

The Berean Expositor

Acts xvii. 10, 11

“Study to show thyself approved unto God,
a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,
rightly dividing the Word of truth”

II Tim. ii. 15

VOLUME XVII.

1927

The Berean Publishing Trust,
52A, Wilson Street, London EC2A 2ER.

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

Since the first number of *The Berean Expositor*, as far as human limitations have allowed, the claims of a rightly divided Word of truth have been honoured in its pages. We trust that our readers perceive that the study of dispensational truth is only of value as it reveals the fullness of *Christ*, which fullness is the glory of the Prison Epistles.

Now that the long period of pioneering has in measure passed, we intend, as grace is given, to sound this note more emphatically in future issues.

We commend to every reader the words of Col. iii. 11:--

“CHRIST IS ALL, AND IN ALL”,

and make it our prayer that the witness of this magazine may, in some degree, merit this glorious message as its motto.

Yours in the bond of the peace,

CHARLES H. WELCH
FREDK. P. BRININGER

December, 1927.

INDEX

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS	5
BRITISH-ISRAEL TRUTH	7
COVENANT AND PASSOVER	10
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
The tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 10-22)	12
The table of shewbread (Exod. xxv. 23-30)	17
The golden lampstand (Exod. xxv. 31-40)	22
The tabernacle; its fabric and foundations (Exod. xxvi.)	12
HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
The rainbow of faith (xi.)	30
The perfecting of faith—	
Encouragement and reproof (xi.)	33, 36
Abel's offering (xi. 4)	37
Enoch, or the faith that transfers (xi. 5, 6)	40
Noah: the faith that inherits (xi. 7)	45, 48
Abraham: the obedience that inherits (xi. 8)	49
MAN CHRIST JESUS, THE--	
Jesus Christ come in the flesh	54
The last Adam, the one Mediator	57
The Son	59
The Apostle of apostles	62
MINISTRY OF CONSOLATION, THE--	
Earthen vessels	67, 69
Ourselves	69, 70
Sympathy	67, 71
The bowed soul, and the fixed heart (Psa. lvii. 6, 7)	72
PROPHETS, STUDIES IN THE--	
The theme of all the prophets	74
Israel's restoration, and the new covenant	74
To obey is better than sacrifice	77
Times and seasons	79, 82
The nation and the nations	87
PYRAMID, THE GREAT; ITS DIVINE MESSAGE	7

REDEMPTION (NEW SERIES)--	
The meaning of redemption	90
The way out and the way in	97
Atonement; a covering by cancellation	99
The five offerings of Leviticus	104
The whole burnt offering	106
ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
The just by faith shall live (i. 17)	109
The suppression of the truth (i. 18)	112
Inexcusable (i. 19, 20)	115
Glory and thankfulness of God for His goodness (i. 21)	119
Given up (i. 21-32)	124
An important parenthesis, and its point (i. 18 - iii. 20)	129
SIGN OF THE TIMES	133
WORDS IN SEASON--	
Onions and garlick, or this manna! (Numb. xi. 5, 6)	136
YOUNG PEOPLE, SPECIALLY FOR--	
Talks on the way	138
Christ the way	142

Answers to Correspondents. p. 115

E. (Urmston) asks for information concerning words which are used in Scripture that have a bearing upon the idea of eternal or everlasting. We give just a preliminary hint here, hoping to deal with the subject more fully later.

Hebrew.

Ad.—Eternity, ever, everlasting, old perpetually. Refers to past (Job xx. 4), to the Divine present (Isa. lvii. 15).

Netsach.—always constantly, evermore, perpetual. Usually rendered by the LXX, *eis to telos*, unto completion.

Tamid.—Always, continual, daily, ever, perpetual. Usually rendered by the LXX, *diapantos*, continually.

These are the most important. Added to these we have:--

Orek (Psa. xxiii. 6); *dor* (Psa. lxxvii. 8); *tsemithuth* (Lev. xxv. 23); *gedem* (Deut. xxxiii. 27); *yom* (Deut. vi. 24); *eth* (Psa. x. 5).

All these words are used to express some form of duration, beside the one which is most frequently used, viz., *olam*.

Greek.

Aion and *aiionios*.—Variously translated age, world, for ever, etc.

Aidios.—Perpetual (Rom. i. 20).

Pantote.—Evermore (John vi. 34).

Eis to dienekes.—For ever (Heb. x. 14).

These words practically cover the whole ground. You may look for explanation of their meanings, examples of their usage, and LXX translations in a series of articles in course of preparation.

To our new readers.
p. 177

It is a joy to those responsible for this magazine to know that many who subscribed to the first volume are still keenly interested in its witness. At the same time we gladly welcome every new reader, trusting that they may be an additional strength in this fellowship of the gospel, while the darkness deepens and perilous times draw near.

We realize, however, that there are many items known to older readers that must seem puzzling to new subscribers, and so, without going over the ground already covered, we hope to help the newcomer as well as more fully establish the veteran by commencing a series in January, 1928, entitled:--

The Mystery.
Its meaning, its message and its ministry.

We should value the co-operation of all readers in drawing the attention of any who would profit by such a series. Do you know of any gift costing 3s. that would represent as much value for the outlay? Let us send a copy to your friend. Canadian and Australian readers are reminded of the honorary agencies tabled on the notices page.

“British-Israel Truth”, and “The Great Pyramid, its Divine Message”.

What should be our attitude to these things?

pp. 33 - 36

British-Israel Truth.

In nine cases out of ten the attitude of Neh. vi. 3 is the one to adopt when tempted to turn aside from positive testimony, and only occasionally does the seriousness of error justify a departure from this rule. If we so desired, we could easily occupy a deal of space monthly in the unsavoury exposure of the erroneous teaching that is growing all around, but we have neither the commission to attempt the task, nor the qualification necessary to make it profitable. There is, however, a double line of teaching that appears to have fascinated many true children of God, and as we have been asked more than once what our attitude might be, we feel that a brief word may be of service to the generality of readers. The two lines of teaching about which we have been asked to express opinion are (1) Anglo-Israelism, and (2) The Witness of the Great Pyramid.

Anglo-Israelism, or British-Israel Truth, as it is called teaches that the “lost” ten tribes of Israel migrated across Europe, and by a series of divinely guided settlements or invasions found themselves established in Great Britain. There are as adjuncts to this idea wonderful stories which speak of Jeremiah coming to Ireland with a daughter of Zedekiah, bringing with him also the ark of the covenant and the stone used by Jacob at Bethel, which stone is now under the Coronation Throne in Westminster Abbey. Into all this we do not here attempt to enter, but we draw attention to one serious and awful result of accepting Anglo-Israelism.

Under this teaching the reigning house of Britain is said to be the dynasty of David, and a book is published by one whose letters are M.A., F.R.G.S., and A.V.I., to prove that our present King, His majesty George V, is a direct and lineal descendant of David through the marriage brought about by Jeremiah between the daughter of Zedekiah and a King who ruled in Ulster, Northern Ireland. Together with this is the teaching that the “Stone Kingdom” of Dan. ii. is the British Empire, and that it began to function round about 1558A.D. The whole fabric is so monstrously unscriptural, and so manifestly untrue, that the space devoted to its exposure would be sheer waste were it not for this serious and anti-Christian issue. *Anglo-Israelism, by declaring that the British reigning house “is in direct succession” to the throne of David, aims a blow at the royal rights of the Lord Jesus!*

Two genealogies of the Lord appear in Matthew i. and Luke iii., respectively, the one through David’s son Solomon, the other through David’s son Nathan. These two lines meet in the person of Christ, *and are exhausted in Him.* The Lord Jesus Christ is

shown to possess the exclusive right to David's throne. He died without natural successor. He was raised from the dead "to sit upon his (David's) throne" (Acts ii. 30), and consequently any other claimant to that throne must be an incipient Antichrist. The stone kingdom also of Dan. ii. is described as a kingdom which "the God of heaven shall set up", "which shall never be destroyed", and "which shall stand for ever". This is said to be the British Empire. Dan. vii. shows that this kingdom is that of the coming Christ:--

"And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. vii. 14).

