

The third of the three episodes now under study is that of the three mightiest of David's warriors' breaking through the ranks of the Philistines, and getting from the well at Bethlehem's gate the water so ardently longed for by David (2 Sam. 23: 13-17; 1 Chro. 11: 15-19). In Vol. IX, Chap. VI, the antitype of Jashobeam's part was given in some detail, and above was briefly sketched Bro. Barton's part therein. Here will be given some details on J.'s part therein, as the antitype of Eleazar. David's longing for water typed Bro. Russell's longing as that Servant, not as a pilgrim, for Truth needed at those three times. As Bro. Russell's pertinent fight with demons and sifters was along the line of trusting the Lord's ability fully to protect the flock against demons and sifters, and as Bro. Barton's pertinent fight with demons and sifters was against their efforts to arouse him to resent Bro. Russell's way of dealing with the sifters, especially A. E. Williamson, so J.'s pertinent fight was against demons and sifters (the troop of Philistines pitched in the valley of Rephaim [*gigantic, i.e., demons*], v. 13) who sought to make him take a wrong attitude toward Bro. Russell as that Servant. The three coming to David in the harvest time, and that to the cave of Adullam (*vengeance of the people*,—the Hebrew for the Greek *Laodicea*), places the antitype in the Harvest. The 19081911 sifters above all others entrenched themselves in the Bible, misinterpreted, of course (the garrison ... in Bethlehem [*house of bread*], v. 14).

J. started toward the antitypical well, the Truth (the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate, v. 15), about April 1, 1910, and soon found himself engaged in the sharpest internal debate of his life. The debate revolved about this question: How in the study and exposition of the Scriptures, as a servant of the Truth, was J. to act internally and externally toward Bro. Russell as *that Servant*? Was he to, abstain altogether from studying and expounding the Bible to the Brethren in each detail until that Servant first expounded it in such detail? Or was he to study and expounded it in those parts that he thought he understood, even if they had not already been expounded by that Servant to the Church? Or was he to accept that Servant's teachings simply on his authority as that Servant? Or was he to subject them to careful examination? First the subtlest arguments were suggested to his mind to study and expound any part of the Bible, regardless of whether that Servant had expounded it or not. He met all of these arguments and refuted them; for he saw that this course would put him into the position of disregarding Bro. Russell in his office functions as that Servant. Then a series of most subtle arguments was brought to bear on his mind not to study or expound any part of the Bible not already seen by him in the expositions of that Servant. These arguments he also met and refuted, since he saw that this would debar his studying and expounding even the simplest and clearest passages, even historical, hortatory and ethical ones, if he had not first gotten their exposition from that Servant. After this feature of the battle was won, the demons suggested very subtle arguments to convince him that he should accept that Servant's teachings without careful proving, since the latter was God's special mouthpiece. J. met and refuted these arguments with the reason that this would make him bow down on his knees and drink with the 9,700, and not stand erect and lap the water out of his hand with the 300 (Judg. 7: 2-7).