use our best efforts to harmonize them. To establish harmony does not mean that we must explain the hidden mystery which they seem to contain. All we are obliged to do under the rule is to show that there is no contradiction, the burden of proof resting on the shoulders of the opposition to show that there is disharmony and disagreement which cannot be reconciled between the alleged conflicting sentences. Why cannot these three be contained in one? The question raised is: Can there be such a union?

There have been some striking analogies in this world which may be used to explain the trinitarian construction. The Siamese Twins were organically connected so that the same life-blood sustained them both. They had separate and distinct personalities and yet were of common origin. Suppose there had been three of them instead of two. They, too, could

35409

have been called a trinity, notwithstanding the three separate personalities of which it was composed. They would have been composed of the same flesh and blood or "essence," as the specialists are wont to call it, and sustained by the same life-giving processes. The commonness or oneness of life in the Siamese Twins was such that the death of one meant the death of the other. It was therefore two lives in one. The same equally would have been true had there been triplets. Suppose that it had happened that the three came into power and that it became necessary for them to perform official duties. Could not the three agree among themselves as to which should be considered the first, and the second, and the third? Endow such a triumvirate with the quality of perfection and there would exist the most perfect accord in all that they did. Clothe them with divinity and they could create worlds and move them with perfect harmony. If they were clothed with divinity, the physical union which bound them together in this world would no longer exist, for they could at will rise above and cast it off, but the oneness of divine essence and unity of life and purpose would still exist. They would be, as they were in the physical life, a trinity—a union of three

in one, known by whatever name they might assume. Of course, it is not claimed that perfect analogy exists in this illustration.

To further explain the passages given, we offer the following quotation from an eminent authority:

"This doctrine is rejected by many because it is incomprehensible; but, if distinct personality, agency, and divine perfections be in Scripture ascribed to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, no words can more accurately express the doctrine, which must unavoidably be thence inferred, than those commonly used on this subject, viz., that there are three distinct persons in the Unity of the God-head. The sacred oracles most assuredly teach us, that the One living and true God is, in some inexplicable manner, Triune, for he is spoken of as One in some respects, and as Three in others (Gen. 1, 26; Gen. 2, 6-7; Is. 48, 16; 2 Cor. 13, 14; John 14, 23; Matt. 28, 19; 2 Thess. 3, 5; 1 John 5, 7; Acts 5, 3-4). The Trinity of persons in the Deity consists with the unity of the Divine Essence; though we cannot explain the modus of it, as the modus in which any being subsists according to its distinct nature and known properties, is a secret to the most learned of men, and probably always will continue so. But if the most common of God's works, with which we are the most conversant, be in this respect incom-

prehensible, how can men think that the *modus existendi* (or manner of existence) of the infinite Creator can be level to their capacities?

"The doctrine of the Trinity is indeed a mystery, but no man has yet shown that it involves in it a real contradiction. Many have ventured to say, that it ought to be ranked with transubstantiation, as equally absurd. But Archbishop Tillotson has shown by the most convincing arguments imaginable, that transubstantiation includes the most palpable contradictions; and that we have the evidence of our eyes, feeling, and taste, that what we receive in the Lord's supper is bread, and not the body of a man; whereas we have the testimony of our eyes alone, that the words, 'This is my body,' are at all in the Scriptures. Now this is intelligible to the meanest capacity; it is fairly made out, and perfectly answerable. But whoever attempted thus to prove the doctrine of the Trinity to be self-contradictory? What testimony of our senses, or what demonstrated truth, does it contradict? Yet till this be shown, it is neither fair nor convincing to exclaim against it as contradictory, absurd and irrational." (*The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopaedia*, p. 1678.)

#### APPLICATION OF THE RULE

We will again avail ourselves of the rule of construction governing us in this discussion,

since it is stated that there is a mystery contained in the doctrine of the Trinity. That portion of the rule to be applied is as follows, to wit:

"If any portion of a law be intricate, obscure, or doubtful, the proper mode of discovering its true meaning is by comparing it with the other sections, and finding out the sense of one clause by the words of obvious intent of another, and in making this comparison it is not to be supposed that any words have been employed without occasion, or without intent that they should have effect as a part of the law."

But what words appear to be "obscure, intricate, or doubtful"? The quotation from the belief of the Unitarian Laymen indicates that in this case they are those which have reference to the "God-head." In searching the document for these we find the following, to wit:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

"There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness,

to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And 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 1, 1-14.

It is admitted that these words, unexplained, are obscure and intricate, and, under the rule governing, we should compare others with them of "obvious intent," to learn their true meaning. To this end, we will first compare John with John, to see if he will explain his own words or can explain them.

According to John, the "Word" was Jesus the Son of God. John 1, 15-18. By substituting the words "Jesus the Son of God" for the word "Word," the first sentence quoted would read as follows, to wit:

"In the beginning was Jesus the Son of God,

and Jesus the Son of God was with God, and Jesus the Son of God was God."

To the finite mind, without further explanation, this is impossible, because the Son could not be himself and another at the same time. Some comparisons must be made with words of "obvious intent" if we are to arrive at the true meaning of that sentence, because the proposition, left as stated, is absurd. We will, therefore, take from the document other words and sentences of "obvious intent" for purposes of explanation, to wit:

"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. For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."

These are plain words, and their intent is obvious. They can be construed to mean nothing but this: God, the Father, had such an interest in the world which He created 'in the beginning,' that He sent His only begotten Son, Jesus, into the said world to save it from some impending danger described in other parts of the document. The word "sent" has a definite meaning which is not obscure. It is the past participle of the verb "send" which

means "to cause to go." (Webster.) The meaning, then, is that the Father caused the Son to go to the world to save it from some impending evil. There are two distinct personalities described and referred to and one dominates the other to that extent that He commands Him to do His own will. It is obvious that the two personalities cannot be one, and this fact is recognized by the Son, and is so stated by John in another paragraph of this document, to wit:

"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 the Father which hath sent me." John 5, 30.

These are also words of obvious intent which must be understood by the ordinary mind. In other words, the Son clearly states that He can do nothing by reason of His own power but must rely upon the Father who sent Him. He explains the reason for this as follows, to wit:

"For I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me." John 6, 38.

The substance of this declaration is again repeated as follows, to wit:

"Jesus said unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded

forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me." John 8, 42.

Here is a plain declaration, made in the simplest of words, subject to but one construction, to the effect, that the Son did not come to the earth of His own accord but that He was sent by another who was the Father. In this, He maintains His own personality and that of the Father also—the two working in perfect harmony and accord.

Again, towards the end of this document, we find another section which reads as follows, to wit:

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." 1 John 5, 7.

Thus we see, that by using words of definite and obvious meaning to explain those of obscure meaning, one writer of this document is made to explain, at least in part, what he means by the use of those words; that there are three great personalities described in this document, one of which transcends the others, and who is called God the Father, and that these three are united in such a way as to warrant him in saying that they are one.

Are there any words of obvious meaning to be found in this document which can be used to explain this? Let us examine it to see.

In the very first part of it we find these words, to wit:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Gen. 1, 1-2.

"Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." Psalms 51, 10-11.

From this it will be seen that the spirit of God and the Holy Spirit are one and the same, and that He is under God's direct control and command. He goes and comes at His will. It follows, that in the Trinity, the personality of God is supreme. That is why He is first in the Triune and given the place of honor by the Son. Further proof is seen of this in the following, to wit:

"And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. 4, 6.

We also observe the following:

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14, 26.

But it must be obvious that the Spirit of God is of the same divine essence as Himself, and the Son who was pro-created by the Holy Spirit, must be also. They are of one common substance, of like attributes, and are united in one essence. The document declares this to be so, as follows, to wit:

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one." 1 John 5, 7-8.

#### POWERS OF THE TRINITY

From the foregoing, it may be seen that the three members of the Trinity are of common origin and unity in divine essence; that they are correspondingly equal in potential power. But it does not necessarily follow from that, that by reason of some mutual arrangement amongst them (the *modus operandi* of which is not revealed to us in this record), certain authority is not vested in one which is not common to all; that certain defference is not paid to one which is not paid to all. Nowhere have we been able to find in this document where the Son or Holy Spirit have either of

them set Himself above the Father or directed Him to do a certain thing without consulting Him or without His consent. But the document is full of statements where the Father has directed Them to do things because of the superior authority He possessed. There is no instance recorded where He ever went to One of Them in supplication or for guidance. He is all majesty at all times. The Son repeatedly acknowledges His dependence upon the Father. Let us now turn to the document to find the proof of this.

#### GOD'S MAJESTY

"In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth." Gen. 1, 1.

"And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." Gen. 17, 1.

"Behold, God is mighty, and despiseth not any: he is mighty in strength and wisdom." Job 35, 5.

"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare if thou hast understanding." Job 38, 4.

"For the Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward." Deut. 10, 17.

"Wherefore thou art great, O Lord God: for there is none like thee, neither is there any God besides thee, according to all that we have heard with our ears." 2 Sam. 8, 22.

"And the house I built is great: for great is our God above all Gods." 2 Chron. 2, 5.

"The Lord God of Gods, the Lord God of Gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know; if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord, (save us not this day).

"Ye are my witnesses saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me." Is. 43, 10.

"Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." Tit. 2, 13.

"That if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. 10, 9.

The language employed in these quotations is of obvious intent, and it needs no other words to explain its meaning. The exalted nature of the Father is fully set forth, His majesty is acknowledged beyond question, and His supreme power is admitted. This is proven by the attitude which the Son takes towards Him and the many admissions and statements He makes which are found in the record.

## THE SON'S REVERENCE AND OBEDIENCE

Referring again to the document, we find the following statements, to wit:

"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.

"For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John 3, 17.

These are simple words of obvious intent. God gave His only begotten Son, as a Savior to the world. He could not give what was not His to give. Therefore the Son was His to give. He could not send the Son to do a particular thing for Him without obedience from the Son. The Son, recognizing His filial obligation to the Father and His superior authority, went to do and did His Father's bidding.

"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 the Father which hath sent me." John, 5, 30.

Here is a plain, frank statement, made by the Son, to the effect that under the *modus operandi* existing in the Trinity, He can do

nothing without the Father's orders, and that He listens ("as I hear") to get them, acting accordingly as they may be given. This may not mean that there is not potential equality in the Trinity, and it does not follow that each member thereof is not potentially vested with infinite power. But it does mean, if it means anything, that under the *modus operandi*, the Son gets His orders from the Father and obeys them. This is in perfect accord with the announced purpose of His coming, and may be clearly seen if the contents of the document are carefully examined. The pact entered into by the members of the Trinity, was made in heaven, and the *modus operandi* of the same is as much of a mystery as is the *modus existendi*. However, it can be readily determined from the contents of this document that such pact was and is being carried out.

"In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight." Luke 10, 21.

In this section, the Son acknowledges the supremacy of the Father by personally addressing him as "Lord of heaven and earth."



Not only does it appear that the Son came to the earth upon the order of the Father, but it also appears that He kept in close touch with Him while He was here. This is seen in the following statement, to wit:

"Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always." John 11, 41-42.

An examination of the record shows, that the Son had been in communication with the Father concerning the death and resurrection of Lazarus.

Again we read:

"And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down and prayed, saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done." Luke 22, 41-42.

Here the Son is found petitioning the Father, not in behalf of others, but in behalf of Himself, at the same time submitting His own will to that of the Father, in accordance with the *modus operandi*.

But in order to remove all further question about the matter, we have only to examine one more statement, made by the Son Himself,

relative to His relationship to the Father, to wit:

"Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye love me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I." John 14, 28.

These are simple, plain words of obvious intent, and can be construed to mean nothing less than, that, in their relationship, one to the other, the Father was greater than the Son. These are the words written by John, who also wrote,

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." John 1, 1-2.

The hidden or obscure meaning of these words has been explained by comparing other words of obvious intent with them. The word, the "Word," means the "Son," and the Father and the Son, together with the Holy Spirit, compose the Trinity, or "Three in One," in the Deity, and this trinity of persons in the Deity "consists with the unity of the Divine Essence." It has been found that three personalities compose this Trinity, the Father, the

Son, and the Holy Spirit; that these three are potentially equal, but by reason of some understanding or agreement among them, the *modus operandi* of which is not disclosed, the supremacy of the Father is established and acknowledged by the others.

We think it can be safely stated, that a fair construction placed upon the contents of this document will not warrant any one in holding that "the second person in the God-head" had come down to earth to be sacrificed to Himself, but that He, as the Son, was sent by the Father, to the world to save it from some impending evil, which would require great sacrifice on His part. The nature of this will be further explained.

## DIVISION V.

### CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAW AS TO THE DIVINE SACRIFICE

"As the second person in the God-head he had come down to earth in order to be offered as a sacrifice to himself, and so appease his own wrath."

This is neither a proper statement of the orthodox belief in the purpose of the divine sacrifice, nor a correct construction of the law governing the case. The Second Person of the God-head, the Son, did not "come" down to earth, but was "sent" down to earth by the First Person of the God-head, the Father. He did not "come down to the earth to be offered as a sacrifice to Himself," but was "sent down" to be offered as a sacrifice, if necessary, for the good of the world. The difference in construction is very obvious, and that difference is the dividing line between truth and error.

The record as to this, states as follows, to wit:

"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. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John 3, 16-17.

To this program, the Son assented, as may be seen from the following quotation from the record, to wit:

"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 the Father which hath sent me." John 5, 30.

In other words, the Son came to do the will of the Father, and not His own. He did as He was told, for He clearly states, that "as I hear, I judge."

The record shows that He followed His instructions through the darkest hours, keeping in constant touch with the Father, consenting to every sacrifice which was required of Him, no matter how bitter it might be. This may be seen from the following excerpt taken from the record, to wit:

"And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount of Olives; and his disciples also followed him. And when he was at the place, he said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into

temptation. And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done." Luke 22, 39-42.

If this means anything, in the light of the circumstances described, it means that the program, as outlined to Him at that time, was hard for Him to accept and follow, but if there were no other way acceptable to the Father, He was willing and ready to undertake its execution. The program, as outlined in the record (Luke 22 and 23; Matt. 26 and 27; Mark 13, 14 and 15; John 18 and 19) provided for His crucifixion, with the agony it would bring to His mother, His friends and followers, and the destruction of Jerusalem with all of its attending horrors. But He was told, by the Father, that there was no other way by which the world could be saved from its impending doom, and He heroically met the issue squarely; that is to say, the presumption is that the Father told Him that there was no other way consistent with the Father's judgment and will, for He asked three different times that the program be changed, but it was not. Matt. 26, 36-46.

## WHY THE SACRIFICE WAS MADE

"As the second person of the God-head he had come down to earth in order to be offered as a sacrifice to himself, and so appease his own wrath."

This is not a correct statement of the belief of those who hold that the second Person of the Trinity, the Son, was sent to earth to save it from impending doom, and that He was offered as a sacrifice, which program He accepted, in order to accomplish His mission. The question then arises: Why was the Son sent to earth to save it? and what was the nature and character of the peril from which He was to rescue it? These questions are general and call for an extended examination of the document, and careful application of the rules of construction. In it we find the following provisions, which appear to be statutes and rules of conduct, to wit:

"Honor thy father and thy mother: and, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness." Matt. 19, 18-19.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great com-

mandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 22, 37-39.

These are all plain words of obvious intent which the simplest mind can understand. The first are plain prohibitive statutes. A further examination discloses some peculiar and heavy penalties fixed for their violation, some of which are as follows, to wit:

"And 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 obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1, 7-9.

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and 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 delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell

were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20, 11-15.

The construction is plain: The laws governing men's lives were given to them from time to time by the Law-giver's representatives (and men have been aware of them) for the purpose, first, of differentiating good from evil, and, second, to give notice of and provide penalties for those who should violate them. A statement concerning the first law enacted and its violation is given in the very first part of the record, and it is to be seen that after that a more elaborate set of laws were adopted and put into force. The cause of the first violation is set forth, and ascribed to the rebellious influence of an evil spirit called Satan. Gen. 3. This violation carried with it, and made active, the law of heredity, whereby the offspring inherited the weaknesses and imperfections of his forefathers. This principle was announced at the time the law was first promulgated by the law-giver, Moses, as follows, to wit:

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in

heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water that is under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." Ex. 20, 3-5.

This was a public announcement of an existing principle which had already manifested itself in the lives of Cain and his children. Gen. 4, 1-4. The mischief done seems to have been very great, according to the record, for it states:

"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose. And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his

heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them." Gen. 6, 1-7.

From this record, it will be seen that something had gone wrong with the plans of the Father, and He was resorting to extreme methods to correct the evils done. To accomplish this, he selected the most perfect man then living in all the earth with which, under the immutable laws of heredity, to start over again the creation of a race which should measure up to his standards of Godliness. To this end, he selected Noah, with his family, who "was a just man and perfect in his generations," that is, according to his race and the day in which he lived. Gen. 6, 8-9. The rest of the race was destroyed by a great flood.

But it appears from the record, that even this extreme measure did not eradicate the evil existing, for Noah, soon after, was guilty of excesses, and one of his sons, Ham, showed such signs of depravity that his father placed a curse upon him and his offspring. Gen. 9, 20-29. This was a bad new start for the human race, and showed quite conclusively that error (sin) had come into the world to stay.

A careful review of the whole document discloses a record of strife between the opposing forces of good and evil, for the mastery of mankind. Law-givers, prophets, and great teachers appeared, from time to time, to expound and maintain the law which the Father had given. But these seemed to be able to make no headway. The situation seemed to be desperate. The Father had tried to purify the blood of the human race by the natural processes of heredity, for Noah was the survivor of the fittest of his day, but the taint was too extended and deep to permit it, and it had failed. What was He to do?