If the royal house of Great Britain be the true dynasty of David, and if the stone kingdom which is to fill the whole earth and never pass away be the British Empire, FOR WHAT PURPOSE IS THE LORD COMING AGAIN? We leave the subject at this issue. All else is subsidiary.

The Great Pyramid, its Divine message.

Closely associated with British-Israelism is the teaching connected with the Great Pyramid of Gizeh, which stands on the border of upper and lower Egypt, and is said to fulfil the word of Isa. xix. 19, 20:--

"In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be a sign and a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt."

The Great Pyramid of Gizeh is a marvel of masonry, its stone work being compared to the accuracy of an optical instrument. This very feature is fatal to its ever being "an altar unto the Lord", for the law has never been rescinded that is given in Exod. xx. 25, 26:--

"If thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it, neither shalt thou go up by steps unto Mine altar."

Here we see that as an altar the Great Pyramid must be reckoned as polluted, and all are familiar with the huge blocks of stone that make the ascent like climbing a giant stairway.

Just in the same way the identification fails in connection with the word "pillar". In what way can the Great Pyramid be called a "pillar"? The Hebrew word *matstsebah* is sometimes translated "image", "standing image". Moreover, the two words "altar" and "pillar" come together in Exod. xxiv. 4, "And Moses built an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel". Isaiah himself uses the feminine form of the same Hebrew word in vi. 13, where the margin reads "stock or stem". A pillar that in any sense resembles an image of Baal or a stem of a tree is no true description of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh.

Into the ocean of astronomical mathematics and chronological arguments we cannot plunge, but quite a series of books have been written purporting to show that the Great Pyramid contains a most elaborate and detailed prophecy of the purpose of God in Christ. The chronology of “the time of the end” as given by the Great Pyramid covers A.D.1557 to A.D.1914. Its minuteness of detail is remarkable. The exact date of the entry of Great Britain into the War in August, 1914, together with the date of the Armistice is given by the Great Pyramid.

So many dates and events which have such deep and immediate personal application are given, that one of the effects is that *the prophetic chronology purporting to be that of the Great Pyramid* becomes more vivid and important than the Scripture itself. Imagine the effect upon the mind of a person who has accepted the teaching that the Great Pyramid is God’s own divinely ordained prophetic witness for these last days, being solemnly told that the Great Pyramid marks off with uncanny precision the following dates as events in the bringing in of the end, 3:53p.m. on 29th May, 1928; 11:14a.m. on 16th of September, 1936; 0:45a.m. on 20th August, 1953. The Bible can show nothing like it. If this is divine, then the Bible so far as prophetic exactness is concerned must take a second place. Without dating the second coming of the Lord, the Great Pyramid makes it very plain that it cannot *be later than 16th September, 1936*. If the Lord has not come by 16th September, 1936, what will the Pyramid believers do if Antichrist should appear? Will they not be forced to accept him?

We do know that the Egyptian Book of the Dead has much to say of Pyramid symbolism. Osiris is called “The Lord of the Pyramid”, and “The Lord of death and resurrection”. Ancient Egyptian religion is Messianic in character. *So was ancient Babylonianism*. As surely as God recorded the coming of the Seed of the woman, so did Babel travesty that truth and fill the earth with its prophecies and its symbols.

We have already referred to Anglo-Israelism. According to Pyramid chronology the times of the Gentiles ended in 1917, the stone kingdom, namely kingdom, Britain, holding the mandate over Jerusalem now being not a Gentile power, but, unknown to the Jews, really Israel. The Pyramid prophecies really bolster up Anglo-Israelism, and so from two points of view should be left alone by all those who believe that in the written Scriptures we have all the revelation of God’s purpose that we may legitimately expect until that day when we shall know even as we are known.

Covenant and Passover.

pp. 126, 127

In the pamphlet entitled *The dispensational place of the Lord's Supper*, the third edition of which we have just published (*see Notices*), readers will remember that we have drawn attention to the intimate association of the Lord's Supper with the new covenant, and teaching that the passover stands to the old covenant in somewhat the same relation as the Lord's Supper stands to the new. The relation of a covenant with the passover has been called in question, and as this is an important item we would add the following:--

The exodus and the covenant.

“The children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage and God heard their groaning, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob” (Exod. ii. 23, 24).

This one citation alone would be proof enough that the deliverance of Israel from Egypt was in direct line with a covenant, and a reference back to Genesis will confirm this:--

“Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance in the fourth generation they shall come hither again” (Gen. xv. 13-16).

There can be no shadow of doubt but that this refers to the exodus of Israel from Egypt. We have further evidence in Exod. vi.:--

“I appeared unto Abraham I have also established My covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I HAVE REMEMBERED MY COVENANT I will redeem you and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will bring you in unto the land concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it you for an heritage: I am the Lord” (Exod. vi. 3-8).

The deliverance of Israel by the passover is central in the remembrance of this covenant, and cannot be considered apart from it. Jer. xxxi. looks back to the passover and the old covenant, and looks forward to the true passover Lamb, and the new covenant:--

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers IN THE DAY that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which My covenant they brake” (Jer. xxxi. 31, 32).

When the Lord Jesus took the cup on that passover feast, and said, “This is My blood of the new covenant”, it was a direct fulfillment both of type of the passover covenant, and the prophecy of the new covenant of Jeremiah.

I Cor. x., xi., and the wilderness.

Another objection is based upon the fact that I Cor. x., which speaks of the cup, the Lord’s table, and the broken bread, relates to the wilderness and not to the passover. In Exod. xii. 12-14 we read:--

“I will pass over you and this day shall be unto you for a MEMORIAL.”

while in I Cor. xi. 24 we find the words:--

“This do in REMEMBRANCE of Me.”

It was quite impossible to “remember” as a memorial feast the passover in Egypt until it was an accomplished fact, and it would have been equally impossible for the twelve apostles to have “remembered” the Lord’s death at that first “Lord’s Supper”, for that death had not then taken place. But as the years succeeded their exodus from Egypt, so the memorial feast was spread, and as the occasion was seized, the new covenant saints of the early church showed forth the Lord’s death while they waited for “the hope of Israel” which covered the Acts (*see* Acts xxviii. 20), and therefore included the hope expressed in the words “till He come”.

We are grateful for the query, for it has enabled us to see the connection of passover and covenant more clearly than before. Criticism is welcomed, for we can do nothing against the truth.

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth.

#58. The Tabernacle.

The ark and the mercy seat (Exod. xxv. 10-22).

pp. 17 - 25

The first item of the tabernacle that is specified is the ark. This is severally called:--

- “The ark of the testimony” (Exod. xxv. 16);
- “The ark of the covenant” (Numb. x. 33);
- “The ark of the Lord” (Josh. iii. 13);
- “The ark of God” (I Sam. iii. 3);
- “The ark of the Lord God” (I Kings ii. 26);
- “The ark of Thy strength” (II Chron. vi. 41);
- “The holy ark” (II Chron. xxxv. 3).

