

were yet hoping for the fulfillment of the promises God had made unto the fathers, is the best of evidence that those promises had not yet been fulfilled.

Stephen, in his defence before the high priest, Acts 7: 2, 5, said: "Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken: the God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and said unto him, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall shew thee. Then came he out from the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran: and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."

Here we have the testimony of the Inspired Stephen, who tells us in unmistakable language, that Abraham did not inherit the land promised to him in the gospel sermons God preached unto him, not even enough of that land to set his foot upon. Shall we impeach his testimony by claiming that he did inherit that land? No true, upright man would dare to contradict the language of inspiration.

I have now given you two inspired testimonies upon this question, and as the scriptures declare that "out of the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word shall be established." I will add the third testimony upon this point.

"Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." Rom. 15: 8.

To confirm a promise, is to make that promise sure. And if Jesus, the Christ, was a minister of the circumcision for the truth, or to demonstrate the truthfulness of God, so as to confirm to the circumcision, (or to the Israelitish nation,) the promises he had made unto the fathers of that nation, does it not show that those promises had not yet been realized? Would it be necessary to undertake to confirm promises, or to try and make them more sure, if those promises had already been fulfilled or realized? Paul says, Jesus, the Messiah, appeared upon the scene, to confirm the promises God had made unto the fathers; therefore we can but conclude that those promises had not yet been fulfilled.

We stated that in every case where the true gospel is preached it would contain such allusions to the promises God made unto the fathers, as would be in harmony with the fulfillment of the same. And that if these features were lacking, it would evidently be another gospel than that preached by the apostles.

We will now consider the language of the prophets, to show that their utterances contain the necessary words to constitute what they have said, in the gospel, because it relates to the complete carrying out or fulfillment of the promises God made unto the fathers.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)