#### INTENT OF THE LAW-GIVER

This brings us to the question of *intent*, and we can only determine this by examining the whole document. In so doing, we must carefully observe sound rules of construction. Justice Cooley states that it is sometimes necessary to use extrinsic aids in order to determine the meaning of a constitution, law, or document, and he states the governing rule as follows, to wit:

"The considerations thus far suggested are such as have no regard for extrinsic circum-

stances, but are those by the aid of which we seek to arrive at the meaning of the constitution from an examination of the words employed. It is possible, however, that after we shall have made use of all the lights which the instrument itself affords, there may still be doubts to clear up, and ambiguities to explain. Then, and then only, are we warranted in seeking elsewhere for aid. We are not to import difficulties into a constitution, by a consideration of extrinsic facts, when none appear upon its face. If, however, a difficulty really exists, which an examination of every part of the instrument does not enable us to remove, there are certain extrinsic aids which we may resort to, and which are more or less satisfactory in the light they afford. Among these aids is a contemplation of the object to be accomplished or the mischief designed to be remedied or guarded against by the clause in which the ambiguity is met with." Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, p. 79.

#### APPLICATION OF THE RULE

By referring to this document, we recall the advent of the Son, into the world, and His declaration, to wit:

"For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John 3, 17.

We learned from this document what the condition of the world was, at the time of Noah, and we are now interested in learning what its condition was at the time of the advent of the Son. If it had improved during the interim, one could hardly understand the need of the coming of so remarkable a character as the Son, but if it had not, one would be justified in concluding that a sufficient lapse of time had occurred to give the Noah experiment a fair trial. If that experiment had failed, it would become evident that something of a far-reaching character, accompanied by tremendous power, would have to be resorted to, to save the human family from certain doom. Had any improvement taken place? Reference to the record would seem to show that it had not. This record shows that Palestine, the native land of the Son, was under the rule of the Roman empire, and that that empire was practically the mistress of the whole world. The record describes the condition of the Roman people as follows, to wit:

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do the things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetous-

ness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, deceit, debate, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventers of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection; implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Romans 1, 28-32.

The section just quoted is a most terrible indictment of a nation, and as that nation ruled the whole world, its influences must have been very great. The situation must have been appalling, because the race to which the earthly relatives of the Son belonged, which seemed to have been a sort of chosen people, seemed to have become also very corrupt, for the witness speaks of these people as follows, to wit:

"Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. . . . Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. 23, 27-28, 33.

But if the foregoing is not sufficient evidence to enable us to determine the *intent* of the law-giver or his "contemplation of the object to be accomplished or the mischief designed to be remedied or guarded against by the clause in which the ambiguity is met with," we shall have access to authentic history in determining the *intent* of the law-giver expressed in his declaration before quoted, to wit:

"For God send not his son into the world to condemn the world: but that the world through him might be saved."

Probably no modern historian is better qualified to testify upon this particular point than Professor Fisher, of Yale, whose great history (Beginnings of Christianity) is in practically every public library in the land. Concerning the condition of the world at the time of the advent of the Son, as well as for many years before that, he testifies as follows, to wit:

"Licentiousness entered into the rites of heathen worship. Prostitution was not made a part of religious service among the Babylonians and other Semitic peoples alone. It was practiced, likewise, in honor of Aphrodite at Corinth. The indecent songs, symbols, and revelry, which attended the Bacchanalian and other festivals, cannot be mentioned in detail.



The Bacchic orgies were carried by the Greeks to Etruria, and being thence transferred to Rome, led to most indecent and iniquitous excesses; so that the consuls, in the year 189 B. C., interfered to suppress ceremonies that involved murder, as well as gross debauchery. At that time, seven thousand persons in Rome were united in the practice of these frightful orgies. Livy states that subsequently a Praetor condemned to death, in one year, 3,000 persons on the charge of poisoning, where crime was mixed up with religion. The Romans, notwithstanding their earlier regard for decency, admitted rites of an opposite character. Mythological stories which were adapted to excite the baser propensities, were represented in pictures and statues, and swelled the tide of corruption which beat with increasing force against the ancient barriers of chastity and order. (*Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 198.)

Professor Fisher describes in detail the degradation of women at the time of the advent of the Son; the extravagance of the people; unnatural vice and pollution; infanticide; the horrors of Roman amusements; the depravity of the stage; the circus; and the brutality of the arena, in which gladiatorial contests, where living men, often in large numbers, were set to fight in deadly combat with one another, and with wild beasts, for the amusement of

spectators of both sexes, and of every age and rank, who delighted in the bloody scenes. He closes his testimony in these words, to wit:

"Such was the state of society in the first century. Nor was there wanting a consciousness of the decay and approaching ruin of all things which men had most valued. The noblest men took refuge in stoicism, and suicide was frequent among them. A vein of melancholy runs through the histories of Tacitus. Repeatedly he adverts to the wrath of the gods against the Roman state as a fact to be taken for granted. He apologizes for the interminable catalogue of crimes and sufferings which he is compelled to record. 'The more I meditate,' he says, 'upon the events of ancient and modern times, the more I am impressed with the capricious uncertainty which mocks the calculations of men.' He was oppressed with the contemplation of the gloomy drama of human history. It was not a period of hope, but of sadness and despair. The world seemed to have stopped its motion and to have begun to dissolve itself into primitive chaos. An incurable internal disease had fastened upon the Roman state, and what was there beyond it?" (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Fisher, p. 219.)

An examination of this testimony discloses the fact that the then known world was going from bad to worse; that it was seemingly afflicted with an incurable internal disease, in

dire distress, and in need of some extraordinary remedy.

Now, before we can discover the true *intent* of the author of the law in question, commonly denominated by Christians as THE DIVINE LAW, we shall have to diagnose the disease from which the world was suffering, and to which Professor Fisher refers, to ascertain if the remedy prescribed was a specific cure for the same. We have traced the origin to the beginning of the human race; to that fatal error of our first ancestors, and have found that mysterious law of heredity passing the effects of it down through the succeeding generations. We have observed the conflict between the opposing forces of truth and error, and the almost complete triumph of error at the time of Noah. We have noted the failure of the extreme and terrible remedy administered at that time. Annihilation was tried then, and failed in its purpose. Is its very antithesis to be tried now as a specific cure for that "incurable internal disease"? To aid us in this determination, we will call in a very noted specialist as an expert witness and authority, Professor Henry Drummond, F.R.S.E., F.G.S., author of "The Natural Law in the Spiritual World," who gives a general diagnosis of such

diseases, which must apply to the case at bar, and which is as follows, to wit:

"In one of his best known books, Mr. Darwin brings out a fact which may be illustrated in some such way as this: Suppose a bird fancier collects a flock of tame pigeons distinguished by the infinite ornamentations of their race. They are of all kinds, of every shade of color, and adorned with every variety of marking. He takes them to an uninhabited island and allows them to fly off wild into the woods. They found a colony there, and after the lapse of many years the owner returns to the spot. He will find that a remarkable change has taken place in the interval. The birds, or their descendants rather, have all become changed into the same color. The black, the white, and the dun, the striped, the spotted, and the ringed, are all metamorphosed into one—a dark slaty blue. Two plain black bands monotonously repeat themselves upon the wings of each, and the loins beneath are white; but all the variety, all the beautiful colors, all the old graces of form, it may be, have disappeared. These improvements were the result of care, and nurture, of domestication, of civilization; and now that these influences are removed, the birds themselves undo the past, and lose what they had gained. The attempt to elevate the race has been mysteriously thwarted. It is as if the original bird, the far remote ancestor of all doves, had been blue, and these had been compelled by some strange

law to discard the badges of their civilization and conform to the ruder image of the first. The natural law by which a change occurs is called *The Principle of Reversion to Type*." (Natural Law in the Spiritual World, p. 83.)

Professor Drummond declares the law to be universal, and that it applies to all animal as well as plant life. In this connection, he makes the following statement, to wit:

"Now the same thing exactly would happen in the case of you or me. Why should man be an exception to any of the laws of nature? Nature knows him simply as an animal—sub-kingdom *Vertebrata*, class *Mamalia*, order *Bimana*. And the law of Reversion to Type runs through all creation. If a man neglect himself for a few years he will change into a worse man and a lower man. If it is his body he neglects, he will deteriorate into a wild man and bestial savage—like the de-humanized men who are discovered sometimes upon deserted islands. If it is his mind, it will degenerate into imbecility and madness—solitary confinement has the power to unmake men's minds and leave them idiots. If he neglect his conscience, it will run off into lawlessness and vice. Or lastly, if it is his soul, it must inevitably atrophy, drop off into ruin and decay." Id. p. 84.

But how can this law apply to the case before us? is asked. We think Professor Drum-

mond answers the question conclusively in the chapter on *Degeneration* in his work before quoted. He states that there are three possibilities of life, according to science, open to all living organisms—*Balance*, *Evolution*, and *Degeneration*. But *Degeneration*, he says, rather than *Balance* or *Elaboration* (Evolution),

"is the possibility of life embraced by the majority of mankind. And the choice is determined by man's own nature. The life of balance is difficult. It lies on the verge of continual temptation, its perpetual adjustments become fatiguing, its measured virtue is monotonous and uninspiring. More difficult still, apparently, is the life of ever upward growth. Most men attempt it for a time, but growth is slow; and despair overtakes them while the goal is still far away. Yet none of these reasons fully explains the fact that the alternative which remains is adopted by the majority of men. That *Degeneration* is easy only half accounts for it. Why is it easy? Why but that already in each man's very nature this principle is supreme. He feels within his soul a silent drifting motion impelling him downward with irresistible force. Instead of aspiring to a conversion to a higher type, he submits by a law of his nature to a Reversion to a lower. This is *Degeneration*—that principle by which the organism, failing to develop itself, failing even to keep what it has got, deter-

iorates, and becomes more and more adapted to a degraded form of life." Drummond, p. 85.

Professor Drummond says that when God gave nature this law into her own hands to enforce, He seems to have given her two rules upon which her sentences were to be based. The one is formally enunciated in this sentence, "*Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.*" The other is informally expressed in this, "*If we neglect, how shall we escape?*"

"There must be some hidden and vital relation," says he, "between these three words—Salvation, Neglect, and Escape—some remarkable, essential, and indissoluble connection. Why are these words so linked together as to weight this clause with all the authority and solemnity of a sentence of death?" "The answer," he says, "is in the meaning of the word salvation," and this, he states, includes not only forgiveness of sin, but deliverance from the downward bias which he denominates *Degeneration*.

Continuing, Professor Drummond testifies:

"We have seen that there is a natural principle in man lowering him, deadening him, pulling him down by inches to the mere animal plane, blinding reason, searing conscience, paralyzing will. This is the active destroying

principle, or sin. Now to counteract this, God has discovered to us another principle which will stop this drifting process in the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way. This is the active or saving principle, or *Salvation*. If a man find the first of these powers furiously at work within him, dragging his whole life downward to destruction, there is only one way to escape his fate—to take resolute hold of the upward power, and be borne by it to the opposite goal. And as this second power is the only one in the universe which has the slightest real effect upon the first, how shall man escape if he neglect it? To neglect it is to cut off the only possible chance of escape. In declining this he is simply abandoning himself with his eyes open to that other and terrible energy which is already there, and which, in the natural course of things, is bearing him every moment further and further away from escape." Drummond, p. 90.

We again refer to the instrument in question to find a statement as to why the Son was sent into the world, and we find that he himself said that he came not to condemn the world but to save the world. John 3, 17. In other words, he claimed to be its savior, and to furnish it salvation, or deliverance from the inexorable law of *Degeneration*, explained by Drummond, "the active destroying principle, or sin."

law to discard the badges of their civilization and conform to the ruder image of the first. The natural law by which a change occurs is called *The Principle of Reversion to Type*." (Natural Law in the Spiritual World, p. 83.)

Professor Drummond declares the law to be universal, and that it applies to all animal as well as plant life. In this connection, he makes the following statement, to wit:

"Now the same thing exactly would happen in the case of you or me. Why should man be an exception to any of the laws of nature? Nature knows him simply as an animal—sub-kingdom *Vertebrata*, class *Mamalia*, order *Bimana*. And the law of Reversion to Type runs through all creation. If a man neglect himself for a few years he will change into a worse man and a lower man. If it is his body he neglects, he will deteriorate into a wild man and bestial savage—like the de-humanized men who are discovered sometimes upon deserted islands. If it is his mind, it will degenerate into imbecility and madness—solitary confinement has the power to unmake men's minds and leave them idiots. If he neglect his conscience, it will run off into lawlessness and vice. Or lastly, if it is his soul, it must inevitably atrophy, drop off into ruin and decay." Id. p. 84.

But how can this law apply to the case before us? is asked. We think Professor Drum-

mond answers the question conclusively in the chapter on *Degeneration* in his work before quoted. He states that there are three possibilities of life, according to science, open to all living organisms—*Balance*, *Evolution*, and *Degeneration*. But *Degeneration*, he says, rather than *Balance* or *Elaboration* (Evolution),

"is the possibility of life embraced by the majority of mankind. And the choice is determined by man's own nature. The life of balance is difficult. It lies on the verge of continual temptation, its perpetual adjustments become fatiguing, its measured virtue is monotonous and uninspiring. More difficult still, apparently, is the life of ever upward growth. Most men attempt it for a time, but growth is slow; and despair overtakes them while the goal is still far away. Yet none of these reasons fully explains the fact that the alternative which remains is adopted by the majority of men. That *Degeneration* is easy only half accounts for it. Why is it easy? Why but that already in each man's very nature this principle is supreme. He feels within his soul a silent drifting motion impelling him downward with irresistible force. Instead of aspiring to a conversion to a higher type, he submits by a law of his nature to a Reversion to a lower. This is *Degeneration*—that principle by which the organism, failing to develop itself, failing even to keep what it has got, deter-

iorates, and becomes more and more adapted to a degraded form of life." Drummond, p. 85.

Professor Drummond says that when God gave nature this law into her own hands to enforce, He seems to have given her two rules upon which her sentences were to be based. The one is formally enunciated in this sentence, "*Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.*" The other is informally expressed in this, "*If we neglect, how shall we escape?*"

"There must be some hidden and vital relation," says he, "between these three words—Salvation, Neglect, and Escape—some remarkable, essential, and indissoluble connection. Why are these words so linked together as to weight this clause with all the authority and solemnity of a sentence of death?" "The answer," he says, "is in the meaning of the word salvation," and this, he states, includes not only forgiveness of sin, but deliverance from the downward bias which he denominates *Degeneration*.

Continuing, Professor Drummond testifies:

"We have seen that there is a natural principle in man lowering him, deadening him, pulling him down by inches to the mere animal plane, blinding reason, searing conscience, paralyzing will. This is the active destroying

principle, or sin. Now to counteract this, God has discovered to us another principle which will stop this drifting process in the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way. This is the active or saving principle, or *Salvation*. If a man find the first of these powers furiously at work within him, dragging his whole life downward to destruction, there is only one way to escape his fate—to take resolute hold of the upward power, and be borne by it to the opposite goal. And as this second power is the only one in the universe which has the slightest real effect upon the first, how shall man escape if he neglect it? To neglect it is to cut off the only possible chance of escape. In declining this he is simply abandoning himself with his eyes open to that other and terrible energy which is already there, and which, in the natural course of things, is bearing him every moment further and further away from escape." Drummond, p. 90.

We again refer to the instrument in question to find a statement as to why the Son was sent into the world, and we find that he himself said that he came not to condemn the world but to save the world. John 3, 17. In other words, he claimed to be its savior, and to furnish it salvation, or deliverance from the inexorable law of *Degeneration*, explained by Drummond, "the active destroying principle, or sin."

By a careful examination of the record with reference to this last phase of the discussion, we find that there had developed two crises in the life of the human race, one at the time of Noah, when the Father tried the experiment of annihilation as a cure for Degeneration, to give the race a new start, and the other at the advent of the Son. If the former experiment had failed, the need of another becomes apparent. The question arising, then, is: had it failed? If it had, the presumption follows that the world was in as bad condition as it was at the time of Noah, when the Father lamented that he had ever made man.

The point then to be determined is; was the world in need of a deliverer from the effects of that law (Degeneration) at the time of the advent of the Son? Had not the people of the world any god, son, or moral or metaphysical plan of deliverance from it? The question will necessitate an inquiry into the matter. To this end, we will summon the accredited historian, Dollinger, and take his testimony.

This witness states that the controlling moral and spiritual force in the world at that time was called paganism, which was of mythical origin, founded on Greek tradition, and was imported from that country into Rome.

Roman paganism had, in the beginning, all of the early virtues of the Greek, but, like it, became contaminated with the degrading influences of the East. In due time, says the accredited historian, the same "silent drifting motion," which had dragged man down to destruction at Noah's time, began to manifest itself among the western peoples, although unappreciated by them. Just in proportion as the virus of degeneracy worked, the number and baseness of their gods increased. The Romans could hardly import them fast enough from Greece, and they accordingly made molds and cast them according to order. Jupiter was the father of all of the gods, and reigned supreme. Three hundred jupiters, under different forms, were worshiped in Rome alone. There were the twelve gods who were supposed to hold counsel on mount Olympus, and hosts of minor gods. There was a special god for each different class—even the most menial and the most immoral; and a special divinity for those who were afflicted in a peculiar manner. There were the god of the stable, and the goddess of the horses. There were gods for everything, gods, gods, gods.