These seven titles are doubtless distributed throughout the Scriptures with that discrimination which we always find whenever we subject the Word to a careful examination. For example, the title “The ark of the testimony” is reserved for the period covered by Moses and Joshua, whereas the title “The ark of the covenant” extends from Moses’ tabernacle to Solomon’s temple, from wilderness to kingdom. We must leave the tabulation of these titles, with the added one “The ark of the God of Israel” (I Sam. vi. 3) and others, to those who may be able to spare the hours that verification and accuracy demand.

The ark and its contents.

The ark was an oblong wooden chest 2-1/2 cubits long, 1-1/2 cubits wide, and 1-1/2 cubits high, covered within and without with gold, and having upon it round about a crown of gold. For the purpose of transport four rings of gold were fixed to the four corners, and two staves of shittim wood overlaid with gold were placed in the rings, and left there in constant readiness for the removal of the ark. The shittim wood of which the ark was made is most probably that of the acacia tree. It is mentioned, together with the cedar, the myrtle and the oil tree, fir tree, pine, and box, in Isa. xli. 19, and appears to be one of seven trees that indicate blessing:--

“The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of My sanctuary’ (Isa. lx. 13).

Jerome says that the wood of the shittim tree affords long planks smooth and free from knots, and that it does not grow in cultivated places, or in any other place of the Roman Empire, except in the desert of Arabia. It is intensely interesting to note that the LXX renders the word shittim wood *xulon asepton* = “incorruptible wood”. The woodwork of the tabernacle was covered; it was designed for constructional purposes, and not for beauty, and the humbler office was fulfilled throughout by the shittim or acacia tree. Where every detail is so specifically shown, and where the typical character of every item

seems so apparent, we can hardly dismiss as fanciful that suggestion that the two natures “flesh” and “spirit” (Rom. i. 3, 4) are set forth by the wood and gold used in the construction of the ark. Within the ark was placed, at different intervals of time:--

1. The tables of the covenant.
2. Aarons’ rod that budded.
3. The golden pot of manna.

The tables of stone are called “the testimony” and “the covenant”, and give their names to the ark. These were the only articles placed in the ark when it was first made (Exod. xxv. 16). The tables of stone originally given to Moses were broken by the angry law-giver at the sight of the people and the golden calf, and after having demonstrated that they had so soon broken the covenant into which they had entered, Moses prayed for the people:--

“Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin---; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written” (Exod. xxxii. 31, 32).

Passing over much that we shall have to consider later, we find the Lord restated the covenant, after bidding Moses to hew tables of stone like unto the first. After the proclamation of His mercy and graciousness, the Lord in restating the covenant lays particular stress upon idolatry (Exod. xxxiv. 10-28). Moses returned to Israel with the new tables of stone, and Exod. xxxv. 4 re-introduces the question of the tabernacle. What we have to learn from this rather complicated parenthesis is the old lesson of the ages. Before Israel actually received the tables of stone, they had broken them, and when Moses once more returned with the fresh tables of stone, he said in effect: “Make an ark. This covenant cannot be kept by you. All that you can hope for is to have a system of types and shadows, and await the advent of Him Who alone can magnify the law and make it honourable.”

The same story is found in Gen. iii. Man failed, and is shut up to the promised Seed. Israel failed, and is shut up unto the faith that should afterward be revealed. The important fact for us at the moment is that the *ark contains the unbroken law*. It is fundamental to both doctrinal and dispensational truth that it should be so. One cannot imagine, after a knowledge of the truth, the *broken* tables of stone being placed in the ark. The ark speaks of a law and a covenant fulfilled. Now the tabernacle and its furniture were shadows of the true or heavenly reality. Two references from the *Apocalypse* will be sufficient to prove that the ark was a pattern of a heavenly reality:--

“And the temple of God was opened *in heaven*, and there was seen in His temple the ark of the His covenant” (Rev. xi. 19).

“Behold, the inner shrine of the tabernacle of the testimony *in heaven* was opened” (Rev. xv. 5).

Following the former quotation came lightnings, voices, thunderings, earthquakes, and great hail, which in turn is followed by the sign of Israel and the dragon (Rev. xii.).

Following the latter quotation we find the seven angels with the vials of wrath spoken of as a sign “great and marvelous” (Rev. xv. 1).

This is the covenant of marvels, which God made upon the restatement of the covenant with Israel:--

“Behold, I make a covenant: before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation” (Exod. xxxiv. 10).

Thus it is that the plagues which fell upon

equaling about three pecks) instead of the ark; a lid made of lead, instead of the mercy seat made of gold. Wickedness within instead of righteousness, and two women with wings like those of an unclean bird to serve as cherubim, finally taking it back to its own resting place, Babylon. A remarkable statement in Jeremiah leads us to understand still further the typical character of the ark:--

“In those days (of Israel’s restoration) saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord; neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall it be made again” (Jer. iii. 16),

the reason being, according to verse 17, that the throne of the Lord will then be at Jerusalem, and therefore the type will no longer be necessary.

Priesthood and provision.

Beside the two tables of the covenant, there were placed in the ark Aaron’s rod that budded, and the golden pot of manna. The rebellion of Korah and Dathan, that foreshadows the great revolt against the Lord Himself, was followed by the command to lay up in the tabernacle, before the testimony, the rods of the leaders of Israel, among them Aaron’s. On the morrow it was discovered that Aaron’s rod had budded, bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds. This symbol of life, while it confirmed Aaron in his office, pointed on to Him Who by means of resurrection hath an unchangeable priesthood. The golden pot of manna was a constant memorial of the faithfulness of God in supplying all pilgrim needs until the land of promise was reached, and is a very real type of Christ. Is it no comfort to us in our wilderness journey to know that beside the unbroken law, there is the reminder of that Priest Who ever liveth to make intercession for us, and of that faithfulness that has said no good thing will He withhold while we walk the pilgrim pathway?

The golden ark with its crown, its unbroken covenant, its pledge of the ever living Priest, and its memorial of ever faithful care, was incomplete without the mercy seat that rested upon it. Righteousness without mercy would not bring salvation to sinners:--

“Though justice be thy plea, consider this, that in the course of justice, none of us should see salvation.”

In the ark and the mercy seat, “righteousness and peace have kissed each other”.

The mercy seat.

The mercy seat was made of pure gold, unlike the ark which was made of wood overlaid with gold. Made of one piece with it were the cherubim with their wings stretched forth on high, and with their faces toward the mercy seat:--

“And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I will give thee. And THERE I WILL MEET WITH THEE, and I will commune with thee” (Exod. xxv. 17-22).

The N.T. word mercy seat in Heb. ix. 5 is translated in Rom. iii. 25, “propitiation”, and is the word used by the LXX to translate the Hebrew word mercy seat. The word mercy seat (*kapporeth*) is from the word *kaphar*, to make atonement. Now whatever our conclusions may be as to the exact meaning of the word translated “atonement”, one thing is established, and that is that it is an essential part of the great sacrificial work of Christ.

We endeavour in this series to avoid arguments that are complicated, or that necessitate too close an investigation into the originals, and as we hope to give the doctrine of the *atonement* a careful study in the series headed “Redemption”, we leave the controversial side alone in this article. If we were asked what ideas came to the mind at the mention of the mercy seat, we should probably say, something to do with atonement, acceptance, or forgiveness. All these are true, but they are not the primary truth. This atonement is necessitated by our sins, but what is the object before us which necessitates the removal of the barrier, sin? We may receive a precious lesson from the very first statement made concerning the use of the mercy seat. To Moses the Lord said, “There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee”. Fellowship and communion, these are the real objects; all else but makes a way.

