

it is pretty good evidence that they have those passages in mind as a help, but it is not a matter of a specific technical usage of a particular word, necessarily. It may be such. I think it is like the thing that we were just dealing with of, beginning with "Hear ye, hear ye" and the change from rhetorical usage from a question regarding negative answers, and then regarding the positive answer. So it is the use of a similar phrase. It may be a device to call attention of a feature of Christ, but it is not necessarily so. It is always worth asking the question, Does ~~himself~~ <sup>Ephesians when it</sup> use it this way, have the same thought in mind as is here, and points backward, but it is not a right to assume the answer immediately. The two passages should be considered together and a conclusion reached, in order to avoid the great danger of falling into error through a superficial interpretation.

(Pupil: I have the impression that, that seems to be the approach of a good many modern law books.) Yes, it is a superficial approach due to careful, serious study. It is of course far better than the approach but it lasts that much <sup>?</sup> <sup>?</sup> better (9). There is a great deal that ~~the approach of him~~ <sup>?</sup> is simply ignorant for the Christian. Now there is a certain study up to a point, but we must go beyond that point, and get more thoroughly into the meaning of it. Now I think it is a very wise ~~thing~~ feature, but one to be gotten (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ).

(Pupil: In line with Mr. Foxwell's problem I was wondering if it would be possible for a perusal of that little booklet you put out last year, "Principles of Spiritualization", by Dr. Hoffman. I haven't had the opportunity to read it but I just noticed it the other day, and I was thinking now that it might be helpful.) But what we are dealing now with is the matter of Pre-Millennialism. He was a pre-millennialist in a Dutch Reformed Church, greatly persecuted for his view, and he wrote a number of pamphlets and books attempting to defend his premillennial view that was under attack by other ministers, and I haven't read this particular one, but from what I have seen it is very good.

(Pupil: I will not confine myself to a metaphoric merely, as some other things which . In connection with 59:3 and 4 there is an indication that these different figures here are set forth as the conception of birth, internal and external sin, that is in my Bible I mark hands, or fingers, or lips or tongues, then when we precede over into the other verse, such as the following verse, there is a mention of conceding mischief. I'm wondering if the repetition here of the members of the body and then the mention of conceding mischief, is not a presentation of a fact that the totality of this sin was both external and internal. The conceiving mischief being a setting forth of the internal character