This god-making business was both a cause and an effect. The more gods they made the



worse the people became, and the worse they became the worse were the gods which they made. Their worst gods were their most popular ones. Zeus was an unmentionable creation, whose foulness was depicted in statues and set in public places for the edification and instruction of the youth. Venus was the recognized goddess of the characterless; Flora was a brazen faced courtesan; Hercules was a gladiator; Mercury was a highway robber, and Bacchus was a drunken roysterer. Needless to say, he was a very popular god. The stage reeked with filthy dramas of the vilest sort. Larealus, who took the part of a robber chief, was actually crucified on the stage before the audience, and torn to pieces by a hungry bear. Venus, the mother of the gods, was exhibited in shameless fashion, and the unmentionable perfidy of Jupiter was loudly acclaimed. Dollinger, Vol. 2, pp 205-207.

Conditions were as bad in Greece as in Rome. The ceilings and the walls of the homes of the people of the city of Athens, the most "cultured" city of its day, as well as other cities, were adorned with the paintings of Leda and the Swan, the base courtship of Dionysus and Ariadne, and of the naked Aphrodite ensnared in the net with Ares. (Dollinger.)

The Ten Commandments of Moses had been lost or flouted, and the Father's word stamped under foot.

### THE ARGUMENT

Worshiping such gods as those, is it any wonder that the people became very corrupt? If it were right and holy for gods to do such things as those described, by what standards were Greeks and Romans to judge their own conduct? Had they not a right to believe that the conduct of their own gods was a sound criterion for themselves? If a god, as a gladiator, could go out and slay his rivals, for the amusement of his fellow gods, could there be anything wrong in the eyes of a Roman to make real gladiators and wild beasts fight each other, and to hold men and women in slavery?

This is what the witness Paul refers to in his testimony quoted, and was the result of the operation of the law of Degeneration—"the active destroying principle, or sin." It seems to have followed the human family from its original home—the dreadful plague-spot in the East—where it seems to have originated. The East communicated it to Greece, and Greece to Rome, and we find the "Mistress of the world," with her gods folded to her bosom,



standing with bloated cheeks and bleared eyes, on the very brink, looking hopelessly into the yawning abyss into which other peoples, including those of Noah's time, had fallen before. Said Professor Fisher, "The world seemed to have stopped its motion and to have begun to dissolve itself into primitive chaos. An incurable internal disease had fastened itself upon the Roman state, and what was there beyond it?"

What was the nature of that *incurable internal disease*? The answer is given in the diagnosis of Professor Drummond: Rome was suffering from that malady which had afflicted the nations during the ages, which the Father had sought to eradicate during the time of Noah, known to the law as *Degeneration and Reversion to Type*. In other words, they had reverted to the type of the Noah era, when all but him and his family were so bad that God destroyed them. Even Noah was not free from it because he begat a reprobate son. He was only "perfect in his generations," for the Father took the best he could find to try His experiment. The Father measured Noah by the generations of his time.

What was to save Rome? as well as the rest of the world? The philosophy of Socrates and

Plato, and Greek learning, had failed, the Noathanian experiment was a disappointment, and the Jewish prophets had not been sufficient. Her historian, Tacitus, could direct her attention to the vast heaps of the ruins of other nations, scattered about her empire, and remind her of her own impending fate. But that would only mock her. He could see the storm-clouds fast gathering, but into what harbor of refuge could he direct her for succor. Her very soul was harrowed, but to whom could she go for comfort and guidance. Her iron heel was pressed down hard on the neck of all creation, and her hand was raised against all mankind. The fires of degeneration raged within, and the storm of adversity without beat unceasingly upon her walls. She was sick with an incurable internal disease, but the Great Physician had not come. Juvenal, the Roman satirist of the time, in drawing a picture of the sadness and despair of the age, said:

"And when could satire boast so fair a field?  
Say, when did a vice a richer harvest yield?  
When did fell avarice so engross the mind?  
Or when the lust of play so curse mankind?  
No longer, now, the pocket's stores supply  
The boundless charges of the desperate die:

The chest is staked! Muttering the steward stands,  
And scarce resigned it at his lord's commands."

Well might he have appended to one of his passages, a verse like this:

"Tell me ye winged winds that 'round my pathway roar,  
Do ye not know some spot where mortals weep no more?  
Some lone and pleasant dell, some valley in the west,  
Where, free from toil and pain, the weary soul may rest?  
The loud wind dwindled to a whisper low  
And sighed for pity as it answered 'No'."

#### APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF DEGENERATION

Let us now apply the principles laid down by Professor Drummond, to the situation in the Roman empire.

We found that "these powers" were "furiously at work within" the Romans and Greeks, dragging them down to destruction. Professor Fisher calls it an "incurable internal disease." If there is only one way to escape that fate now—"to take resolute hold of the upward power, and be borne by it to the oppo-

site goal"—what other way of escape was there then? If a sinking Greek or Roman were to reach up, it was to take hold of Jupiter or Zeus, Venus, Flora, Bacchus, or other polluted god or goddess of paganism, whose hold would only drag them down to deeper depths of degradation and physical ruin. Were the forces of error at last to triumph over the forces of good? Was this earth which the Father had made with such consummate care, to be the abode of man, made after His own image, to become a desolate waste, and sad reminder of His own failure?

#### THE ACTIVE OPPOSING PRINCIPLE—SALVATION

In view of the facts which this remarkable document reveals, it becomes clear that it was the intent of the Law-giver, the Father, to give to the world a deliverer who should rescue it from the thralldom of the law of Degeneration, which comprehends and includes sin. Such a redeemer must be more than a mere human being, because the very best men, which the world had produced by the processes of breeding and culture, had failed. The root of the evil lay deeper than the reach of mortal man. The remedy must be greater than the evil to

effect a cure, and the time had come when the issue had to be met. The decision was made, and the Father accordingly sent the Son into the world possessed of the other, "the active saving principle, or Salvation" to "stop this drifting process in the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way." He came heralded by the angels, and announced by John the Baptist. He declared His own identity and announced His purposes. He proved His supernatural character by the miracles which He performed and the perfect life which He led. He gave His life upon the cross to accomplish His mission, and His blood was shed for mankind. The philosophy involved in the act, through which He was to affect the hearts and minds of men, is expressed in His own words, to wit:

"Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die." John 12, 31-33.

The only construction which can be placed upon this record is, that the Son was sent to the earth to redeem it from the thralldom of the law of Degeneration; that to do it was necessary for Him to suffer, die, and shed His

blood on the cross; that through His sacrificial act, all men would be drawn unto Him, and those who would do so of their own free will, might seize hold of the "upward power and be borne by it to the opposite goal."

In view of these facts, can it be fairly said by the Unitarian Laymen" that the doctrine expressed in the quotation at the beginning of this discussion is a fair statement of the belief of orthodox Christian laymen, to wit:

"As the second person in the God-head he had come down to earth in order to be offered as a sacrifice to himself, and so appease his own wrath."

## DIVISION VI

## CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAW AS TO THE RECLAMATION OF MANKIND

From a study of the whole document before us, it ought to be apparent that there was need of the intervention of some power in the world, greater than ever had been known before, to stop the downward course of the human race towards degeneration and destruction, when Jesus the Son was born into the world. Moses and the Prophets (the Old Dispensation) were for the Jews. While it may be contended by some that they were not for the Jews alone, as a matter of fact no other nation of people seemed to have accepted them. As a moral force paganism had broken down until it became a vile thing, damning in its influence, and without hope of reformation. The Old Dispensation had run its course, and was inadequate to save even the Jews from moral bankruptcy. Hence the question so pertinently asked:

"Ye generation of vipers! How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

The circumstance seemed to warrant the doing of something of an epoch-making character; something of such tremendous psychological power as to set the world to deep thinking concerning its downward drift. It must be something so out of the ordinary, in all respects, as to challenge attention by reason of its very uniqueness. It must be something with convincing power back of it. The day of false pretenses was past. Pagan priests laughed in each others' faces as they passed on the streets, because of their hypocrisy. The plain, simple, solid truth must come, clothed with modesty, humility and sincerity, and one day (so the record states) there appeared on the highways about Jordan (Luke 3, 3) a strange man, "clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey;

"And preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Mark 1, 6-8.

Then silently out of the village of Nazareth of Galilee, stole an humble and gentle Soul,

Who walked to the river Jordan and asked the man in camel's hair to baptize Him. But the man, recognizing Him, said: "I have need to be baptized of thee." However, He insisted upon its being done, and after the ceremony, as He was coming up out of the water, "lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This was probably the most remarkable introduction ever given to any man. (Matt. 3.) But this simple, modest Person, so wonderfully proclaimed, was none other than the second member of the Trinity, the Hope of mankind, Who had been sent to earth to redeem it from the bondage of error. From that moment, a most remarkable career was commenced, the like of which has never been known, terminating on a cross on the crest of Calvary. During the whole of that eventful period, not an unseemly word was spoken, not an unjustifiable act was performed nor an error of judgment committed by Him who so quietly stole away from Nazareth and went to the river Jordan to be baptized by the man dressed in camel's hair. One does not wonder, that when He was crucified, even the soldiers

who had taken part in the execution should say: "Truly this was the Son of God."

The document speaks of the blood of Jesus being shed for mankind. The blood of Jesus must have flown freely from the spike wounds in his hands and feet, and from the spear wounds in his side, as his body sagged down upon the cross, and He Himself announced that the shedding of that blood was for "many for the remission of sins."

#### THE PRINCIPLE OF SALVATION

This brings us to the discussion of the *modus operandi* of salvation; that "active saving principle," spoken of by Drummond, "which will stop this drifting process of the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way." There can be no mistake about the situation in the Roman empire, and the need of adopting some kind of "active saving principle" is proven by the record, beyond a peradventure. What was that "active saving principle"? Professor Drummond calls it *Salvation*. But what is salvation? An expert witness defines it as:

"Deliverance from a state of sin and misery, into a state of union with Christ, in which we

are justified by his blood, adopted into his family, sanctified by His spirit, and comforted by His presence;—a deliverance from spiritual danger and distress, to a comfortable and quiet condition.” The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopaedia.

This deliverance is what the lowly Man, who was baptized in the river Jordan, and introduced to the world by the Holy Spirit as the Son of God, said He had come to bring, and He announced it in the following words, to wit:

“For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.”

And a few days later He said:

“I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and shall find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.” John 10, 9-11.

This is what the world needed, for it was dying physically as well as spiritually. It was committing physical, moral, and spiritual suicide. When one examines the whole document, in the light of the conditions existing

when this remarkable Character came into the world, he can construe it to mean nothing less than that the Son of God was sent by the Father into the world to save it from physical, moral, and spiritual destruction. Commenting upon this very thought, Professor Drummond says:

“It ought to be placed in the forefront of all Christian teaching that Christ’s mission on earth was to give men life. ‘I am come,’ He said, ‘that ye might have Life, and that ye might have it more abundantly.’ And He meant literal Life, literal spiritual and Eternal Life, is clear from the whole course of His teaching and acting. To impose a metaphorical meaning on the commonest word of the New Testament is to violate every canon of interpretation, and at the same time to charge the greatest of teachers with persistently mystifying His hearers by an unusual use of so exact a vehicle for expressing definite thought as the Greek language, and that on the most momentous subject of which He ever spoke to men. It is a canon of interpretation, according to Alford, that a figurative sense of words is never admissible except required by context.”

This is squarely in line with the legal rules of interpretation, namely, that the interpreter “must lean in favor of a construction which

will render every word operative, rather than one which may make some words idle and nugatory." This construction is supported by other sentences and clauses in the document, to wit:

"Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same." Job 4, 8.

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. 6, 7.

If a man sow vice and disease as the Romans did, he will reap vice and disease, which shorten life, and he will pass the effect on down through his posterity. Ex. 20, 3-5. The result would be another experience like that of the days of Noah. It was to be either Life, physical, moral, and spiritual, through the power of Jesus, or death, physical, moral and spiritual, as in the days of Noah, through that active "destroying principle, Sin." The Father had to choose between these two courses, and the record shows that he took the way of Life through the saving power of the Son—Salvation. Says Professor Drummond:

"The explanation has partly been given already. It lies still further, however, in the meaning of the word Salvation. And this, of

course, is not at all Salvation in the ordinary sense of the forgiveness of sin. This is one great meaning of Salvation, the first and the greatest. But this is spoken to people who are supposed to have had this. It is the broader word, therefore, and includes not only forgiveness of sin but salvation or deliverance from the downward bias of the soul. It takes in that whole process of rescue from the power of sin and selfishness that should be going on from day to day in every human life."

This construction is certainly supported by the record, as may be seen from the following quotation therefrom:

"By so much was Jesus made a surety for a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

The interpretation seems to be clear, that in order that men should have life and have it more abundantly than they had previously had it, they should receive not only forgiveness of sin but "salvation or deliverance from the downward bias of the soul."



## THE MODUS OPERANDI OF SALVATION

But how shall this be accomplished? and what are the details of the plan by which it shall be done? These inquiries necessitate a further examination of the document to find the answer. In doing so, we find a plan outlined and in connection with it such words as these: Advocate, Mediator, Intercessor, Regeneration, Sanctification, Justification, Atonement, Ransom, Remission, Redemption, and others of similar import. When we look for their context, we find that they are sometimes used to express the same thought or thing, and are used as they may best fit the circumstance of the case. The following quotations will illustrate this:

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." I John 2, 1.

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ." 1 Tim. 2, 5.

"Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Rom. 8, 34.

Here are three words: Advocate, mediator, and intercessor, which, from their context

seem to mean the same thing. But an advocate is "one who pleads the cause of another; one who exhorts, defends, comforts, or prays for another." The meaning of the three words becomes plain: Jesus, as a mediator, intercedes with the Father in behalf of those who accept His services, and in doing so He becomes their advocate. This is discussed at length in another place, and we will only state here, that when His services are so accepted all war which man has waged against the Father ceases between such and Him. This is just what the bloody and brutal Romans needed to stop that "drifting process of the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way." Roman was murdering Roman, and the emperor was burning his own capitol. Here the *intent* again becomes apparent.

When we look into the document again, we find other words which seem to have great significance, such as: regeneration, sanctification, justification, atonement, ransom, remission, redemption, and others. Let us consider them.

## REDEMPTION

A careful examination of the record requires us to consider the meaning of the word *redemp-*



tion first, and we find the following clauses, to wit:

"For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified by His grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." Rom. 3, 23-24.

"For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? Heb. 9, 13-14.

In view of what was discovered in reference to the *modus operandi* of the Trinity, we can only construe this to mean, that, as the Father and Son beheld the sad condition of affairs in the world, and the hopelessness of accomplishing anything further worth while, under the Old Dispensation of law and prophet, the Son offered Himself to the Father, to be used by Him under His command, to commence a new dispensation of such an effective and peculiar character as would stem the tide of moral, physical and spiritual disintegration, and thus save the world from utter collapse. As we have seen already, the Father accepted the offer and sent the Son to the world on His mis-

sion, which meant His crucifixion, shedding of His blood, and death on the cross, that in so doing He might "draw all men unto Him." The situation was so bad and so chronic, that it became necessary for Him to become the divine Martyr. He could not be crucified without shedding His blood in the act. Therefore it was the logical and necessary outcome of His martyrdom. There is no escaping the conclusion, that His blood was shed for mankind; that it was sacrificial blood in the truest sense possible to conceive. This becomes more apparent as we further examine this record, for it states:

"And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. 9, 15.

There can be only one construction put upon these sentences, and that is, that the sending of the Son into the world, by the Father, on this mission, created a new dispensation which took the place of the old, and Christ's blood took the place of that of the blood of "goats and calves, "for:

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9, 12.

Jesus was acting in obedience to the Father, under their contract of agreement, and His blood was shed at the command of the Father, not to satisfy the Father's "wrath," but to bring about the redemption of mankind by stopping the "drifting process of the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way," in its course of regeneration and sanctification.

#### JUSTIFICATION

We have seen before, that under the rules of construction governing us, our duty is to establish harmony among the several parts of this document, if it is possible to do so, and to this end we will compare Paul with Paul first to see if there is any disharmony. In so doing we discover that he used other words of special significance in describing the *modus operandi* of salvation, such as justification, atonement, ransom, and remission. We will first take up the word *justification*, and when we look to Paul's words, we find that it is something which grows out of *redemption* which we have just discussed. Paul goes on to say:

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; 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. 3, 23-25.

Justification, then, comes through redemption, and redemption comes through the crucifixion of Jesus, which caused the shedding of His blood, which, in turn, was a symbolic substitute for the shed blood of goats and calves. The sacrificial act was the crucifixion and suffering He experienced, and the symbol was His shed blood. Justification for the sinner is the result of his *faith* in the redemptive sacrifice which Jesus made for him.

But just here we find what appears to be a contradiction in the declarations made by Paul, and it becomes our duty to harmonize them, if possible. The declarations are as follows:

"Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the gentile. But glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God. For as many

as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God but the doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. 2, 9-13.

"Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Rom. 3, 27-28.

It will be observed that in the last clause of the first paragraph, Paul declares the law to be that "the doers of the law shall be justified," while in the last paragraph he states distinctly that they shall not be. It is not to be presumed that Paul forgot when he was writing the third chapter of Romans what he had written in the second, and, standing unexplained, these sentences form a complete contradiction. It becomes our duty, then, to examine the context of the document for words of explanation, in an effort to establish harmony. In so examining it, we find both faith and works urged upon the believers in Christ:

"But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us. Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath

raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2, 4-10.