I will meet.—The words *to meet* mean “to meet by appointment”, and the Hebrew word enters into one of the names of the tabernacle, viz., “the tabernacle of the congregation” (Exod. xxvii. 21). It is translated “to betrothe” in Exod. xxi. 8, 9, and “agreed” in Amos iii. 3. It will be remembered that the tabernacle number was given as number 5, and 5 times in the book of Exodus does the Lord speak of the mercy seat, or the altar, where the blood was shed that sprinkled the mercy seat, as the place where He would meet Moses, and the children of Israel (Exod. xxv. 22; xxix. 42, 43; xxx. 6, 36).

The meeting place, a beautiful symbol of the result of the atonement, contains within itself the ideas of entrance, access and acceptance. A most interesting and helpful suggestion of the fullness of this meeting with God is contained in the LXX rendering of the word “meet” in these passages, where the translation reads, “And I will *make Myself known* to thee from thence”. The knowledge of Himself and His ways are made known *there*. Knowledge in the scriptural sense is far removed from mere scholarship, valuable

asset though that is. Asaph learned this lesson, and recorded it in Psa. lxxiii., for when he went into the sanctuary of God he understood that which before he could not discover.

I will commune.—The Hebrew word *dabar*, which is translated “commune” 20 times, is translated “speak” 814 times, so that while we lose an apparently spiritual idea by giving up the deeper word “commune”, we in reality gain by using the commoner word “speak”, for instead of thinking of set occasions, and for specially holy purposes Moses heard the voice of the Lord, it was here at the mercy seat that *every* word was heard, every instruction given, every problem settled. Here it was that the Lord “spake (*dabar*) with Moses face to face, as a man speaketh (*dabar*) unto his friend” (Exod. xxxiii. 11). Here it was that the Lord “talked” with Moses (Exod. xxxiii. 9):--

“When Moses was gone into the tabernacle of *meeting* to *speak* with Him, then he heard the voice of One *speaking* unto him from off the mercy seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim, and he *spake* unto him” (Num. vii. 89).

Who will have the temerity to decide that the meaning of the last clause should be written, “and *He* spake unto him”, or “and he spake unto *Him*”? Is it not the very essence of this meeting place that both should speak; Moses speaking with God, and God speaking with Moses? Is not this “communion”? To speak with God, and to hear His word, before the blood sprinkled mercy seat? Truly we have yet to learn of burnt offerings and sin offerings, offerings to make atonement and peace, yet are they not all with the very object to remove all barriers and unfitness so that, unhindered, we may enter into the presence of God, to “meet” with Him and to have this “communion”?

So important is this somewhat forgotten aspect of the result of atonement, that the word *dabar* was used as a name for the holiest of all, and appears in the word “oracle” (II Sam. xvi. 23), and in the slightly modified form (*debir*) in sixteen other passages in the O.T. The mercy seat, though associated with the work of atonement, is essentially a place of fellowship, and the hearing of the word of God.

The references to the mercy seat (*kapporeth*) in the tabernacle are 26 in number, and those who have Dr. E. W. Bullinger’s *Number in Scripture* will find examples tending to show the connection of the number 13 and its multiples with the subject of atonement. These 26 references to the mercy seat are divided into three groups:--

1. Those in Exodus which speak of the actual making and placing of the mercy seat.
2. Those in Exodus and Numbers that refers to it as a place of meeting and communion.
3. Those in Lev. xvi. which deal with the great day of atonement.

The references in Lev. xvi. are seven in number. What was the actual origin of the day of atonement? The sin and death of Aaron’s two sons Nadab and Abihu. These men offered strange fire before the Lord, and were destroyed:--

“Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is that the Lord spake, saying, I WILL BE SANCTIFIED in them that come nigh Me, and before all the people I will be glorified” (Lev. x. 1-3).

Lev. xvi. begins with the words:--

“And the Lord spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before the Lord, and died Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times within the vail before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not.”

The words “at all times” mean “just at any time”. Aaron and his sons were becoming too familiar, and made certain religious conventions necessary. It is the habit of the superior person to sneer at conventions, but with some natures they have their place, and while set forms, solemn ritual, and ceremonial may degenerate into superstition and empty formalism, they have their place. The solemn ritual of the day of atonement, and the restriction of access to the high priest once every year, would have the tendency to hallow the name of God and prevent that unholy familiarity that was evidently developing. And so there is the washing of the flesh, the linen clothes, the sin offering and the atonement, the incense and the seven times sprinkled blood. The words of the wise man are very appropriate here:--

“Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few” (Eccles. v. 1, 2).

The cherubim [which are so closely associated with the mercy seat as to be made “of the matter of the mercy seat” (Exod. xxv. 19 margin)], have been dealt with in the series *Redemption*, both in connection with the cherubim themselves, and in connection with the original office of Satan, and though we do not pretend to have exhausted the teaching of Scripture, we can say nothing more to profit at the end of an article. May the four simple features brought before us in connection with the ark and mercy seat be a blessing to us:--

1. An unbroken covenant.
2. An undying Priest.
3. An unfailing supply.
4. A place of fellowship and communion.

“And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin” (I John i. 3-7).

**#59. The table of shewbread (Exod. xxv. 23-30).
“All one in Christ.”
pp. 49 - 55**

Having considered something of the rich teaching set forth by the ark of the covenant, and the mercy seat within the second veil, we now, following the order of the narrative before us, pass into the holy place and turn our attention to the furniture there.

Divine service.

Before passing on to detailed descriptions, however, we must have some idea of the typical meaning of the “holy place” in which this furniture stood:--

“There was a tabernacle made; the *first*, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary (margin, the holy, Gr. *hagia*). And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all” (Gr. *hagia hagion*) (Heb. ix. 2, 3).

Here we have very clearly the subdivision set forth with the distinctive names of the two parts, the division being made by the second veil:--

“Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went *the high priest alone once* every year, not without blood” (Heb. ix. 6, 7).

Without seeking to force a distinction beyond its limits, it appears from the usage of the words “service” and “serve” that these do not so much describe the great atoning work of Christ, as that they refer to the worship and service of the redeemed. Both the Saviour and the saved were set forth in type in the tabernacle. The Saviour being typified by the solitary act of the high priest “alone once”, the saved being typified by the priests who went “always” accomplishing the “service”. *Latreia* (service) occurs in Heb. ix. 1 and 6, *latreuo* (to serve or worship), in Heb. viii. 5; ix. 9, 14; x. 2; xii. 28; xiii. 10. It will be seen that the “service” is entirely connected with the Levitical priesthood, or its N.T. counterpart. They that did the service were not perfected as pertaining to the conscience by the daily ritual then imposed (Heb. ix. 9). It necessitated a greater high priest than Aaron, and a better sacrifice than was offered on the day of atonement to purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Heb. ix. 14). The shadows of the law with its typical sacrifices could not make the comers thereunto perfect, for their consciences were not really purged from sin (Heb. x. 1, 2). The gifts and sacrifices that constituted the service of the typical tabernacle “stood only in meats and drinks, and divers baptisms, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 10).