It will be seen that here Paul states that "by grace ye are saved" through faith and not by works "lest any man shall boast." But he also states that good works were ordained of God, that "we should walk in them." It would seem from this that Paul recognizes as a fact that Christians ("created in Christ Jesus") should do the good works which God has ordained they should do. Therefore, such good works are a necessary part of the plan of salvation, but they should be preceded by faith as a paramount obligation on the part of the Christian.

But a further examination of the document discloses the fact, that in the first section quoted, Paul's comment pertains to works under the law of the Old Dispensation. He indicates this in the following statement:

"For as many as have sinned without the law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law."

And this, he says, applies first to the Jew and then the gentile. Nothing is said about faith, because Paul had not, at that time, reached the point in his discussion where faith in Christ was involved. The paragraph has to do simply with the Old Dispensation, in which faith in Christ was not involved.

A thorough examination of the text must convince the reasoner that Paul had made a strong effort to educate the Jews, with whom he mostly came in contact, away from the old belief that works under the law constituted salvation, and he seems to differentiate the works done under the Old Dispensation from those done under the New. He appears to want to rid their minds of the idea that their works under the law will save them, for of their good works they boasted in their selfish pride. He is supported in this by the statement made by Jesus to the ruler who said he had kept the law from his youth up, but Jesus told him that that alone was not sufficient. Luke 18, 18-24.

Paul seems to have been trying to drive home that lesson of faith, for he repeatedly refers to it, and he seems to have been so absorbed in that attempt by his own convictions, that he does not, at all times, distinguish be-

tween works under the Old Law without faith, and works under the New Law with faith. He does this, however, in the paragraph quoted (Ep. 2, 4-10), and there is harmony.

However, not all of the apparent disharmony is thus cleared up, for we strike other passages of the text which seem to conflict with the sections taken from Paul's contribution to the record. Among these are the following, to wit:

"What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit?" James 2, 14-16.

This is in harmony with another section of the text in which Matthew reports Jesus as instructing His followers in the matter of good works, making the doing of them mandatory. He goes on to say to them:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? And the king shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Matt. 25, 35-40.

Thus it may be seen that both Paul and James get their authority from one common source—the teachings of Jesus. And if careful study is made of the rules they lay down, complete harmony will be found. From the passages quoted, it is plainly seen that Jesus enjoins both faith and works upon His followers. James is in harmony with it but lays great emphasis upon works, for he says:

"Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." Notice that he says "being alone." He also says: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith, only." He does not say that *faith* is not needed as a prerequisite to justification, but that it *alone* is not sufficient. In fact he recognizes *faith* as an inherent quality in Christian life, for he states:

"James, a servant of God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are

scattered abroad, greeting. My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into diverse temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your *faith* worketh patience. But let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in *faith*, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed." James 1, 1-6.

James' letter is addressed to the twelve tribes of Israel, and he, like Paul, strikes hard to establish the new faith in the hearts of his kindred. He tries hard to root out the old and establish the new, and they both seem to be working to a common end. Paul says to the Jews:

"For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. 2, 13.

And James says to them:

"Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." James 1, 22.

They meet on common ground and labor for a common purpose. Both cite as their authority "Abraham our father" as a convincing ex-

ample, knowing that it would challenge the respect of the Jews. Paul says:

"What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Rom. 4, 1-3.

"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all." Rom. 4, 16.

"He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed 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 Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Rom. 4, 20-25.

Thus it will be seen that Paul draws his conclusions from the faith of Abraham. But by using the same illustration, James also sus-

tains his position in regard to works. He says:

"Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God.

"Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." James 3, 21-26.

To conclude this construction, let us bring together the substance of the principles laid down by these two apostles where they may be clearly interpreted:

#### PAUL

"Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Rom. 3, 27-28.

"But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us. Even when we

were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace we are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2, 4-10.

#### JAMES

"Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works." Jas. 2, 17.

"Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?"

"Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Jas. 2; 21, 22, 24.

If we put these paragraphs together, with the understanding that Paul was excluding works under the Old Law as a means of salvation for the Christian, and not the works re-

quired under the New Law, we shall establish harmony of the parts of this document. Paul was inveighing against the Old Law of an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a thing of the past, while at the same time he admits the obligation of doing good works, under the New Law, as a part of the Christian's duty "which God hath before ordained."

The sum and substance of it all is, that Paul emphasizes *faith* with good works ordained under the Christian Dispensation, while James emphasizes *good works* with faith under that same dispensation. They thus become agreed upon the necessity of both, as they are each an indispensable part of the Christian Dispensation required by Jesus himself.

#### REMISSION, RANSOM, ATONEMENT

We have already noted that the Son, when the opportune time had come, announced that He had a fixed purpose in mind, which He thus stated:

"For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke 19, 10.

This announcement is sufficient to cause us to investigate the methods He proposed to accomplish that end. We have discovered that



the world was in a deplorable condition as the result of degeneration, and that it must be redeemed or perish. We have discussed the general plan of redemption, but find in connection with it several important details described, such as *remission*, *ransom*, and *atonement*. We will go to the text of the document to see what it has to say about these terms. Among other sections, we find the following, to wit:

#### REMISSION

"Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, . . . . Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." John 20; 20, 23.

"And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26, 27-28.

"And he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved 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 24, 46-47.

"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall

receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2, 38.

"To him give all the prophets witnesses, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts, 10, 43.

"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. 3, 25.

"This is the covenant I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." Heb. 10, 16-18.

#### RANSOM

"Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28.

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. 2, 5-6.

#### ATONEMENT

"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, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." Rom. 5, 8-11.

We see at once that these are important provisions in the proposed plan of redeeming the world, and it becomes our duty to examine them carefully to determine their meaning; in other words: to construe them. In so doing, we must not lose sight of what already has been determined.

Let us consider *ransom* and *atonement* together, for, studied in the context, the words appear to be synonymously used. In the first it is proclaimed that the Son "gave himself as a ransom for all," that is, as He voluntarily died on the cross, it follows that He "died for all," which included *us*. In the second, it is proclaimed that, "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The language and meaning are the same. Says a noted expert on the subject of *atonement*:

"When the term respects the sinner himself, it implies his being covered or protected from

punishment, and is rendered a *ransom* or atonement for him." P. & C. Bible Encyc.

Let us make the application in this case, by referring to what we determined in the examination of the provision which concerned *redemption*. We found that:

"There is a natural principle in man lowering him, deadening him, pulling him down by inches to the mere animal plane, blinding reason, searing conscience, paralyzing will. This is the active destroying principle, or Sin. Now to counteract this, God has discovered to us another principle which will stop this drifting process of the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way. This is the active saving principle, or Salvation. If a man find the first of these powers furiously at work within him, dragging his whole life downward to destruction, there is only one way to escape his fate—to take resolute hold of the upward power, and be borne by it to the opposite goal." (Drummond.)

Since the end of this *drifting* is destruction, which is the penalty for it, whoever or whatever stops it prevents the infliction of the penalty, and thus *ransoms* the prisoner or victim caught in the *drift*. And since Salvation is the active saving principle in this case, the Author of it, the Son Jesus Christ, is the one who pays

the *ransom* or *atonement* to prevent the infliction of the penalty.

### REMISSION

There is a difference between *ransom* and *remission*, although the same end is reached. *Ransom* or *atonement*, as we have seen, means the payment of a penalty by one which has been assessed against or inflicted upon another. To stop the downward drift of the human race, individually and collectively, Jesus stepped into the breach, and by the sacrifice of His life, stopped the tide of disintegration, spiritually, morally, and physically, and saved mankind from its penalty or opened a way for its salvation. But *remission* has a special meaning, and it is contained in the following section, to wit:

"This is the covenant I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." Heb. 10, 16-18.

This is further explained by Peter in his sermon to the people as follows:

"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2, 38.

Our construction of these sections must be, that the offender must repent his wrong doings, accept Jesus Christ as his Redeemer, be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and he shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; that if he does these things he will be forgiven or pardoned for the wrongs he has done: "And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." *Ransom* is the payment of a penalty, and *remission* is the setting aside of the penalty and restoring the offender to liberty. It is in the nature of a pardon. Since Jesus both paid the penalty and forgave transgressions, He both ransoms and remits, and He is either or both in one.

We now come to the consideration of the terms *Regeneration* and *Sanctification*.

### REGENERATION

Paul in writing to Titus states a principle not yet fully discussed, and it is found in the following, to wit:

"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be

ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men. For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washings of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

Paul clearly states that he and his associates were once in that *downward drift* spoken of by Professor Drummond, for he says:

"We ourselves were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another."

But from this *downward drift* he was saved by the "washings of *regeneration*." What is it? We will go to high authority for our definition:

(1) "Regeneration is expressed in Scriptures by being born again, born from above, so it may be rendered being quickened; Christ formed in the heart; a partaking of the divine nature.

(2) "The efficient cause of regeneration is the divine Spirit. That man is not the author of it is evident, if we consider (1) The case in which men are before it takes place; a state of ignorance and inability; (2) The nature of the work shows plainly that it is not in the power of men to do it; it is called a creation, a production of a new principle which was not before and which man himself could not produce; (3) It is expressly denied to be of men but declared to be of God." P. & C. Bible Encyc.

This great authority declares *regeneration* to be the production of a *new principle* which did not exist before the *ransom* or *atonement* was made, and the declaration is supported by the quotation made from the text of the document. But this is exactly what Professor Drummond says in his remarks on the *law of degeneration*. It will be pertinent and helpful for us here to repeat what he said:

"We have seen that there is a natural principle in man lowering him, deadening him, pulling him down by inches to the mere animal plane, blinding reason, searing conscience, paralyzing will. This is the active destroying principle, or Sin. Now to counteract this, God has discovered to us another principle which will stop this drifting process of the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way. This is the active saving principle, or Salvation."

But *salvation* is the broad term used to denominate God's plan of saving the world from the result of that "drifting process of the soul" which drags it "downward to destruction." It covers atonement, Justification, and Intercession. *Regeneration* is the *active* principle of salvation, which was not known before the Christian dispensation. It was that principle which stopped the drifting process of Paul's soul, steered it round, and made it "drift the other way."

#### SANCTIFICATION

*Sanctification* logically follows in the course of *regeneration*, for it is its perfection. Concerning this, the following section is quoted from the Scriptural document:

"And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10, 11-14.

To use a metaphor: *Sanctification* is the finishing touches of Christian artistry—the

consummation of the divine purpose—for after Jesus had made perfect His plan of *salvation* by *sanctification*, He sat down on the right hand of God the father. It was finished.

"Sanctification is the Christianizing of the being and life of the believer. It is the carrying on of the work begun in regeneration until the entire nature is permeated with the Spirit of Christ and lives under the rule of the risen and reigning Lord. Regeneration begins the enlargement of the divine life in man; sanctification takes it forward through Christian growth towards the full-grown man, unto the stature of Christ. The first is the planting of the seed, the second the development into the noble plant, with waving leaves, and ripened fruits. The first is a new life, the second is that life in action." P. & C. Bible Encyc.

## DIVISION VII

RES JUDICATA OF THE TRIAL AND  
CONVICTION OF CHRIST

For the purpose of discussion, we have assumed that the question of *res judicata* has been raised by the opponents of Christianity as to the trial and conviction of Christ; that He was tried by a court of competent jurisdiction upon the charge of blasphemy because He claimed that He was the Christ, the Son of God, the Messiah of Jewish prophecy, and was convicted; that His conviction constitutes *res judicata* of the case at bar; that the judgment cannot be attacked collaterally in a case here, and, under the pleadings in such a case, must stand as conclusive evidence against the Christian's claim.

## THE REPLY

In reply to this allegation, we shall endeavor to show what constitutes and what does not constitute *res judicata*.

"RES JUDICATA. A legal or equitable issue which has been decided by a court of competent jurisdiction.

"To constitute a matter *res judicata*, so that, in a subsequent action, it cannot be drawn in question, (1) the court deciding the issue must have had jurisdiction; (2) there must be identity of the subject matter of the action; (3) identity of the cause of action; (4) identity of the parties, but privies of the parties are bound; (5) identity of the capacity of the parties in which they sue or are sued; (6) and there must have been a final determination of the issues (7) on the merits; (8) upon the particular issue; but the adjudication is final upon every matter which might have been litigated under the issue made." Cyclopedic Law Dictionary, p. 797.

"Where a court has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide every question which occurs in the cause; and whether its decision be correct or otherwise, its judgment, until reversed, is regarded as binding in every other court. But if it act without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal, in opposition to them. This distinction runs through all of the cases on the subject; and it proves that the jurisdiction of any court exercising authority over a subject, may be inquired into in every court where the proceed-

ings of the former are relied on and brought before the latter, by the party claiming the benefit of such proceedings." Elliott at al., v. Piersol et al., 1 Pet. R. 340 (U. S.).

We will now apply this law to the trial, conviction and execution of Jesus of Nazareth. The Christian litigant maintains that (a) The Great Sanhedrin which tried Jesus did not have jurisdiction over Him; that the whole trial was illegal and without jurisdiction; and (b) that the trial by the Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate, resulted in an acquittal of the defendant, Jesus of Nazareth, and that He was murdered at the instigation of the Jewish officials.

#### ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT. There were several important things done in connection with the trial of Jesus which have a direct bearing on the question of jurisdiction. The Jewish law under which the Sanhedrin was working was very particular about this. All proceedings at night were prohibited, as was the testimony of an accomplice, and all secret or private hearings and trials were forbidden. The law limited the trial of accused persons

to certain days of the week and year, as well as hours of the day. No trial of this nature could be concluded within one day, and there could be no ambiguity in the charges made in the indictment. The place of trial was fixed by law and the Sanhedrin could not legally function elsewhere. The members of this court were prohibited from sitting as judges in certain cases where the question of personal interest or enmity was involved.

2. OTHER IRREGULARITIES. No accused person could be convicted upon his uncorroborated confession, and any conviction must rest upon the testimony of two competent witnesses who agreed upon the facts charged. Neither could there be a legal conviction if the decision of the court were unanimous. A prescribed course of procedure must be observed in all trials, and every case was to be tried upon its merits.

#### STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

We now turn to the facts in the case and the circumstances leading up to the trial. The principal part of the record is to be found in Matt. 26 and 27; Mark 14 and 15; Luke 21, 22 and 23; John 18 and 19; and other scattering

passages. The record shows that Jesus came from the home of an humble carpenter, and was a Galilean Jew by birth, which did not add to His prestige at Jerusalem. He was thirty years of age when He commenced to preach in the synagogues. He never had been ordained as a priest, but He assumed the rights of the priesthood, in that respect, and took occasion to severely criticise the scribes and Pharisees for what He deemed their shortcomings. He incurred the enmity of the high priest, Caiphas, by driving his hirelings out of the temple, who were using it for mercenary purposes. He further offended the scribes and Pharisees by openly violating their Sabbath laws. He aroused their anger by prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of its people. He offended their pride by claiming that He, the "son of a carpenter," was their promised Messiah, and the Son of God. He held Himself aloof from them and showed His contempt for them by the things He did and the rebukes which He publicly administered to them. All this could have but one effect, and that to create a bitter hatred of Him in their hearts. They accordingly sought to destroy Him. (Matt. 12, 14.) They laid snares for Him to entangle Him in the

meshes of the law. (Matt. 22, 15-22.) They dogged His footsteps wherever He went. His doctrines were revolutionary to that extent, that if the people were to adopt them no privilege was safe and no job secure among the favored classes. The new order of things which He was teaching was becoming very popular, and the privileged classes feared Him. (Matt. 21, 46.) There was no compromising with Jesus where wrong was involved. The issue between Him and the Pharisees was drawn, and the climax was reached when He came from the Mount of Olives into Jerusalem and found the money-changers in the temple. These he forcibly and violently expelled, and in answer to a question regarding His authority for doing such things, and in explanation thereof, in the very precincts of the temple, He delivered to them, face to face, one of the most scathing denunciations ever recorded, to wit:

"The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be born, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their



phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments. And love the uppermost rooms at the feast, 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, and call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. 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.

"But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites. For ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two fold more the child of hell than yourselves. Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whoso-

ever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty.

"Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisees, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also.

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish



the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. 23, 2-33.

One can well imagine the venomous hatred such a castigation would engender in the hearts of such a people at such a time as that. It was his valedictory, and it ended in one of the saddest lamentations found in all literature. Realizing the hopelessness of saving His people, and visualizing the dreadful scenes which were to be enacted in the destruction of the city which was later to follow, He gave expression to the sadness which was in His heart as follows:

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."

He then prophesied the destruction of the temple in their hearing, for they so declared at his trial a short time afterwards. The chief

priests and scribes then assembled and conspired to take Him "by subtlety, and kill him," but they hesitated to do so because they were afraid of the people. Jesus then took His disciples and went to the house of Simon in Bethany. From there Judas Iscariot stole away, went to the chief priests and scribes, and secretly bargained with them to betray His Master. (Mark 14, 3-11.) From this place, they went back to Jerusalem. The people learned that He was coming, and, as He rode in on the back of a colt, they took palm branches, went forth to meet Him and cried, "Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord."

The presumption is that this greeting did not lessen the envy or hatred which reposed in the hearts of the scribes and Pharisees. Arrangements having been previously made, Jesus repaired with His disciples to the room where they were to hold their last supper together on the evening preceding the day of the Passover. It was at this time that Jesus announced that He would be betrayed by one of them. It created surprise and anxiety, and each one looked upon the other with suspicion. No one appeared to want to ask Him openly which one it was, but Peter motioned to John,

who was reclining on the breast of Jesus, to ask Him who it was. John probably did so in a whisper, the rest, probably, being engaged in conversation, did not hear it. Jesus audibly answered him saying: "He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it." "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." At the same time, Jesus told Judas to do quickly what he was about to do. Some of them thought He had instructed Judas to go out and make some purchases for the company or to give alms to the poor. But Judas took the sop and immediately went out to seek the high priests and scribes to betray Jesus. The eleven were left in the room, and after prayer and instructions had been given, they left the place and went over the brook Cedron into the Mount of Olives to a place where they were wont to visit. Judas knew about this place, and knew that he would find Jesus and His disciples there. (John 18, 2.) It was the garden of Gethsemane. He took three of his disciples and went a little way from the rest. These three He also left a short distance away while He engaged in prayer. He was in great agony of soul: "and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down on the ground." Three distinct times he

offered up this prayer: "O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done."

It will be noted that Jesus here uses a figure of speech in describing the martyrdom He was about to suffer, referring to the cup of poison which the ancient Greeks drank as a penalty for the commission of certain offenses, and it is not unlikely that Jesus was familiar with the narrative of the death of Socrates. At least, it is suggested.

But why should Jesus be so wrought up over His approaching end? He had prophesied it and had prepared for it. Was it fear that He now experienced? Was the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, at the crucial moment of His career, to show fear of mortal man, falter and fail in His mission? The destiny of mankind rested in His hand. Never was there so much at stake on the one hand and so much grief to bear on the other. He saw the imperative need of the sacrifice He was about to make, and along with it came the terrible vision before His eyes of His weeping mother and the sorrowing friends at the foot of the cross. He visualized the scenes enacted by the Roman army under Titus as it battered down the walls of Jerusalem. He saw the starving thousands

in their misery and woe; the blood of tens of thousands of His kinsmen flowing in streams in the streets of that ill-fated city; the awful conflagration of the holy temple, "And being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." That was the cup Jesus had to drink. Three times He petitioned the Father about it, but the program was settled and could not be changed. The perverseness of mankind had made it necessary that He should drink that cup, and He was now ready to drink it, that "He might draw all men unto Him," and that "The world through Him might be saved."

In the mean time, Judas had accepted the thirty pieces of silver as his bribe. The record goes on to state: "Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons." It was then that He probably earned from John the title of "The Lion of the Tribe of Juda," for He went forth to meet His enemies, face to face, in the night time, on the mountain, in the glare of the torches and lanterns. He offered no coward's alibi but said to them when they asked for Jesus of Nazareth, "I am he."

They seized Him and took him to Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, the high priest, where some sort of proceedings were had. (John 18, 13.) Annas sent Him bound to Caiaphas, the high priest, where an examination was held at the latter's palace, at which they blindfolded Him and struck Him in the face. All this took place in the night time.

These proceedings took place at the palace of the high priest and Jesus was held under arrest, probably there, until early in the morning when the Great Sanhedrin had been hastily assembled. Some high authorities have even doubted this and have been inclined to believe that he was summarily dealt with by nothing more than a vigilance committee. However, there is no question about Annas, Caiaphas and other chief priests being involved in the proceedings, which were conducted and concluded on Friday, a day of the Passover, the great festal day of the year. The record clearly discloses that it was not the intention of this court or Sanhedrin to give the accused a fair trial according to law and precedent, for it states:

"Now the chief priests, and elders, and all of the council, sought false witnesses against Jesus, to put him to death; but found none;

yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death." Matt. 26, 59-66.

Another part of the record gives the following account:

"Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy: What think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death. And some began to spit on him, and to cover

his face, and to buffet him, saying, Prophecy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands." Mark 14, 61-65.

Let us now review some of the irregularities of these proceedings to determine whether the claim of *res judicata* will hold. In so doing, we find several that go to the very heart of the question. They are as follows: (a) The arrest of Jesus was made upon the complaint of an accomplice, Judas, for he was one of his associates and had taken an active part in what He had done. (b) He was arrested and examined in the night time, the examination being conducted privately. (c) He was tried by his personal enemies who had three times previously met to discuss His teachings, without giving Him a hearing, and had determined upon His death. He was, in substance, convicted before any charge had been formulated against Him or His arrest made. (d) False witnesses were suborned and used against Him, and no two of them agreed. (e) He was convicted upon His own confession and not upon the evidence of others. (f) The trial was held on a festal day in violation of law. (g) The proceedings were conducted and concluded inside of a period of twenty-four hours, contrary to law. (h) The trial itself was irregular, because (1)

the high priest rent his garments, personally conducted the examination of the prisoner, declared his own decision in advance of that of the others, no poll of the judges was taken as required, but the vote was taken en mass, and (2) the trial was held in a place forbidden by law. (i) The charges against Jesus were so vague and uncertain that it was impossible to identify the subject matter of the action. (j) The case was not heard upon its merits nor upon any issue.

#### THE QUESTION OF JURISDICTION

There are several assignments of error in this trial, at least, which go to the jurisdiction of the court. (1) Jesus was tried for a capital offense in the palace of the high priest instead of the hall of hewn stone which was the place fixed by law for all such trials. If the Great Sanhedrin ever had jurisdiction over the accused, it lost it in this unlawful proceeding, and its judgment was null and void. (2) He was tried and convicted on a festal day, on Friday, a day of the Passover, and the whole procedure was concluded within one day, contrary to law. It was therefore null and void and does not constitute *res judicata*. No tri-

bunal is under any obligation to respect either the court or its decision in that case.

The Great Sanhedrin had ample grounds upon which to base a charge against Jesus had it followed its own law with the determination of giving the accused fair play. He had broken their Sabbath and claimed to be the Christ, the Son of the Blessed. He had preached in the temple within a few hours before his arrest, and had months before publicly laid claim to the Messiahship. Why did not these scribes and Pharisees have Him indicted and arrested, in the day time, while He was preaching his so-called blasphemous doctrines in the temple? They knew He was there because they went to Him and asked Him by what authority He did those things. There can be but one answer to the question: they feared the people. Several times these men had dodged the issue when the common folks were present in force.

Had they sought to proceed regularly and fairly, they should have made their charge against Jesus plainly and distinctly, and the charge should have been made by some conscientious person who believed that He had violated the laws of the land. They should have waited until daylight before making the

arrest. The proceedings which followed should have been conducted on a day allowed by law, and an adjournment should have been taken to the following day so that proper time might be given by the judges to think over the evidence and consider the case. No judge should have sat in the case who had any personal interest in it or who was a personal friend or enemy of either the accused or accuser. They should have summoned their witnesses and given the friend of the accused at court a chance to cross-examine them. Two fair witnesses should have testified affirmatively to the charge, and the accused should not have been required to testify against Himself. The case should have been tried upon its merits, and full opportunity given the accused to summon His witnesses and present them for examination. One of the judges should have acted conscientiously as His friend and counsel and should have conducted His case. An adjournment should have been taken over night to permit deliberation on the part of the judges. The high priest should have conducted the trial in a lawful manner. He should have arranged the judges in a semicircle, himself in the center as presiding judge, the scribes, acting as secretaries who kept the proceedings, at either side. Fac-

ing this semicircle, the accused and witnesses should have been seated with the court officers. Each witness should have been taken into an adjoining room and admonished to tell the truth and nothing but the truth. Then he should have been carefully examined and cross-examined by the judges. The prosecution should have put in its case first, and then the accused should have been given an opportunity to introduce His witnesses. He had the right to speak if He chose, but could not be compelled to do so. The high priest then should have had the accused and witnesses removed from the room. Silence should have been enforced until one of the judges had spoken for the accused. Then the discussion should have been taken up. When this was through, he should have directed a poll of the court, commencing with the youngest judge and advancing to the next older until himself was reached as the last one voting. Those who voted for the accused should have said "I absolve" and those voting against "I condemn." A majority of one could absolve but it took a majority of two to condemn. After the vote had been taken, the accused should have been brought back into court and the ballot announced. If a majority were found for Him, He should have

been discharged, but if the vote were against Him, an adjournment should have been taken until the following day as one night must have intervened between the verdict and sentence. The judges should have fasted over night and early the next morning they should have convened to take testimony and consider the case further. Late in the afternoon, after full consideration of the matter before them, they should have taken their final vote as prescribed by the rules of practice and procedure. If the required majority then voted "I condemn," the accused should have been sentenced at once and led forth to execution.

Nothing of this kind took place at this trial. The seizure of Jesus in the night time, when there were but eleven of His friends with Him, His examination at night, His early morning trial on a day and in a place forbidden by law, indicates that they were afraid to take Him to the Hall of Hewn Stone because it was a public place and the common folks might be there to interfere. When asked if He were the Christ, He said "I am." They gave Him no chance to prove that He was. If they had done so, He could have called their attention to the prophecies concerning His coming and that how He fulfilled every condition. He could have called

in Lazarus whom He had raised from the dead for he was still alive. There were the others He had raised from the dead, cured of leprosy and palsy, and those who had seen Him walk upon the sea, turn water into wine, heal the blind, and feed the thousands with a few loaves and fishes, whom He could have summoned to prove His supernatural powers. But these rights were all denied in their haste to railroad Him to His death, and the case was never heard upon its merits. This alone controverts the claim of *res judicata*.

#### THE HEARING BEFORE PILATE

As has been stated already, no definite charges were made against Jesus before the Great Sanhedrin, and He never knew for just what He was being prosecuted. Some of the witnesses, in a rambling way, charged Him with threatening to tear down the temple, while others charged Him with blasphemy which was punishable by death. The Jewish law required a specific charge to be made in all cases. But if the charge made against Him before the Great Sanhedrin were vague and indefinite, that made against Him before Pilate was more so.



The record states that as soon as the Great Sanhedrin had pronounced its verdict, they at once led Him before Pilate, and the following is what is given concerning the charges made:

"And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he himself is Christ a King."

Thus we find him charged with the commission of five different offenses for which He was tried in one day: Threatening to tear down the temple, blasphemy, perverting the nation, forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and claiming to be a king. Within a period of a few minutes, they changed their charge from blasphemy to forbidding to give tribute to Caesar. They knew that Pilate would not take cognizance of a charge of blasphemy, for the Roman law knew no such crime, and they accordingly shifted it to high treason, charging Him with claiming to be a king within the realm of the Roman empire. This was a most serious offense and was punishable by death. But Jesus did not know whether He was being tried for perverting the people, refusing to give tribute to Caesar, or claiming to be a king. Pilate questioned Him about it and His answer was in perfect accord with all of His teachings, for

He said: "My kingdom is not of this world: if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence." Pilate then asked him the question: "Art thou a king then?" To which Jesus further replied: "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Jesus was treading upon dangerous ground during this colloquy, but He did not flinch nor quibble. His answers were straight to the mark.

In studying the record carefully, it is seen that Pilate laid stress upon the charge that Jesus claimed to be a temporal king, and he appears to pay little or no attention to the other charges. As a matter of fact, the charge that He had refused to render tribute to Caesar was a plain falsehood, and the one who made it perjured himself. It was known to be false by these Jews, because these same fellows, who were now clamoring for His blood, had sent an emissary to Him to ask Him whether it was lawful to render tribute to Caesar, and He replied to them by saying: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things



which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Not only was this an example of loyalty to the existing Roman government in the matter of rendering tribute, but it went farther than that, and counseled obedience to all the laws of the Roman state. That public teaching by Jesus of loyalty to the government was a complete refutation of the charge that he was perverting the nation and stirring up the people against the government. It was a malicious falsehood uttered for the purpose of influencing Pilate to order the execution of the accused.

Pilate did not regard these charges seriously, and tried to avoid all responsibility in the matter. The first thing he said to them in reply to their charge that Jesus was a malefactor, was: "Take ye him, and judge him according to your own law." This gave them permission to execute Him, on the charge of blasphemy, by stoning Him to death. Why did they not do it? Their reply that they had no right to inflict the death penalty under the Roman law, was mere subterfuge, for Pilate's offer was unconditional. Furthermore, it was only a short time after this that they actually stoned Stephen to death, and a little later tried to do the same to Paul. Why was it that they did

not do it in this case? There is but one plausible answer, and that is, they were afraid to attempt it for fear the common people who were friends of the Accused would rescue Him and probably handle them rather harshly. They appeared to be not only prevaricators, but cowards as well, fully deserving of the terrible castigation which Jesus had given them at the temple.

It cannot be truthfully said that it was a mob of the scum of the city of Jerusalem, an irresponsible crowd of people, who clamored for the execution of Jesus, for the record clearly states that Pilate "called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people." The chief priests and rulers were there, and to them he said: "Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and, behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him." This was an acquittal of the accused, and He should have been released, provided with a bodyguard and conducted safely to His friends.

During the examination, Pilate discovered that Jesus was a Galilean, and came within the jurisdiction of Herod. This provided him with an excuse for turning the case over to the lat-

ter, and thus avoid the unpleasantness of disposing of it himself. This desire was further strengthened by the advice of his wife who had counseled him, saying: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." He accordingly sent the accused to Herod who examined Him at length. The record does not state what charge was made against Him before Herod, but it does say that His enemies "vehemently accused him." It was not the so-called mob who did this, for the record clearly states that it was the chief priests and scribes who appeared before Herod to vehemently accuse Jesus. These were the very fellows who had sat in judgment on his case in the Great Sanhedrin; His former judges who were now prosecuting Him before a higher court. Herod refused to be a party to the travesty and sent Him back to Pilate, thus acquitting him of their charges.

It is evident that the case was a troublesome one to Pilate, for he tried to avoid the responsibility of ordering the execution of Jesus. Several acts show this conclusively: (a) He first acquitted Jesus and stated his desire to let him go. (b) He sent the accused to Herod to get rid of the case. (c) He offered to chas-

tise Him hoping that that would satisfy the chief priests and scribes. (d) He offered to release Him in preference to Barabbas the murderer. (e) He took the trouble to examine the accused three times and each time acquitted Him. (f) Finally to show his displeasure, in the presence of the multitude, he washed his hands in water, saying: "I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children."

From this record it will be seen that, not only did Pilate acquit Jesus, but he paid tribute to Him by declaring Him to be a *just* man. Thus we see the spectacle of One Who had been acquitted and at the same time pronounced a just man by the trial court, led away to execution. By whose order and under what law was He executed? It has been claimed by some of the apologists for this outrageous proceeding, that the Roman government did it. On this point the record says of the chief priests and scribes:

"But they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar. Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be

crucified. And they took Jesus, and led him away."

Who took Jesus and led him away? "They." Who were "they"? *The chief priests and scribes*. Who crucified Jesus? The chief priests and scribes, assisted by the Roman soldiers, with the reluctant consent of the Roman governor who had symbolically washed his hands of the blood of the accused, and the responsibility of which they assumed, before God, when they said, let "His blood be on us, and our children."

He was then led away, an innocent and just man, to be crucified, and we are reminded of a remarkable statement made, in this document, six hundred years before: "He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation." (Isa. 53, 8.)

The last point to be discussed in connection with the trial is this: Was Jesus' crucifixion an execution of the law, justifiable homicide, or plain murder? Which? It must have been one of the three. It could not have been an execution of the law because Pilate acquitted him. It could not have been justifiable homicide because He was a Man of peace and offered to harm no one. It was, therefore, a plain case of murder. We must distinguish between

*power* to do things and *authority* to do them. They had the *power* but not the *authority* to execute an innocent person, and the difference between them is the difference between a legal execution of a guilty person and the murdering of an innocent one. A plain statement of the case appears to be, that Jesus was lynched by the chief priests and scribes, under the protection of the Roman soldiers, with the assent of Pilate, the Roman governor, who was too weak morally to do what he knew to be just.

The chief priests and scribes said, let "His blood be upon us, and our children," and Jesus said, as He hung on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The events which have transpired since that time can testify for themselves whether or not that prayer was answered. The principle of *res judicata* cannot apply to this case.

## DIVISION VIII.

## PROOF OF THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

We have been asked many times if the proof of the resurrection of Jesus was as complete and convincing, from a legal standpoint, as that afforded by the record of the other events in His life narrated in the Gospel. To this question we must answer, Yes. The proof is to be found in the same record, supplied by the same witnesses, as that upon which we must rely to sustain our belief in those other events noted.

The veracity of the witnesses has been discussed already, and we must analyze their testimony to determine to what they have testified on this point, applying to it the rules of evidence governing it. To this end, we will again take for our authority Professor Simon Greenleaf, previously referred to, who has furnished us such rules, and who states them in his first volume on the law of evidence as follows:

"The word *Evidence*, in legal acceptation, includes all the means by which an alleged matter of fact, the truth of which is submitted to investigation, is established or disproved. This term, and the word *proof*, are often used

indifferently, as synonymously with each other; but the latter is applied by the most accurate logicians, to the effect of evidence, and not to the *medium* by which truth is established. None but mathematical truth is susceptible of the high degree of evidence, called *demonstration*, which excludes all possibility of error, and which, therefore, may reasonably be required in support of every mathematical deduction. Matters of fact are proven by *moral evidence* alone; by which is meant, not only that kind of evidence which is employed on subjects connected with moral conduct, but all the evidence which is not obtained from intuition or from demonstration. In the ordinary affairs of life, we do not require demonstrative evidence, because it is not consistent with the nature of the subject, and to insist upon it would be unreasonable and absurd. The most that can be affirmed of such things is, that there is no reasonable doubt concerning them. The *true question*, therefore, in trials of fact, is not whether it is possible that the testimony may be false, but whether there is *sufficient probability* of its truth; that is, whether the facts are shown by competent and satisfactory evidence. Things established by competent and satisfactory evidence are said to be proved."

The question before us, then, is not whether there is a possibility that the evidence of the resurrection of Jesus may not be true, but

whether there is a sufficient probability of its truth; that is, are the facts of the resurrection shown by competent and satisfactory evidence. If they are, then it follows that they may be said to be proved.