Latreuo and *latreia*, are not found in the Septuagint of Genesis, they appear for the first time in Exodus. The Passover feast is called “this service” (Exod. xii. 25, 26). Pharaoh understood “service” to involve the offering of sacrifice, for in Exod. iii. 12; iv. 23; vii. 16; viii. 1 & 20 the demand had been made that Israel should be liberated to “serve” God, Pharaoh’s words are, “Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land” (Exod. viii. 25). Moses, moreover, when speaking once again to Pharaoh, uses another expression of similar import. To Pharaoh’s “Go, serve the Lord”, Moses replies, “We must hold a feast unto the Lord” (Exod. x. 8, 9).

While *latreuo* seems to have special reference to “the service of a worshipper”, and is omitted from Genesis, *douleuo* is of frequent occurrence in that book. It is used of the service rendered of kings (Gen. xiv. 4); of Israel’s bondage (xv. 14); of the elder serving

the younger (xxv. 23); of men serving man (xxvii. 29, 40); and of Jacob's service to Laban (xxix. 15, 18, 20, 25, 30; xxx. 26, 29; xxxi. 6, 41). The apostle uses the two words in Rom. i.:--

“Paul, a bond slave (*doulos*) of Jesus Christ” (Rom. i. 1).
“Whom I serve (*latreuo*) with my spirit in the gospel” (Rom. i. 9).
“Who worshipped and served (*latreuo*) the creature” (Rom. i. 25).

If the distinct aspects of service that these two words indicate are kept in mind, the meaning of the apostle will become more clear. Coming now to Exod. xxv. we bring with us the thought that here in the first tabernacle, where priests ministered daily, we are dealing with *service*, and it is in connection with service that we must view the table of shewbread.

Divine sustenance.

The table not only held the twelve loaves of shewbread, but also was laid with “dishes, spoons, covers, and bowls of pure gold”. It was a table, not an altar, a table spread in the presence of the Lord with food wherewith those who rendered service might be fed. The margin of Exod. xxv. 29 renders “to cover withal” by “to pour out withal”, and the LXX reads:--

“And thou shalt make its dishes and its censers, and its bowls and its cups, *with which thou shalt offer drink offerings*; of pure gold shalt thou make them” (Exod. xxv. 29).

This makes us think of the supreme act of service contemplated by the apostle Paul in Phil. ii. 17, and carried through in II Tim. iv. 6, where we have the only occurrence of *spendomai* in the N.T. He was willing to be poured out as a drink offering upon the sacrifice and service of faith. While therefore the bread is the important item on the table, the drink offering must be remembered.

This feminine form of the word occurs seven times in Scripture. The passages are Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16; v. 12; vi. 15; xxiv. 7 and Numb. v. 26. *Zikkaron*, the masculine form, occurs twenty-four times. We give a selection only. We use the word “reminder” as variant, as familiarity with the A.V. sometimes blunts our senses: “This day shall be unto you for a *reminder*” (Exod. xii. 14). “It shall be for a sign and a *reminder*” (Exod. xiii. 9). These two passages refer to the feast of the Passover and the unleavened bread: “Stones for a reminder unto the children of Israel their names before the Lord as a *reminder*” (Exod. xxviii. 12, 29). Here the names of Israel engraven upon the stones of the ephod and breastplate are a reminder both to Israel and to the Lord. We cannot give all occurrences, they can easily be found. *Zikkaron* is used seven times in blessing, and once in judgment against Amalek in Exodus. *Zeker*, another masculine form, occurs several times. The first occurrence is Exod. iii. 15, “This is My name for the age, and this is My *reminder* unto all generations”.

The Passover was a reminder of redemption, the unleavened bread of the bondage endured and the exodus effected, together with the need to “purge out the old leaven of wickedness”. The name “Jehovah Elohim of your fathers” was a sufficient reminder for God to “remember His covenant” (Lev. xxvi. 42, 45). The frankincense upon the twelve loaves was a *reminder*. A reminder of what? Before we can answer that question we must answer another: “What did the twelve loaves typify?”

The bread of the presence.

It is good to see in books dealing with the tabernacle and its typical teaching that every opportunity is seized to bring forward the fullness of Christ, but there may be even in this, zeal without knowledge. We refer to the interpretation that speaks of the twelve loaves as typical of Christ as “the bread of life”. In John vi. the Lord says, “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead I am the living bread” (John vi. 49, 51). It will be seen that lying upon the ground outside the tabernacle morning by morning was to be found the type of Christ as the bread of life. That therefore can scarcely be the meaning of these twelve loaves also. This “bread of presence” before the Lord “always” (Exod. xxv. 30), the “continual bread” (Numb. iv. 7), like the names engraved upon the stones of the ephod and the stones of the breastplate, represented the twelve tribes of Israel.

The table of shewbread is mentioned in II Chron. iv. 19 under Solomon, and again in II Chron. xiii. 11 it is mentioned in king Abijah’s appeal to the ten tribes when he pleaded for the true unity of Israel, also in Hezekiah’s reign (II Chron. xxix. 18). When the captivity returned under Nehemiah, even though called by their enemies “these feeble Jews” (Neh. iv. 2), and even though the restored temple was in the eyes of those who knew the Lord’s house in its first glory “as nothing” (Hag. ii. 3), there is not the remotest suggestion either by Abijah, Hezekiah, or Nehemiah that any number of loaves than twelve should be used, or that the frankincense should be omitted. The twelve loaves set forth Israel as viewed in Christ, not as viewed in themselves. “He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath He seen perverseness in Israel” (Numb. xxiii. 21). This was no “legal fiction”, but based upon the offering of their Messiah:--

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God” (Rom. iii. 25).

Whatever the personal state of Israel may have been whether united as one nation or divided into two, whether humbly seeking God or wickedly departing from His commandment, one thing remained “always” and “continual”. That was the “everlasting covenant” or the “covenant of the ages”. This it will be remembered is connected with the command concerning the shewbread in Lev. xxiv. 5-9. Just as the memorial in the offering for jealousy was to bring “iniquity to remembrance” (Numb. v. 15), so the memorial upon the shewbread was to bring the sweet savour of Christ to remembrance.

The age-abiding covenant.

The first mention of *berith olam*, “an age-abiding covenant”, is in Gen. ix. 16, where God sets His bow in the cloud as a “reminder” (“that I may remember”) of His covenant with all flesh. Now this covenant was made *notwithstanding* the fact that “the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth” (Gen. viii. 21), and in *close association* with the “sweet savour of rest” that spoke of the offering of Christ. So with Israel. Abram’s name was changed to Abraham, and the Lord said:--

“I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for *an age-abiding covenant*, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, And I will give unto thee, and to they seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for *an age-abiding possession*; and I will be their God” (Gen. xvii. 7, 8).

Though Israel broke this age-abiding covenant (Isa. xxiv. 5), yet in the person of their Messiah that covenant is established (Isa. lv. 3 and lxi. 8). This age-abiding covenant lies behind the new covenant which was sealed by the blood of Christ (Jer. xxxii. 40 and xxxi 31-37). Perhaps there is no more marvelous setting for this covenant, nor a passage that emphasizes its utter independence of human merit than Ezek. xvi. 60. Charges are made against Israel in Ezek. xvi. that reveal a condition that dwarfs the sin of Sodom “as a very little thing (xvi. 47), and by comparison can justify the words “they (Sodom and Samaria) are more righteous than thou” (xvi. 52). Then come the words of verse 60:--

“Nevertheless I will remember My covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish with thee an age-abiding covenant.”