In the first place, it must be evident that that there could have been no resurrection without His previous death. The burden of proof, then, rests upon us to show from the record that Jesus died previous to His resurrection. We have discussed already his trial and crucifixion. The first point to be determined then, is, did Jesus die as a result of His crucifixion?

In this connection, it may as well be stated here, that it has been claimed by some who dispute the allegation that Jesus rose from the dead, that He did not die on the cross but that he merely swooned, was taken down by friends, revived by them, spirited away from the sepulcher and Roman soldiers to a place of safety and there succored until He recovered from His injuries. Since the latter is a theory proposed by these persons, it may be well to state theory to show by a *preponderance* of the evidence of proof rests upon those who propose the here, that under the rules of evidence, the bur-

dence that He was not crucified until dead but that he merely swooned.

Nor is that all. Jesus claimed he was to rise from the dead (Matt. 16, 2), and after the crucifixion He appeared before His disciples and claimed that He had risen from the dead. (Luke 24, 46) If He did not rise from the dead, he was guilty of falsehood, fraud and gross imposture, and to convict Him of these charges requires, not only a preponderance of the evidence but proof of it "*beyond a reasonable doubt.*" Evidently those who propose that theory assume a grave responsibility. The only way they could avoid making such a charge against Him would be to propose another theory that Jesus became unconscious and that He mistook such a condition, when He recovered, for His resurrection. But the burden of proof, again, rests upon them to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that He was so misled, in order to exonerate Him from the charge of gross fraud and imposition. Could Jesus have been so misled? Let us examine the record for the facts of the case.

#### THE CRUCIFIXION

If Jesus were crucified until dead, then there could have been no "swoon." Was he dead?

Let us see what the witnesses have said about it.

Matthew was one of the chosen twelve and therefore a friend of Jesus. Luke says (Luke 23, 49) of Jesus at the crucifixion, "And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things." Now, since Matthew was one of Jesus' closest acquaintances, he must have been, according to Luke, an eye witness of the great tragedy. This being true, Matthew becomes a competent witness in every respect. He testifies to what he saw as follows:

"And when they were come to the place, which is called calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left." (Mat. 23, 33.)

"And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst. And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, unto thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost." (Mat. 23, 44-46.)

There can be no mistake about this testimony. Matthew, who stood where he could see, states clearly that Jesus died from the effect of His crucifixion.

John, another of the intimate acquaintances of Jesus, testifies as follows:

"And they took Jesus, and led him away. And he bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha: where they crucified him, and two other with him, on either side one, Jesus in the midst." (John 19, 16-18.)

"When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home. After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hysop, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished; and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." (John 19, 26-30.)

It is not clearly stated in this testimony who the "disciple standing by" was, but witnesses who are qualified to testify as experts state that it was John, himself, who was too modest to speak of himself, a characteristic manifested on other occasions (John 13, 23). It would be quite natural for the mother of Jesus to get as

near to Him as she could at such a time as that and John and the mother, who at first had stood "afar off," as Luke puts it, had drawn nearer to the scene as the climax approached. John was therefore a close observer of the crucifixion, and he testifies that Jesus died (gave up the ghost).

Nor is this all of John's testimony on the point. He goes on to state:

"Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." (John 19, 32-34.)

This observation came later, and for the second time John called Jesus dead. He states that by a providential act the soldiers did not break Jesus' legs (19, 35-37) but that to make sure of their job of killing, they thrust a spear into His side. Now the Roman spear was no tiny weapon. The shaft was from six to ten feet in length and the spear-head was about two inches across at its widest part. It was that cruel, destructive weapon which was thrust into His side about three hours after He had had spikes driven through both hands

and feet, the weight of His body hanging upon them to torture Him and cause a loss of blood. In this weakened condition, the spear was thrust into His side deeply enough to penetrate either the abdominal cavity or thorax. The exact point of penetration is not given. Nor is the quantity of blood and water which came out stated. If the spear entered the abdominal cavity it must have penetrated the bladder from whence came the water. It must have been a ghastly wound to do that and one well calculated to cause death if it had not occurred before. There is no evidence that Jesus had medical care and attention after the crucifixion. We will discuss this point later. If the spear penetrated the thorax, then from whence came water? The answer to this question is given by medical experts who explain that great agony or grief would produce such a condition in a human being; that in the case of Jesus, the agony He suffered from seeing His mother weeping, with his dearest friends, at the foot of the cross, the terrible vision of the destruction of Jerusalem, was sufficient to cause the chemical changes in His body, internally, which produced water; that the blood came from a ruptured blood vessel, which blood had accumulated in the thorax with the



water, and the opening made by the spear let it out.

We will summon one more witness to the tragedy, Peter, who was also a disciple and one of Jesus' intimate acquaintances. According to the historian, Luke, Peter must have witnessed the crucifixion. Some time after witnessing that scene he wrote the following which constitutes a part of his testimony:

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." (1 Pet. 1, 3.)

Not only does Peter say that Jesus was dead but that he was resurrected from the dead.

Not only have we these eye witnesses who have given direct testimony as to the crucifixion and death of Jesus, but we have the expert testimony of Luke who was a Greek physician and fully qualifies as an expert. (P. C. Bible Enc. Vol. II.) He states that he gets his facts from eye witnesses. (Luke 1, 2), and from their statements he is able to give a graphic account of the crucifixion and death of Jesus. Basing his expert opinion, as a physician, upon what these eye witnesses stated to him about the crucifixion, he declares that

Jesus died (gave up the ghost). (Luke 23, 46.)

Now let us examine, for a moment, the theory that Jesus merely swooned.

The record clearly shows that He hung on the cross for several hours (Luke 23, 44-46), a Roman spear was deeply thrust either into his thorax or abdomen, he was taken down, carried to the tomb of Joseph of Aramathea, placed therein, the door tightly closed, sealed, and a huge boulder placed against it (John 10, 38-42; Mat. 27, 57-66). In this damp, forbidding, unventilated place this desperately wounded Man, without medical attention, was lain on the stone floor, where He remained for more than two days, without food or drink, in a "swoon." (Mat. 27; 28.) If that theory is correct, at the beginning of the third day of his confinement in the tomb He "came to," His friends fooled the Roman guards, rolled the stone away slyly and spirited Him off. They do not explain how this desperately wounded Man was taken away for He could not possibly walk with those terrible wounds in His feet. Those Roman guards must have slept more soundly than usual for they were generally regarded as very alert soldiers.

But suppose, for the sake of arguing out the theory, that His friend came and took Him out



of the sepulcher. We, at once, run up against some more stubborn facts. Matthew, the disciple-historian, who was on the ground all of the time to see for himself and to get the facts direct from the lips of witnesses, states that early Monday morning, following the crucifixion on Friday, the two Marys went to the sepulcher, found it empty, were told that Jesus was not there and at once started away to inform their friends. On their way they met Him face to face and He saluted them with "All hail." They came to Him, held Him by the feet and worshipped Him. The account states that He "met them" (Mat. 28, 9). He had no known means of conveyance other than His feet, consequently He must have been walking. If the theory of our friends is correct, that Jesus had merely swooned, then we must believe that less than three days after He had received a Roman spear thrust into His vitals and great spikes driven through His feet; after nearly three days of confinement in a damp, unventilated sepulcher, without food or water, He was out traveling about, on foot, over those stony paths and rocky hill sides where Joseph of Aramathea had hewn his sepulcher out of the rocks. If one cannot believe the story of the resurrection of this marvelous

Man, it is very difficult, indeed, to know how one can believe such a theory when confronted by such facts as these; and this, too, in the face of the fact that the burden of proof rests upon those who propose that theory. We had better take the witnesses at their word.

Again, if Jesus merely swooned He became a party to one of the worst frauds of all time. This must become apparent to one who will carefully study the record bearing on the subject. If He did not die on the cross, Joseph of Aramathea and those who assisted him in taking the body down must have become aware of that fact when they placed Him in the sepulcher, for, according to that theory they laid their plans to get Him out either while the Roman guards were asleep or through connivance with them. The course taken to accomplish this was not in accord with the high character shown by these disciples and friends through many vicissitudes and hard experiences. To accomplish this they would have had to pretend that Jesus was dead. How utterly unlike Him and His friends that would have been. When the scribes and pharisees came for Him in the night time, in the garden of Gethsemane, He stepped boldly out into the light of the lanterns and answered "I am He."

Athlete that He was, a few bounds into the darkness as He saw the mob approaching in the distance (for He knew Judas had gone to get them) and He would have escaped as He had done at times before. His disciples would have said that they knew not where He was and the mob would have hunted in vain.

If His burial in the sepulcher were a fraud, they carried it to the greatest possible lengths for they would have placed at the door of the sepulcher a man who pretended to be an angel, who had dressed himself up in deceitful garb, spread wax or other substance on his face to make it shine, and instructed him to say to those innocent women who had come heart-broken to inquire about Him:

"Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you." (Mat. 28, 1-7.)

Can anyone conceive that Jesus and His disciples would be a party to such a fraud as that?

But if a fraud were committed, the conduct of His disciples shows that they were not a

party to it and that Jesus carried on the imposition alone. This is made plain by the record which states that after He had saluted the women with "All hail" and had allowed them to hold Him by the feet and worship Him, He directed them to tell His brethren to go into Galilee where He would meet them. They did as he directed them and they met Him in a mountain and He allowed them to worship Him. He told them that all power was given Him in heaven and in earth and that they should go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of God, His own name, and that of the Holy Ghost. That these disciples believed Him implicitly, and that He had risen from the dead, is proven by the fact that they followed Him to the bitter end, suffering persecution and death for His cause. To charge these men with being a party to a fraud is to accuse them of humbugging themselves. As a matter of fact, when the women told the disciples that they had seen Jesus, they would not believe them and both Peter and John ran to the sepulcher to see for themselves whether or not the story was true. (John 20, 3-4.) If any fraud were committed, Jesus and parties not of the disciple band, were guilty of it.

If any fraud were committed Jesus must

have known it and been a party to it. He must have known whether or not He was helped out of that sepulcher by friends or angels. If by the former, He must have been a party to the fraud of masquerading one of His friends as an angel. Such a proposition is intolerable and unthinkable when considering such a character as Jesus. Most certainly the burden of proof is upon those who set up that theory to show beyond a reasonable doubt that he was an imposter. If not a party to the imposition, then who was the person who sat at the door of the sepulcher and told the women that Jesus had risen? If not an imposter, then he was what the record says he was: "An angel of the Lord descended from heaven." (Mat. 28, 2.)

As we study this record, the marvelousness of the events narrated grows upon us, and we no longer wonder that such a person as Jesus rose from the dead? What mortal man could have withstood the cruel spikes driven through his hands and feet, the scourging of his back, the stroke of the Roman spear, the crown of thorns, the loss of blood, the internal hemorrhage, the confinement in a damp, unventilated sepulcher, on a stone bed, without food or drink, in that condition for more than two days and at the end of that time, while walk-

ing over the stony paths of the place, cheerfully hail His friends and appoint a place of meeting for that evening in a distant mountain? Furthermore, He kept His appointment, and while His friends were gathered together in a room, the doors all closed, He suddenly stood in the midst of them saying "peace be unto you," at the same time showing them the wounds in His hands, and side. (John 20, 19-21.) Is there any reason why we should wonder that one who could suspend the laws of gravity and impenetrability should rise from the dead?

There was no possibility of imposition in His case, for the women saw and recognized Him, and His disciples were so close to Him that they could touch His side with their hands. They instantly recognized Him. Ten of them were present the first time He appeared, only Thomas being absent. (John 20, 24.) They told the latter that they had seen Jesus, but Thomas doubted their word. Eight days later He appeared again to them when Thomas was present, the doors being shut as before. (John 20, 26.) John is here testifying to what he saw. There is no hearsay about it. John then relates how that Jesus requested Thomas to put his fingers into the

wounds of His hand and side that he might no longer doubt His resurrection, and Thomas was so overcome by the evidence that he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God."

#### THE CORPUS DELICTI

Considered from a legal standpoint, this is a question of proving the *corpus delicti*, and to establish our case we need go no further in the way of furnishing proofs than is done in a criminal case tried under the common law rules of procedure.

We think we have proven to a *moral certainty* that Jesus was crucified until He was dead and that His crucifixion was a case of murder. Has there been a sufficient identification of the body to justify us in assuming that we have proven the *corpus delicti*? Greenleaf has given us a rule by which we may judge the matter. In Vol. 3., Sec. 30, he states it as follows:

"The proof of the charge, in criminal causes, involves the proof of two distinct propositions; first, that the act itself was done; and, secondly, that it was done by the person charged, and by none other;—in other words, proof of the *corpus delicti*, and of the identity of the

prisoner. It is seldom that either of these can be proved by direct testimony, and therefore the fact may be lawfully established by circumstantial evidence, provided it be satisfactory. Even in the case of homicide, though ordinarily there ought to be the testimony of persons who have seen and identified the body, yet this is not indispensably necessary in cases where the proof of the death is so strong and intense as to produce the assurance of moral certainty."

It will be noticed that in proving the *corpus delicti*, all that is required is to furnish proof of the death of Jesus "so strong and intense as to produce the full assurance of moral certainty." We have discussed already the proofs of His death, and although what occurred after it may have been most unusual and extraordinary, there is no reason why the same rule should not apply in His case as in any other. The sole question is: was Jesus crucified until dead and was the body identified to a *moral certainty* as His body. The proof is so overwhelming and convincing on that point that we must believe that if Caiphas had been arrested for complicity in His murder, and immediately tried (that is before the morning of the third day) before an impartial tribunal, he would have been convicted. The doubt, if

any, which has been raised is the result of His resurrection and appearance again. This re-appearance is the foundation for the theory that Jesus merely swooned. However, as has been shown, already, this theory is thoroughly controverted by the evidence in the case.

This leads us to a consideration of the supernatural aspects of this subject. If Jesus were crucified until He was dead, how is it possible that He thereafter appeared to His friends, walked about the paths and highways, as usual, and conversed with them? That He did this we have shown already by competent witnesses. How possibly could this be done? There is but one answer which can be given based upon legal principles, and that is it was analogous to the "act of God." This is no new thought for the *act of God* has been recognized in law as long as the common law has been in vogue. Greenleaf says, "By the *act of God*, is meant a natural necessity, which could not have been occasioned by the intervention of man, but proceeds from physical causes alone; such as, the violence of the winds or seas, lightning, or other natural accident." (Greenleaf on Evidence, Vol. 11, Sec. 219.)

The restoration of Jesus to life "could not have been occasioned by the intervention of

man," because there is no evidence which even tends to show that any one tried to do it, and its accomplishment must be conceded to have been beyond the power of man to do it. It must be remembered that we are not dealing with an ordinary mortal. The life of Jesus, as narrated by His personal friends, who were witnesses of what took place, continually involves the *act of God*. Note the following narrative:

"And when he was entered into a ship, his disciples followed him. And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep. And his disciples came to him, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us: we perish. And he saith unto them, why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was great calm. But the men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him." Mat. 8, 23-27.

It will be noted that Matthew states that the disciples of Jesus were with Him. Since Matthew was one of these, he must have been an eye witness to the event. He is corroborated by the historians Luke 8, 22-24, and Mark 4, 36-41.

The great tempest was an *act of God*, known as such in the common law, and the character and power of Jesus was such that He was able to control and command those physical forces spoken of by Greenleaf.

John the disciple, relates another incident of similar character as follows:

"And when even was now come, his disciples went down unto the sea. And entered into a ship, and went over the sea toward Capernaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them. And the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew. So when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the ship; and they were afraid. But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid. Then they willingly received him into the ship; and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went." John 6, 16-21.

John, according to his own statement quoted, was an eye witness to this event.

Matthew relates the same narrative, and states that Jesus instructed His disciples, of which he was one, to get into the ship and go to the other side of the lake or sea, while He, Jesus, went up into the mountain to pray. The ship passed into the middle of the sea when the wind and waves became violent.

Matthew states that, "in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them, walking on the sea. And when the disciples saw Him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid." The disciple, Peter, sprang out of the boat to meet Jesus and immediately commenced to sink, whereupon Jesus stretched out His hand and caught him. Not only did Jesus sustain His own weight on the surface of the water, but that of sinking Peter also. Then Matthew goes on to say: "And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased." Mat. 14, 22-36.

Matthew was one of those disciples and must have been an eye witness to that event. Not only did Jesus command the wind and the waves, and thus assumed to do and did the *act of God*, but He suspended the law of gravity as well which is one of the great natural laws. If the blowing of the tempest is the *act of God*, the stilling of it must be also. What the witnesses state that Jesus did and what is known in law as the *act of God* are identical. Is it more marvellous to rise from the dead than it is to still the waves and the wind and to walk on the sea while holding up another man? Do

not all of these things, alike, call for the exercise of supernatural power?

In closing the discussion on this point, let us again turn to the principle laid down by Greenleaf, previously quoted:

"The *true question*, therefore, in trials of fact, is not whether it is possible that the testimony may be false, but whether there is *sufficient probability* of its truth; that is, whether the facts are shown by competent and satisfactory evidence. Things established by competent and satisfactory evidence are said to be proved."

We have discussed already the credibility of the witnesses, which has as much bearing on this question of the resurrection as upon any other part of the Scriptures, and we need not pursue the matter further. As a plain matter of law, the presumption of innocence of all wrong doing rests with Jesus and His disciples, and the burden of proof is upon those who would assail them, to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that they jointly or severally perpetrated an imposition upon the world by pretending that Jesus rose from the dead. Greenleaf on Evidence, Vol. III, Sec. 29.

The latter is the unavoidable position which the self-styled "liberal element" and the Unitarian Laymen must take. In so doing, they

rob Jesus of His divine character, clothe Him with imposture, and then invite the world to sit with them at "His feet and learn how to be a Christian."

## DIVISION IX

## THE SON AS THE ADVOCATE

"For it is written, 'as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.' So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. 14, 10-12.

"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." Ecc. 12, 14.

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and 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 delivered up their dead which were in them and they were judged every man according to their works." Rev. 20, 11-13.

"But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." Rom. 14, 10.

"For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." John 5, 12.

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours alone, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2, 1-2.

"Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man. And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me." John 8, 15-16.

"Whoso therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before the Father which is in heaven. But whoso shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10, 32-33.

"Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Rom. 8, 34.

## CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAW

It is with no desire to introduce a new theology, that the character of Jesus the Son is discussed from this standpoint. The sole object sought is to get at the truth—to determine our exact relationship to Jesus Christ. All through the Scriptures, He is spoken of as a "redeemer," "savior," as "Lord of All,"



while in the passages just quoted, He is referred to as an advocate, an intercessor, and a judge. To the casual reader, these would seem to be incongruous, for how can one be a judge and an advocate at one and the same time? In one place, John has the Son say: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son," while in another place, he has him to say: "I judge no man." The words "advocate" and "intercessor" imply three persons or entities: the one whose cause is to be advocated, the one who is to advocate it, and the one to whom the appeal is to be made. John and Paul recognize the truth of this in the passages quoted, and Jesus so states it in Matthew 10, 32-33, as follows, to wit:

"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

Yet John quotes Jesus as saying, that God has committed all judgment to Him (John 5, 12), while in his first epistle, he describes Jesus as an advocate, taking His position before God the Father as an "advocate with the Father," to plead the cause of sinners, and Paul locates His position at the "the right

hand of God." The same apostle, John, later in life, peers into heaven, and there sees God upon His "great white throne" judging mankind "according to their works." It may be well to ask: what is the meaning of all this?

We shall not get at the truth by detaching these paragraphs and considering them separately. Such a course will end in chaos, as it has already done in some instances. It should not be the effort of the fair investigator to tear things apart to create disharmony, but rather to put things together to create harmony. The great problem then, in this instance, is to ascertain how one person can be an advocate and at the same time be a judge in the same case. Is Jesus to be the judge or the advocate of the world? How can He be both? The statements concerning Him are distinct, and the words used are of a simple character. Can they be harmonized? If not, then thinking men must discard them, and in their place must come discord and chaos, if not a complete breaking down of the claims of the Son as a redeemer.

#### THE SON BOTH JUDGE AND ADVOCATE

It must be evident to the candid mind that, by reason of the *modus operandi* of the Trinity,

the Father is the court of last resort, and that supreme authority is vested in Him, that He has delegated to the Son Jesus Christ the power and authority of separating the righteous from the unrighteous of this world, that is separating those who have kept the faith from those who have not kept it (Matt. 25, 31-46); that such delegated power is so complete, and the relation between the Son and the Father so perfect, that whatever may be the judgment of the Son it will be ratified by the Father upon the simple recommendation of the Son. The Father sent the Son to the world to do this, taking the precaution that He should be endowed with human feelings, so that He could better appreciate man's infirmities (Heb. 4, 15) and grant mercy. He must make this division for the Father, and in so doing, He must pass judgment upon all mankind that He may make His recommendations to the Father, as to who are and who are not fit to receive the eternal reward. This is an act of passing judgment, and since He will miss nobody, we shall, therefore, "all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." In other words, no one who lived under the new dispensation will be admitted by the Father into His kingdom

without the indorsement and recommendation of the Son.

But the Son establishes conditions precedent which must be met by all men before they will be accepted by Him, and those conditions are, that all shall acknowledge him as their Savior, before men, and do His will (Matt. 10, 32-33). To such as do this, He has promised that He will present them to the Father justified, and to recommend them for admission into the kingdom of the Father. He thus becomes their advocate.

But there will be, under this plan of redemption and judgment, those who will accept the Son as their redeemer early in life, who will have a long way to travel amidst pitfalls and snares. Suppose they stumble and fall along the route or depart somewhat, at times, from the straight and narrow pathway, what then? Will the Son desert such for that reason? The answer is given by John, who, in his advanced years, writes with fatherly tenderness and care:

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours alone, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2, 1-2.

From this study, it becomes apparent, that the Son searches the hearts of men and judges them as to whether they accept Him as their Savior, before others, and do His will, and they are under His guardian care from that time on until they are finally admitted into the kingdom of the Father, justified through Him who shed His blood for them, their Advocate and their Savior.

Whether this construction is accepted by many or by few, it is the one reached by reasoning under the rules of construction applied in the administration of law.

Jesus, the Advocate, must always be a supremely interesting character to the lawyer, for to him it must have a special significance. He may not be able to visualize such a situation, but the thought of one being the sole advocate of the people of a condemned world, in the court of last resort in the universe, must thrill the meditative legal mind.

Consider the matter further. John, who uses the word *advocate* to describe the office of the Son, in the great court from whose jurisdiction none can escape, nor appeal, was an intelligent Jew, under Roman rule, and subject to the laws thereof. But the Jewish jurisprudence knew no such officer as *advocate*.

There was no well-known official title contained in the Hebrew law which John could use to properly describe the official character of Jesus in the eternal kingdom. He must have pondered over the matter at length, because he selected a very significant term, found only in the Roman jurisprudence, and used only in connection with Roman procedure, and he put it in writing in his first epistle. While Paul, a Roman citizen, does not use the exact word, he accurately describes the office, in his letter to the Romans quoted, as one "who maketh intercessions for us." The duties are the same.

#### THE ROMAN ADVOCATE

That we may more fully understand the character of an advocate under the Roman legal code, in use at that time, and thus more clearly understand the function which these apostles understood Jesus to perform for them then and for His followers now, we will have recourse to the ancient Roman law.

The word *advocate* is derived from the Latin word *advocatus* which originally meant a patron, a pleader or a speaker. "Originally the management of suits at law was under-

taken by the *patronus* for his *cliens* as a matter of duty arising out of their reciprocal relations. Afterward it became a profession."

This profession was governed by very strict rules, with which our own are somewhat analogous, and only one hundred fifty advocates called *advocati ordinarii* were licensed to practice in the higher courts. The *advocati ordinarii* were compelled, under the rules of their profession, to assist every one who requested their services, unless there was a just reason for a refusal; and they could be compelled to assist in the trial of a needy person. So strict were the rules governing the *advocati ordinarii*, they could be compelled to defend a client against every person, even the emperor of Rome, unless the cause were their own or that of a parent, child or ward.

They were not even excused when opposed by a brother or sister. Stern old law that. He must be of the highest integrity, and if he committed an infamous act, he was disbarred forever from the practice of his profession; he could not be advocate and judge in the same cause; nor after being appointed judge could he practice in another court; nor could he be a witness in a case in which he was engaged as an advocate. He was bound to use the utmost

care and diligence in handling his clients case; he was liable to his client for any damages which might be caused by his neglect or fault. He must clearly and correctly expound the law to his clients, and honestly warn them against transgressions or neglect thereof. "He must frankly and fully inform them of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of their cause of action, and must be especially careful not to undertake a cause clearly unjust, or let himself be used as an instrument of chicanery, malice, or other unlawful action. In pleading, he must abstain from invectives against the judge, the opposing party or his advocate. Should it become necessary or advantageous to mention unpleasant truths, this must be done with the utmost forbearance, and in the most moderate language. Conscientious honesty forbade his betraying secrets confided to him by his client or making any improper use of them." If he violated any of these trusts, he was liable to fine or imprisonment, or suspension, or disbarment, as the offense seemed to warrant.

These were the stern responsibilities and strict human qualifications of an *advocate* when John wrote his general epistle and said:

"We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

That combination ought to insure us all a square deal when we appear with Jesus the Son before the judgment bar, in the final hearing of our cause, when the recording angel shall read the testimony of our lives to the Supreme Court on high, who shall judge all men "according to their works."

Let us now call attention to some striking analogies, that we may better understand the true meaning of the words of the apostle John.

It will be noticed, first, that the number of advocates who could be heard before a Roman judge was limited. The offender must take one of these or stand alone. In the eternal jurisdiction, there is but one who can qualify to practice before that Court, for the membership of the bar is also limited. One will have to accept Him or stand alone, for this is the law:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheep fold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief, and robber. I am the door." John 10, 1-9.

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; for I have not spoken of myself but the Father that sent me." John 12, 48-49.

In other words, the law is clear: there is no way to reach the ear of the Great Judge of all men, that we may ask that the case against us be dismissed, except through the advocacy of the one great Advocate, Jesus Christ, the only one ever authorized to practice before the Great Tribune of the Universe. To reject the Son's offer, means judgment by the Father.

Again let us use the analogy of the Apostle John:

The advocate was required to defend all men before the judge, and must be no respecter of persons, unless there were most extraordinary reasons for refusal. His was a universal service. Concerning this, Jesus said:

"Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

The exception, in which the Roman law finds its analogy, consists of the one class of persons for whom He will not appear, and that is those who sin against the Holy Spirit.

Still further the analogy runs: The Roman advocate was of the highest integrity and probity of character.

John the Baptist said of Jesus: "Behold the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and Peter said He was "as a lamb without blemish and without spot."

As the Roman advocate could not be advocate and judge at the same time, so is Jesus the advocate of your soul, and God is the final judge, upon whose right hand, in the eternal Court of Justice, stands your Pleader waiting, upon invitation, to make intercession for you.

Still further the analogy runs:

The Roman advocate must use the utmost care and diligence in pleading his client's cause, whether poor or rich.

Jesus defended the poor, the widowed and the fatherless against their oppressors. He said:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation."

He passed through the throes of agony in the garden of Gethsemane while His disciples slept:

"And he saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch. . . ' And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst not thou watch one hour?"

He drove the money-changers from the temple, who had made it a den of thieves:

"And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves."

He fed the hungry multitudes, cleansed the lepers, and healed the blind. He was as one who never slept, for we can think of but one instance where it is recorded of him that he ever closed his eyes in slumber. The Shepherd was ever diligently defending the flock.

The Roman advocate must clearly and correctly expound the law to his clients, and honestly warn them against transgressions or neglect thereof. Its analogy is clear.

Jesus was both advocate and teacher. He expounded the law everywhere; in the synagogue and by the wayside; by the seashore and on the mountain; to friends and enemies alike, without flinching. To the wicked and design-cabal who were persecuting Him, he said:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self. On these commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

And when it became necessary to call a spade a spade, He did it, amidst the curses of

the powerful and mighty. It was to these he said:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." Matt. 23, 14.

The Roman lawyer must speak with forbearance when referring to his opponents, but at no time was he enjoined from speaking the plain truth. He must not show hatred towards any one.

There never was a more striking example of this than in the discourses of Jesus. When it became necessary for him to speak plainly, to show them the error of their way, He did so without fear or favor, but it was always in descriptive language appropriate for the occasion. In the midst of His persecutions, He said, "Love your enemies. Do good to them that despitefully use you," and as He hung dying on the cross between two thieves, with a crown of thorns pressed hard upon His brow, raising His eyes towards heaven, He said: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

No courtroom etiquette ever approached that, and no Roman advocatus was ever called

upon to pass through a trial like that before Pilate. No advocate appeared in that friendless chamber to defend Him, for He was not a Roman citizen. He stood alone before the Procurator, without counsel, self-possessed, kindly and firm; the olive skin was pinked with the flush of pure, red blood; the athletic body was straight; the head erect; the long hair falling gently upon a pair of fine shoulders developed at the carpenter's bench, and the eyes were clear and expressive—a royal client without an attorney. What fame a Roman advocatus could have won, for all the ages, had just one of the one hundred fifty licensed to practice before the Procurator appeared on the scene then. What immortal glory could the most unworthy of them have achieved had he but said one word in defense of the Prisoner. The name of Cicero has been written indelibly upon the pages of history, and Marc Antony won undying fame in his oration over the dead body of Caesar, but the poorest advocatus who ever pleaded a case before a Roman bar could have made the world almost forget Cicero and Antony by lisping one little word of apology for Jesus before Pontius Pilate. We wish one had done so. It would now be the glory of the profession wher-



ever a court convenes. But none did, and some Roman lawyer may never know what immeasurable riches he lost because of his wretched conception of his duty, when he mistook the Crown Prince of the Royal House of Providence for a poor, persecuted, friendless Jew.

In the language of Browning:

"This could have happened but once, and we missed it, lost it forever."

But the analogy does not stop at this point.

While it was the duty of an *advocatus* to lend his assistance to any one who might call for it, such services were not forced upon a litigant. By neglect, a Roman could be defaulted and lose his day in court. It was up to him to choose his counsel of his own free-will. He had no reason to complain at the hardships of the law, for he was presumed to know what it was. Neither was he permitted to complain of his own laches. The law had provided him with an advocate, and if he rejected the opportunity or simply neglected to avail himself of such assistance, he did so at his peril. They felt no injustice in this for they knew that justice could not wait always for them. This is exactly what Paul meant when he said in his letter to the Hebrews:

"Therefore we ought to give the most earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" Heb. 2, 1-3.

There were two sides to the Roman law—the civil and the criminal. The latter had to do with violations of the laws of the state and were *not* founded upon contract. The Divine Law is analogous to this, and the basis of it are the Ten Commandments. When the offender of the Roman law was convicted, he faced fine or imprisonment, or both, in the discretion of the judge; and in some cases death, for they had the death penalty there. The emperor could pardon for any offense upon sufficient reason shown by the advocate of the convicted. If a fine were imposed, the advocate could pay it or see that it was paid, and thus secure the release of the respondent.

We now turn to the Divine Law, and we find that all men are under condemnation. With free moral agency, sin has come into the lives of all mankind, accompanied with violations of the Sacred Law, and this finds its analogy in the Roman law in offenses against the



crown. Perceiving this, Divine Providence offered to all offenders the free services of an advocate:

"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. For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved."

In other words, Jesus did not come into the world primarily as a judge, but as an advocate, possessed with quasi-judicial powers, which required Him to pass judgment on men. He found the world in ignorance of the law, and sadly in need of His help. He disclosed to His followers His authority to appear before the Supreme Court, and offered His services to all who should choose to accept them. John explained this when he wrote:

"The spirit and the bride say, come. And let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." Rev. 22, 17.

Jesus carefully prepared his case. He came into the world and made a personal investigation into the troubles of mankind. He knows with what men have to contend, and is pre-

pared to feelingly and sympathetically present their cause to the great Chancellor. Paul explained this to the Hebrews in his letter to them, when he said:

"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. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

Lastly, the high courts of Rome were courts of record, and the principal pleadings and motions were in writing. We find their analogy in John's description of the Great High Court sitting in final judgment on the last day:

"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 delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second

death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20, 11-15.

This is a description of the Supreme Court of the Universe with the great Eternal Judge sitting on his throne, with the books containing the records of the cases He was to hear at hand. From this, it is to be seen that there were two kinds of books kept, one containing the testimony in the case, that is, the record the individual has made in this world, and the other a special book called the "book of life." Those whose names appeared in this book, by reason of some remarkable influence, were exempt from execution. But Paul assures us that such is the standing of the Great Advocate of mankind, for he says:

"But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 24-25.

From this study of the text it may be seen that some of the books containing the evidence in the cases He was to hear, were analogous to the record used in the highest Roman courts which were courts of record. Proper books were kept and all proceedings noted carefully.

When John looked upon the scenes of the last day, these books were among the wonderful things he saw. Out of their contents the accused people were to be judged. But this *book of life* was peculiarly differentiated from the other books in that it was accessible to but One. It was comparable in Roman procedure to a special motion book or one containing special cases. Its true significance can be understood only when we read another passage of the record which John gives as follows:

"And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the back side, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, weep not; behold, the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the

right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seal thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on earth." Rev. 5, 1-10.

There are several things to be noted in this record: (a) John saw God sitting on His throne, and in His right hand He held a *book*, not *books*. This was analogous to a Roman judge sitting on his bench, holding a special record in his hand. (b) There appears a "strong angel" proclaiming in a loud voice, which is analogous to a Roman court crier or officer, announcing the names of the advocates and the cases they were to try. (c) Finally John comes to the one great case, upon which the destiny of the world hung, for the world was on trial. Its peculiar character was such that there was but one advocatus who could successfully plead it, and he was "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David," who came forward as the crier announced the case,

was accepted by the Judge, took the special book from the hand of the Judge, opened it (seal by seal), and explained its contents. He was the only one who could open and expound the contents of this book because he was the maker and keeper of it and the sole possessor of the knowledge of its contents. He it was who had written the names to be found therein, and no one could pass through that court into their eternal reward whose names He had not written in that book with His endorsement attached. He thus held the key to the New Jerusalem which John saw, and of which he speaks as follows:

"And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life. Rev. 21, 27.

As Jesus is the Lamb spoken of, He is the Maker and Keeper of the Book of Life. He it was whom John saw take that book from the hand of the Judge, open it and proceed to advocate the causes of those whose names He had recorded therein. It contains the names of the "sheep" whom he had separated from the "goats" in his administration of the final affairs of the world, as well as his elect who had

gone before, and those are the ones which John described when he said:

"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 honor, and glory, and blessing." Rev. 5, 11-12.