All this is set forth in the table of shewbread. Twelve loaves show Israel complete and undivided before the Lord. These twelve loaves are all unleavened, Israel’s righteousness is fully provided for in *Jehovah Tsidneku*. “Pure” frankincense above, and a “pure” table beneath, indicate their perfect acceptance in the Beloved. Here is a “reminder” of that “age-abiding covenant” that glorifies the end of Ezek. xvi., and will glorify the end of this stiff-necked and gain-saying people.

The shewbread and service.

Returning to our

(Eph. v. 27) the “offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour” (Eph. v. 2). For us no type or symbol is necessary. “The bread of presence” is expressed for the church once and for ever in the blessed words, “Accepted in the Beloved” (Eph. i. 6), and “Made meet” (Col. i. 12).

#60. The golden lampstand (Exod. xxv. 31-40).
Unity in witness.
pp. 84 - 89

If it be true, as we sought to show in our last article, that the holy place is connected with worship and service, that will be true not only as it relates to the table of shewbread, but as it relates to the golden lampstand. The word candlestick is misleading. No candles were used, but oil for the lamps is specifically mentioned:--

“And thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof” (Exod. xxv. 37).

“Oil for the light” (Exod. xxv. 6).

“Pure olive oil beaten for the light” (Exod. xxvii. 20).

“Not by might, nor by power.”

There is a chapter in Zechariah that deals so pointedly with the symbolism of this golden lampstand, that to attempt an interpretation of Exod. xxv. before first considering this passage would be to insult the Author of Scripture, therefore, let us turn to Zech. iv. Here we have one of a series of visions, all concerned with one object, the fulfilling of the *age-abiding covenant*, whose memorial or reminder we have seen was found in the twelve loaves of presence, the shewbread. These visions are eight in number, and occupy chapters i.-vi., a new section of the prophecy commencing with chapter vii. Readers of *The Companion Bible* will notice a light change in the structure of these visions, as we feel that there is no warrant for uniting the sixth and seventh as one member.

The eight visions of Zech. i.-vi.

- A | i. 7-17. The horses. “My house shall be built.” “The Lord shall yet choose Jerusalem.”
- B | i. 18-21. The horns and the smiths. Gentile oppressors and deliverers.
- C | ii. 1-13. Measure Jerusalem; breadth and length.
 - “Jerusalem shall be inhabited.” His eye.
- D | iii. 1-7. The high priest. “The Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem.”
- E | iii. 8-10. My servant the Branch. “Every man under his vine and fig.”
 - Seven eyes.
- D | iv. 1-14. The lampstand. The laying of the foundation of the house. Eyes.
- C | v. 1-4. The flying roll; length and breadth.
 - “Zion that dwelleth with Babylon.”
- B | v. 5-11. The ephah. Gentile dominion. “Build it an house.”
- A | vi. 1-8. The chariots. The four spirits of the heavens. Judgment.
- E | vi. 9-15. The man whose name is the Branch. Temple and throne.

It will be seen that the common theme of these visions is the restoration of Israel, showing the satanic opposition (manifested through Gentile powers and finally at Babylon), and the triumph of the Lord (manifested through Joshua and Zerubbabel, and finally through Christ, the Branch). We are not, however, dealing with Zechariah, but seek light from Zech. iv. upon the symbolism of the candlestick.

The Branch.

In Exod. xxv. 31-36 when reading the description of the lampstand we come upon the word “branches” repeatedly, in fact twelve times. The word branch here is *qaneh*. In Zech. iv. 12, where we read of “the two olive branches”, the word is *shibboleth*. In Zech. iii. 8 and vi. 12 the Branch is *Tsemach*. Now although these seem so diverse at first, they are nevertheless intimately related.

In Gen. xli. 5 we have the first occurrence of *shibboleth*, where it is translated “ears of corn”. In Gen. xli. 5 also we have the first occurrence of *qaneh*, where it is translated “stalk”. This establishes a connection between the “branches” of the golden candlestick of Exod. xxv. and the “two olive branches” of Zech. iv. In Psa. lxxv. 9, 10 *tsemach* is used of corn, “the springing”. So also in Hos. viii. 7 where it is translated as the “bud” that yields no meal, and is connected with sowing, reaping and standing corn (*see* margin). It is demonstrated, therefore, that the three words translated branch are all used of corn, and therefore cannot be widely dissimilar, but, to adopt the words of Scripture, may be as closely allied as “the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear”. We have here a sequence. First the type of the lampstand in the tabernacle, next the vision of the lampstand in Zech. iv., and finally the prophetic fulfillment of both type and vision in “The Man Whose name is the BRANCH”.

It is readily granted that we should naturally have considered the lampstand in the tabernacle as a type of Christ, the light of the world, but we should have made the same mistake that we observed is made by making the shewbread a type of Christ as the bread of life. As the light of the *world* Christ is set forth by other figures, but as the light in the *holy place* another office is implied. Prophecy is said to be a “light that shineth in a dark place” (II Pet. i. 19), until the day dawn, and the Lord comes. Zech. iv. is most certainly prophetic of the day of Israel’s restoration and the coming of the Lord. The explanation of the vision of the lamp fed from the two olive trees is given by the angel:--

“This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord of hosts” (Zech. iv. 6).

There can therefore be no two thoughts as to the symbolism of the olives. They speak of the witness and the work of the spirit in contrast with the arm of the flesh. The seven lamps are evidently “those seven” of verse 10, which are explained to be “the eyes of the Lord” that watch over His purpose. The last word of explanation in Zech. iv. 14 forces us to turn to the book of the Revelation.

“These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.”

The two witnesses.

The state of things under Joshua and Zerubbabel at the return from the captivity is to be repeated on a vaster scale in the time of the end. In Rev. xi. we have the measuring of the temple by an angel (verse 1), parallel to the measuring of Jerusalem by an angel in Zech. ii. The two witnesses withstand the beast until their testimony is finished. This testimony lasts for 42 months. Upon their martyrdom resurrection and ascension follows the sounding of the seventh angel:--

“The kingdom of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ”
(Rev. xi. 15).

To this the two witnesses, the vision of Zech. iv., and the golden lampstand of the tabernacle bore their testimony. “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy” (Rev. xix. 10). It will be seen that “oil for the light” and for the “anointing” (Exod. xxxv. 28) come to much the same thing. Every anointed priest and every anointed king bore testimony to the day when Zech. vi. 12, 13 should be fulfilled:--

“Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH and He shall be a *priest* upon His *throne*.”

All point forward to the King-Priest, after the order of Melchisedec. They too are to combine kingship with priesthood. They are to be “a kingdom of priests”, “a royal priesthood” (Rev. i. 16; I Pet. ii. 5, 9).

The seven lampstands.

While the unity of Israel, so far as God’s view-point is concerned, remains unchanged throughout their whole chequered history, their manifest witness as set forth by the seven branched lampstand did not remain intact. When we come to the book of the Revelation, we have seen separate lampstands, each standing for a church in Asia that was bearing a testimony of some kind. Christ is seen in their midst as the great King-Priest, upholding the seven angels who are responsible for the testimony of these seven churches. Failure could involve the removal of a lampstand out of its place (Rev. ii. 5). Israel were the Lord’s witnesses (Isa. xliii. 10), the tabernacle was called “the tabernacle of witness” (Numb. xvii. 7), they who reign for the thousand years include those who were beheaded “for the witness of Jesus” (Rev. xx. 4). The ark is called both the ark of the covenant, and the ark of testimony or witness* (Exod. xl. 3), and when the seven angels appeared, then John said, “Behold the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony (or witness) in heaven was opened”.