We cannot escape the conclusion that John had a thorough knowledge of Roman court procedure, and used the term *advocate* in describing the official character of Jesus in the eternal kingdom, because he could illustrate it in no other way so comprehensively to mankind. In so doing, he has done us a great service, because we can now visualize the great work Jesus is doing and is yet to do, and appreciate the same. We can comprehend what he means when he says:

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours alone, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2, 1-2.

And in the same way we can understand Paul when he says:

"Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Rom. 8, 34.

## DIVISION X.

## CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAW AS TO JUDGMENT

The official duties of Jesus, the Son, in his Father's kingdom, have been discussed already, and the question now well may be asked: What becomes of the respondent after judgment has been passed upon him? To determine this, we again turn to the law to study its provisions, and apply the same strict rules of construction previously used, in order to determine the *intent* of the Law-maker. We must take various sections of the law bearing on the question, consider them together, and try to determine that intent.

Commencing with the Ten Commandments, we find that men are prohibited from doing certain things. These would mean nothing at all, as statutes, unless some kind of judgment were to be passed upon those who violate them and some penalty inflicted, and the law states that such judgment and penalty shall be had. Concerning this, we find the following provisions, to wit:

"I said in my heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked: for there is a time there for every purpose, and for every work.

And, moreover, I saw under the sun the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, that iniquity was there." Ec. 3, 16-17.

"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." Ec. 12, 14.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my father who is in heaven." Matt. 7, 2.

"When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Matt. 25, 31-34.

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. 25, 41.

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and 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 delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. Rev. 20, 11-15.

From these passages quoted, as well as from many others contained in the document, it must be perfectly apparent, that judgment is to be passed upon all mankind, and that men are to be rewarded according to the record made here; that those who have lived according to the provisions of the law are to be sent to a place called the "kingdom of heaven," and that those who have disobeyed those provisions are to be sent to some other place called "lake of fire," because separation is clearly decreed.

This leads us to inquire: What and where is heaven? If a prisoner is sentenced by a judge to a term of years in prison, for violating some law, the sentence cannot be executed without locating the prison. Neither can he be sent to a place of reward without that place is

located. As respondents, we are all interested in knowing where heaven is. Shall we search the law in vain in an effort to define and locate it?

Just before the betrayal of Jesus by Judas, as His disciples were gathered about Him, Peter expressed a desire to go with Him to that place to which He had referred but which He had not specifically described. He informed Peter that he could not go with Him then but that he should follow Him afterwards. Jesus then proceeded to describe that place to them, and said:

"In my father's house there 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." Jno. 14, 2-3.

By considering this paragraph in connection with the twenty-first paragraph of the seventh chapter of Matthew, above quoted, it will be seen that the words "my Father's house" and the "kingdom of heaven" mean one and the same thing. Years ago we learned, as a mathematical proposition, things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. That

holds true here, and by simple substitution, the paragraph quoted would read as follows:

"In the kingdom of heaven are many mansions: if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you," etc.

Now, unless we are to accuse Jesus of simply playing with words, we can construe His language to mean nothing less than that there were places, or bodies, or things in heaven which He called *mansions*, but that these were not in suitable state of preparation for His followers, and that He must go "to prepare a place for them." Many years later, John, who was one of Jesus' closest friends, who stood by when He made the statement, and who was an old man in exile on the isle of Patmos, longing to catch just one glimpse of the promised place, visualized at least a part of heaven as a city of transcendent beauty and glory. This was his understanding of the place which Jesus had prepared for him in accordance with His promise, and it certainly appears to be His *intent* to provide some place whose environment would comport with the harmony existing between Him and His disciples and with their righteous and exalted characters. He gives tangibility to His description by the use of such words as *house*, *mansion* and *place*

which He would prepare. It is not hard to understand how that the first two of these words were used allegorically, but the word *place* to be prepared, indicates the doing of a specific thing in a certain locality which He describes as *house* and *mansion*. He further describes this place as in a *kingdom*, as before noted. There is also tangibility to that because he refers to it as the realm or sphere governed by His Father who is in *heaven*. That is stated clearly in His prayer which He taught His disciples. As we are told in Genesis, that God made the heavens and the earth, and all there was therein, His kingdom, then, is the universe for He rules over it, and somewhere in that universe are His allegorical mansions, one of which Jesus declared, as He was about to leave, that He would specially prepare for His followers. He said *prepare*, not *create*. He also said there were *many* of them, but did not give the number. We say He prepared *one* of them, because it was His intent, clearly expressed, to keep His flock together, in *one* place, where He could be with them forever. It was not *places* but *place* He was to prepare, and whatever that place was, it was to be *heaven* to them. It could not have been the whole universe which He referred to, for the



language employed excludes the thought, but some place in that universe called *heaven*, which is to be the final home of those chosen by Jesus, accepted by God, ruled over by Him, and is a part of His kingdom.

It seems to have been Paul's conception that heaven was a place and not a *condition* or *status*, for in his epistle to the Hebrews, he says:

"But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city." Heb. 11, 16.

Like John, he understood heaven to be a place which he calls a city located in "an heavenly country." John called it the "New Jerusalem," and as old Jerusalem was the capital of Judea, so, it would seem, the New Jerusalem is to be the seat of government of that "heavenly country."

Again, it was Mark's understanding that heaven was to be a place, for he says:

"So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God the Father." Mark 16, 19.

One cannot conceive of *right* and *left* and *sat* without associating them with substance or place or location, involving the matter of

direction, for how can there be such things without place and locality?

Luke also regards it in the same light, for he says:

"But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Acts 7, 55-56.

At least, he approvingly quotes Stephen as saying that as he was suffering martyrdom.

It would seem, therefore, that it is plain that this record clearly discloses the *intent* of the Law-maker to provide a place of reward for those who shall keep the law, and accept the services of the *Advocate*, which is called *Heaven*, and that that reward consists in the enjoyment of the perfect life of the beneficiaries, and perpetual fellowship with their Redeemer, the Son Jesus of Nazareth.

It has been stated already, that to get a proper construction of a written instrument, such as a will, statute or constitution, the several parts should be considered together, having in mind all of the time the *intent* of the maker or makers of such instrument. This necessitates our considering other parts of the



document at this time, and in this connection. When we do this, we find that this conception of heaven is sustained in the account of the resurrection of the dead, and the second coming and regency of Jesus.

Now, to get the complete record pertaining to this point before us, we will quote again from it, at the expense of repeating a portion of it, pertinent paragraphs noted therein:

"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.

"And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1, 9-11.

Under the rule of construction cited, we should take these detached paragraphs, consider them together and try to get their true

meaning. If we do so, the reasonable mind will construe them about as follows:

Inasmuch as Jesus had told His followers, that in His Father's house there were many mansions; that He would go to prepare a place for them, and that He would come again to receive them unto Himself; that the dead would pass to judgment first; that the righteous dead would rise, and that those alive on the earth at the time of His coming would be judged, as He clearly stated they would be, through His regency. Matt. 25, 31-34.

After the living are judged, it would be unreasonable to assume that they would die in His presence or under His reign. What, then, would become of them? The answer is given in His assurance that He would receive them unto Himself, with the risen dead, in that place prepared for them by Him in His Father's house of many mansions. That place is not this earth, because He clearly states that He was to go away to some other place to make His preparation for them, and He started on His journey when He made His ascension and was caught up in the clouds. He is to come back again by the same route, as Luke states (Acts 1, 9-11), and Paul understands that the living are to go back with Him over the same

course, as is clearly manifested in his statement:

"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 we shall ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4, 17-18.

These statements should dispose, for all time, of the claim that Christ's second coming is simply a spiritual one. They will not admit of such construction. The statement is plain, and the words used are of obvious meaning. Those friends of Jesus had seen him caught up in the air, disappearing in the clouds, and that is as far as they could follow Him on His journey. To follow Him to the new place of abode, would mean that the living would have to be taken up in the air to get to that other place where the righteous dead are to go, and where peace and harmony shall ever reign.

That, in substance, is what Paul says, and it is in substantial harmony with the statements and various promises of Jesus. He tells in His discourse who will go with Him and who will not go, and gives clearly His reasons for making the division. (Matt. 25, 33-46.) He does not state where it is to be, but indicates that it is to be one of the mansions in His Father's house. As we know that His Father's

house is the universe, is it not a fair assumption that the mansion referred to is one of the many planets or heavenly bodies, in the limitless space, which Jesus has specially prepared, during His absence, for the abode of the living whom He will take with Him, and the resurrected dead? It must suggest the thought, that some such planet is necessary for the habitation of the living whom He shall take with Him. In this connection, let us again observe that Jesus said He would *prepare* a place and not *create* one. The word is significant because the record states He had already created all things:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1, 2-3.

"All things" include these planets, and He made them as the Father's great Architect. He does not need to create them over again, but a preparation is needed. The scientists tell us that constant changes are being made in the heavenly bodies under the laws which govern them. If He made them, He also made the laws which govern them, and the changes wrought

are His changes; His preparation of them for some purpose of His own. Jehovah is not so prodigal with His resources that He will scatter these great planetary systems throughout space for no purpose whatever. We learn no such lessons of wastefulness from what we find in this world. Why so there? Is such a presumption fair and reasonable?

Nor are we unsupported in this contention. Inasmuch as the record proves Jesus to be possessed with supernatural power, and able to translate the human body from this planet to that of any other heavenly body, regardless of any other physical or natural conditions, nevertheless the record clearly states that some radical changes in the human body will be made to fit it for that other *place* in the heavenly kingdom and fellowship with Jesus. This is not only true of the resurrected dead, but of the living also without their "tasting death." Says Paul:

"Behold, I show you a mystery: 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." 1 Cor. 15, 51-53; 2 Cor. 5, 4; 1 Thess. 4, 15; Phil. 3, 21.

~ If the body is to be so changed, does not the presumption follow, that it is for the purpose of fitting it for its new habitation and new environment? It is not a wild and vain speculation to follow up the thought. Why this change in or transformation of the body? Christ assumed the form of a man while here, and was not ashamed of it; and the record proclaims, that man was made in the image of God. Why any change? There appears but one answer, and that is, that Jesus went to prepare a place for us; that He is to come again to take those of us who remain to that place with Him, and that the environment of that place is such that some change is required to adapt us to it. There shall be some other method of lighting it than the sun, for the record states that:

"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. 22, 5.

The scientist will note that this provision takes care of that time when the sun shall have become "burned out, cold and dark," for man is to become an immortal spirit, while the life

of the sun is limited, so they say. John is not caught in any trap there, for any heaven lighted by the sun would not be eternal. Although not an astronomer, he seems to know what he is talking about. The environment of such a place may be the atmosphere of some other heavenly body which may be imperishable and to which God shall furnish some other light than the sun, or which may need no light at all. Who knows? But whatever place it may be, it is heaven—the homeland of the spirit, the *place* where Jesus is and to which He welcomes those He redeems.

To some heaven is but a status and not a *place*. No rational construction of the law will sustain such contention. In this connection, it seems that we shall not do full justice to this subject unless we discuss further the question of the *intent* of the Law-giver, for it is of paramount importance. Is it not possible to glean further knowledge of the *intent* by studying the needs and conditions created by the acts of the Law-giver Himself which the law is designed to meet? We think that it is, and we shall accordingly take up the study of the matter of that *intent*.

It must be evident to the thinking person, that the Creator of the universe had in mind

the accomplishment of some purpose in the creation of mankind with all of his peculiar endowments which distinguish them from all other animal creation. The Creator did not stop with the creation of the natural senses, but He endowed all normal creatures with a desire to live out their allotted time. We witness that on all sides, and in all living things. We go a step further in the order of progression, and find man not only possessing a desire to live out his allotted time, but with an understanding of the eternal nature of things just as strong a desire for immortality as he has for natural life. This is true of all classes and races of people. The simple-minded North American Indian prays fervently for the joys of the happy hunting grounds. It is a place to which he longs to go, and for which his nature craves. Is it not fair to presume, nay is it not compelling to believe, that it is the *intent* of the Creator of that insatiable longing to satisfy it? What injustice it would be not to do so if we are to judge the refusal by that other part of the law known as the Golden Rule. What a delusion and fraud it would be for a creator to thus play upon the feelings of his helpless creatures. What a fearful charge of deceit that would be to bring against Jehovah.

This belief is not confined to the simple-minded. It ranges from the highest to the lowest types of intellectuality. Socrates and Plato were as much inspired by the belief in immortality as the most primitive men. In fact, this belief has been almost universal, showing that there was, in the beginning, probably a universal sowing of the seed of this belief by the Master Hand.

Even in those who do not outwardly confess that belief, there are unmistakable evidences of the hope that is within them. The exceptional few have permitted a theory to stubbornly contest for supremacy the hope that is divinely planted in each nature, until the voice which speaks through natural impulse is smothered. It becomes a matter of false education and spiritual perversion. Shakespeare speaks the hope of the natural man when he says: "Heaven, the treasury of everlasting joy." With the natural man, age only intensifies that hope and longing. This verse is but an echo of the voice of old age:

"And when I at last must throw off this frail  
covering  
Which I have worn for three-score years and  
ten,  
On the brink of the grave, I'll not seek to  
keep hovering,

Nor my thread wish to spin o'er again:  
But my face in the glass I'll serenely survey,  
And with smiles count each wrinkle and furrow;  
For this old worn-out stuff, which is threadbare today,  
May become everlasting tomorrow."

We now turn to those whom we have known to have lived the lives of the simple and pure, of the cultured part of our race, and, while we see more of the refinements and understanding than in the primitive man, we find the same evidence of the endless longing for immortality. Instead of the happy hunting-ground, it becomes heaven, a place everlasting where the chosen of the Creator shall dwell forever.

Thus we find the sainted, blind Fannie Crosby singing about the "Blessed Homeland." The Rev. Augustus M. Toplady, in that immortal hymn, "Rock of Ages," speaks his hopes in these words:

"When I soar to worlds unknown,  
See Thee on Thy judgment throne."

That was his vision, and Benson says of it: "No other English hymn can be named which has laid so broad and firm a grasp upon the English-speaking world."

Wesley conceived a place of refuge in his

beautiful hymn, "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," for he said:

"Hide me, O my Savior, hide,  
Till the storm of life is past,  
Safe into the *haren* guide,  
O, receive my soul at last."

It is said that Wesley wrote this hymn after he and his brother had been driven from the place where they had been holding service, by a furious mob.

Heaven is visualized in that fine old hymn, "The Heavenly Land," as the author expresses it:

"I love to think of the heavenly land where white robed angels are."

It is the author's interpretation of the 16th verse of the 11th chapters of Hebrews. They think of heaven as a *place* and not a condition or status merely.

The same view is expressed in that hymn known to us all, "Pull for the Shore"; and in "All the Way My Savior Leads Me," Franny Crosby again says:

"All the way my Savior leads me;  
Oh, the fullness of His love!  
Perfect rest to me is promised,  
In my Father's *house* above;

When my spirit clothed immortal,  
Wings its flight to realms of day,  
This my song through endless ages—  
Jesus led me all the way."

Taking his theme from a paragraph already quoted, "In my Father's house are many mansions," Rev. William Hunter visualized heaven as expressed in these words:

"My heavenly home is bright and fair;  
Nor pain nor death can enter there;  
Its glittering towers the sun outshine;  
That heavenly *mansion* shall be mine.  
I'm going home to die no more."

Perhaps there is no song sung into which little children put more emotion and sing with greater fidelity to their natures than:

"Shall we gather at the *river* where bright  
angel's feet have trod  
With its crystal tide forever flowing by the  
throne of God."

There is only one other song which may rival it in that respect, and that is, "In the Sweet By and By." How the children love to sing it:

"There's a *land* that is fairer than day,  
And by faith we can see it afar,  
For the Father waits over the way,  
To prepare us a *dwelling place* there."

What song is there sung today, of the thousands, to which the average audience listens with more apparent solemn interest, than Harold Jarvis' rendition of "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere":

*"Land of the true where we live anew,  
Beautiful Isle of Somewhere."*

Emerson, in his splendid essay on the Law of Compensation, states that every positive has its negative, every evil its good, every bitter its sweet. Why should there be a failure to respond to the longing for immortality, and why should He who has provided with infinite care and wisdom the supply for every other demand fail to meet the wants of His highest creation?

In answer to the question: "What and where is heaven?" we would reply that, judging from the expressed longings of the natural man, it is a *place* of peace and rest from strife, provided by the Creator somewhere in His universe, which He has provided to meet the conditions which He Himself has created. In other words, we get the *intent* of the Law-maker from the circumstances which go to make up the needs of the governed, and the desirableness and justice of caring for them.

Ask yourself the question: For what does my own soul yearn? Would you be satisfied

with floating about in ether, in a state of imagined ecstasy, where you could float a million years, and with the telescope of a Kepler be unable to discover a human soul, so vast is space. Have you ever discovered anything in your own life which leads you to believe that the Creator who placed in your being a longing for immortality, and brought you into this world of light, heat and substance, as a place of preparation or stepping-stone for some other existence, will answer that specific longing by dangling you up in ether, through endless ages, where, by comparison, the chances of meeting of but two human beings in this world, situated on opposite sides of this earth, without means of communication or travel, save what nature gave them, would be infinitely greater than the chances of meeting a human soul floating in endless ether. It would be the nearest to nothing of anything of which the human mind can conceive, instead of the fulfillment of a great hope or longing so thoroughly felt and understood here.

But what about the unredeemed? Where are they? The inquirer may answer his own question for the law clearly sets forth that they are somewhere else than in heaven. There is not enough in the record by way of description, to

enable one to visualize such a place or existence. But wherever or whatever it is, it is not in heaven. The door is closed to such and they cannot enter. This is the law:

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. I am the door.” John 10, 1-9.

“And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.” Matt. 25, 46.