The great thought of the lighted lampstand in the holy place is that of witness bearing. Gen. i. 3 differentiates “light” itself from a “light bearer” (Gen. i. 14, 15), light being *or* in i. 3 and *maor* in i. 14, 15. This distinction is carried over into the LXX. Exod. xxv. 6 “oil for the light” uses *maor*, the light bearer. “Light” (*or*) occurs but once in Exodus, namely, in x. 23, whereas “light bearer” (*maor*) occurs seven times, and each time is used of the lampstand.

In Isa. xi. 2 we have the sevenfold anointing of Christ:--

“And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.”

He is pre-eminently “the faithful witness”, and all other witness must draw its inspiration from Him, the great Anointed, and receive its light from Him, the true light.

In the description of the lampstand we sometimes use the expression, “The seven branched candlestick”. This is incorrect.

“Six (not seven) branches shall come out of the sides of it; three branches out of the one side, and three out of the other side” (Exod. xxv. 32).

Though there were seven lamps, there were but six branches, the central stem supporting both its own lamp and the remaining branches. It is a fit symbol of the essentials for witness, whether in Israel or the church. The central supporting and uniting shaft is the Lord Himself; the oil for the light, the Holy Spirit; and apart from union with the Lord, and the Spirit of God, we shall have neither light nor testimony. This sevenfold arrangement is well seen in the special testimony for the church of the mystery as given in Eph. iv. 4-6, where the one Lord is in the midst with the two sets of three on either side. “Oil for the light” is a word that should make us examine our own testimony to see that the source of our illumination is that of which God can approve.

The two features of the holy place specified by Exod. xxv. are the table of shewbread and the golden lampstand. They stood over against each other. The light from the lamps would shine upon the pure gold of the table, the twelve unleavened loaves and the pure frankincense. Testimony in the holy place is not taken up with flesh and failure, but with the purpose of grace as seen in Christ.

[* - Both in the Hebrews and the Greek, *witness* and *testimony* are the same.]

One more article of furniture that was found in the holy place, viz., the altar of incense, is not mentioned here, but its description is deferred until after chapters xxviii. and xxix. These chapters are devoted to the consecration of the priests, and then, with the opening verse of chapter xxx., comes the first reference to the altar of incense. The reader will realize the necessity to abide by this divine order, and we therefore follow the leading of the Lord and likewise refrain from comment upon this third item until the proper time, which will be after chapters xxvi.-xxix. have been considered.

a two-fold covering. The tent was made of goats' hair, and is described in verses 7-14 (once called “covering”), the twofold covering of the tent being made of rams' skins dyed red, and of badgers' skins. We must therefore distinguish between the tabernacle proper, made of the glorious linen curtains, and the goats' hair tent and covering of skins, as we

find them distinguished for instance in Exod. xxxv. 11: “the tabernacle, his tent, and his covering”; also by comparing the record of Exod. xxvi. 6 and 11 together.

“And thou shalt make fifty taches of gold, and couple the curtains together with the taches: and it shall be *one tabernacle*.”

“And thou shalt make fifty taches of brass, and put the taches into the loops, and couple *the tent* together, that it may be one.”

In order that we may appreciate these three features we will set out the meaning of each word.

TABERNACLE.—

It can truly be said that righteousness was the warp and woof of the dwelling place of God. It is a lesson that bears repetition, lest at any time we should be inclined to entertain doctrines that necessitate the lowering of this high standard.

Blue is intimately connected with the high priest by the “ephod all of blue” (Exod. xxviii. 31), and with the separation of Israel unto God (Numb. xv. 38). *Purple* is the colour of kings (Judges viii. 26 and Esther viii. 15). *Scarlet* speaks of redemption (Josh. ii. 18). The great Babylonian travesty seizes upon these symbols for its own ends.

“The woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour” (Rev. xvii. 4).

“Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet” (Rev. xviii. 16).

The cherubim speak of the great goal of the ages, the restoration of man, and his dominion in and through Christ. This subject is too vast for a note of this character: the interested reader is referred to a fuller exposition of the matter in Volume XV, page 181.

The tabernacle and its symbolism sets forth the only possible way whereby the lost paradise of Gen. iii. with its cherubim and flaming sword, its curse and its death, can ever be exchanged for the paradise of God with its river of life, where there shall be no more curse or death. That way was shown to our first parents before they left the garden, their covering of skin being perpetuated in the covering of rams’ skins dyed red, a symbol too patent to need much proof. The fabric of the tabernacle therefore speaks of redemption and restoration, a king and a priest, and we have not found any New Testament passage that would lead us to alter the testimony.

The tent of goats’ hair could never be, in the mind of an Israelite, dissociated from the great offerings that occupied so large a place in the daily life of the people. Goats were used as well as lambs for the passover (Exod. Xii.5); they were also used for the burnt offering, the peace offering, the sin offering, and for the great day of atonement, Lev. i. 10, iii. 12, iv. 23, and xvi. 5, & c. It was the purpose of God that the glorious prophecy of the tabernacle should ever be seen beneath the shadow of atonement, the tent of the goats’ hair.

Protecting this tent was a two-fold covering, one of ram's skins dyed red, the other of badgers' skins. *Rams skins* alone would have spoken plainly of sacrifice and consecration (Exod. xxix. 27; Lev. v 15 and xix. 21), but the red dye would emphasize sin and its cleansing (Isa. i. 18).

Badger's skins are not so easy to interpret. The usual suggestion is that the beauty of the tabernacle was hidden from view, and the only rough badgers' skins were seen, just as it is written that Israel saw no beauty in the Lord when He walked the earth in the days of His flesh. Apart from the tabernacle, badgers' skins are only mentioned once in the Scriptures, viz., Ezek. Xvi. 10, where the other references to silver, linen, and embroidered work are considered by many to be an allusion to the tabernacle itself.

While modern translators consider the Hebrew word *tachash* to mean a badger or some such animal, this has not been always the case, for the voice of the ancient versions of the practically unanimous in stating that the word stands for a colour. Josephus has the following remark in His Antiquities:

“There were also curtains made of skins above these which afforded covering.....and great was the surprise of those who viewed these curtains at a distance, for they seemed not at all to differ from *the colour of the sky*” (Book iii., Chap. vi.).

The LXX and Jerome translate the word by *hyacinthus*, the “jacinth” of Rev. xxi. 20, which is azure or sky-blue. Other ancient versions, together with the Vulgate, translate the word by *ianthinus*, violet coloured. That hyacinth was an article of commerce, and used in the dyeing of dress material, can be seen by consulting the LXX of Ezek. xxvii. 24 and Isa. iii. 23. It will be remembered that Moses was instructed to make the tabernacle according to the pattern shown him in the mount (Exod. xxv. 9, 40; xxvi. 30; xxvii. 8; Acts vii. 44; and Heb. viii. 5). It is also very plain that the tabernacle in the wilderness was an example and shadow of “the heavenly things themselves”, that “true tabernacle”, which the Lord pitched, and not man (Heb. viii. 2, 5; ix. 23, 24). May we not have in this fact an explanation of the added covering, and the reason of its azure colour? The true external cover of the tabernacle was the one of rams' skins dyed red, the superimposed covering of blue representing heaven itself in which the true tabernacle really existed. This was but an anticipation in type of Solomon's prayer: “Hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling place.” There are many other features of interest in the details revealed in this wonderful structure that we must leave to the reader to investigate, while we notice briefly the framework, foundations, and the vail, before concluding this survey.

Golden boards and silver sockets.

The walls and framework of the tabernacle were made of *shittim* wood (or as the LXX renders it “incorruptible wood”), overlaid with gold. Forty-eight boards were used altogether, twenty on either side, six across the back, and two to form the corners in some way not revealed. These boards were held in place by a series of bars and rings, and the

boards terminated at the bases in two tenons or “hands” that fitted into silver sockets placed in the earth to receive them. When we read in John i. 14, “The Word was made flesh, and tabernacled among us”, we can readily see in the gold and the wood a type of the true deity and the sinless humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ, while the sockets of silver are explained in the book of Exodus himself. In chapter xxx. 11-16 we find that every man of Israel gave for the ransom of his soul a half shekel of silver. This atonement money was appointed for the service of the tabernacle. Exod. xxxviii. 25-28 tells us how this silver was used. One hundred sockets of silver weighing one talent each were made of this atonement money, and constituted the great foundation upon which the whole typical fabric rested. No words of ours are necessary to illuminate the lesson here. Fine linen and silver, righteousness and atonement, the warp, woof and foundation of the great plan of the ages!

The new and living way.

The record of Exod. xxvi. is not completed until a description is given of the vail and the door hanging. Both vail and hanging are made of the same material, the vail alone having the cherubim. Beautiful as this vail must have been, its presence spoke of man’s failure. Before the typical prophecy of the tabernacle could be fulfilled, that vail must be rent, that golden mercy-seat spattered with blood, such is the nature of sin and of holiness:--

“Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us THROUGH THE VAIL, that is to say, His flesh” (Heb. x. 19, 20).

“And behold, the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom” (Matt. xxvii. 51).

In the writings of the apostle Paul there is scarcely a reference to the earthly life of the Lord, but we find constant reference to His death:--

“In the body of His flesh through death” (Col. i. 22).

“The children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy and deliver” (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

Such is the continual testimony of Scripture. There is no gospel in the spotless life of the Son of God taken by itself, that only aggravates our sinfulness the more, and, like the vail, bars our access to God.

Through the *rent* vail, through that spotless life *laid down* in death is found a way into the holiest. Just as the tabernacle rested upon the silver sockets of atonement, and was covered by the rams’ skins dyed red, so no part of the mighty purpose of the ages shall be accomplished apart from the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is a fundamental of all truth, yea a very chief corner stone.

We earnestly ask our younger readers, for whom this series is particularly written, to test all the modern “gospels” and schemes by this great exhibition of the mind and will of God. No one can believe its message and trifle with the vitals of the faith, which are

everywhere proclaimed through type and symbol, by fabric, colour and position, to be the sacrificial death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Without shedding of blood is no remission For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true: but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. ix. 1-28).

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

#46. Heb. xi. and the rainbow of faith.
pp. 11 - 14

Chapter x. as we have seen ends on the exhortation to live by faith. The words “we are not of them who draw back unto perdition” imply the alternative, “we are of them who go on unto perfection”. In our last study we drew attention to the meaning of perdition when set over against perfection. To live by faith is evidently very closely allied with perfection, and in chapter xii. comes the exhortation to run with patience, “looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith”.

For those who have a desire to “go on unto perfection”, here in Christ is the great example. Even as we say the words however we are conscious of a “great gulf” between the Lord and ourselves. It is just here that Heb. xi. so wonderfully fits in and comes to our aid. Here, living by faith is sub-divided for us, and we see one phase in one example, and another phase in another, and are gently led on to contemplate the perfecter Himself in Whom all faith was resident in its fullness.

Light from the works of God.

It will be profitable for us to turn aside for a moment from the written Word that we may obtain help from an analogy in the works of God. The light of the sun untinted by the atmosphere through which it comes is pure white. If falling rain or water-mist intercept the rays of sunlight, we have the phenomenon called the rainbow. We have all seen with pleasure in our childhood the colours of the rainbow caused by a decanter of water standing on a white tablecloth, or by the prism-shaped pendant ornaments that our grandparents had upon the mantelshelf. These are but demonstrations of the fact that pure white light is made up of three primary colours, red, yellow, & blue, and these mingling form the secondaries, orange, green, & violet. For reasons the explanation of which lies outside the scope of this paper, the actual spectrum or rainbow is found to contain bands of seven colours, always in the following order, red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo & violet.

All colour in nature is dependent upon the fact that sunlight contains in itself the whole range of colour that exists. The red rose is called red because the petals have the power of absorbing the blue and the yellow rays of light, and throwing back to our eye the red. A leaf is green because it lays hold upon the red rays and throws back the blue and the yellow. A white chalk cliff throws back the blue rays, while a black felt hat retains all the rays. Hence, a white dress is cooler than a black one as the light and heat rays are in measure treated alike. Now it is not our intention to attempt to give a paper upon the spectrum as an illustration of the place of Heb. xi.

If we see the pure white light of the sun, as representing perfect light, composed of the perfect number of colours, viz., seven, this will represent Christ, as set forth in

Heb. xii. 2. Heb. xi. will then represent the prism of glass which has the power of splitting up the perfect light of the sun, and will split up the perfect faith of Christ, and focus a ray of each colour, as it were, upon one or more examples, enabling us to see the better the seven-fold splendour of the perfection of faith in Christ, after having seen the seven aspects of it separately in the lives of others. To help us in our study, let us examine the following diagram.

- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - -

The sun is placed to one side and indicated as a type of Heb. xii. 2. Heb. xi. intercepts the beam of light and the result is seen at the side. Before we go further we must make certain that there are these sets of “sevens”, and so taking nothing for granted we begin to count, 1. Abel, 2. Enoch, 3. Noah, 4. Abraham, 5. Isaac, 6. Jacob, and 7. Sarah. Here the record comes to an end for a time, while verses 12-16 speak of the pilgrim character of faith. It will be observed that a woman ends the series. We commence counting again in verse 17, 1. Abraham, 2. Isaac, 3. Jacob, 4. Joseph, 5. Moses, 6. Israel, and 7. Rahab. Here we have another set of seven, again ending with a woman. In verse 32 the apostle says that time would fail to tell of all that could be brought forward, but nevertheless the apparently haphazard list that is assembled in this verse still presents the spectrum, 1. Gideon, 2. Barak, 3. Samson, 4. Jephthae, 5. David, 6. Samuel, and 7. The prophets.

We believe that the seven-fold division of Heb. xi. is an established fact, and so we can now proceed to a further examination. How are these lists related to each other. It seems to be a Scriptural principle that truth is confirmed by two or more witnesses. Believing this to be the case, we approached the double list of names that are mentioned in detail, and found that they were arranged in pairs. For example, Abel and Enoch are both connected with death:--

“He being dead yet speaketh” (verse 4).

“Enoch was translated that he should not see death” (verse 5).

The next pair, Noah and Abraham, are related to an inheritance:--

Noah “became heir of the righteousness which is by faith” (verse 7).

Abraham “was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance” (verse 8).

Isaac and Jacob are mentioned as dwelling in tents, heirs with Abraham of the same promise, and looking for a city which hath foundations, so emphasizing their pilgrim character. Sarah and Abraham are by this arrangement brought together in the centre. Here resurrection is the theme.

Sarah “received strength to conceive seed of him as good as dead” (verses 11, 12).

Abraham “offered up his only begotten son accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead, from whence also he received him in figure” (verses 17-19).

Isaac and Jacob are both mentioned together in connection with blessing that overruled the flesh.

Isaac “blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come” (verse 20).

Jacob “blessed both the sons of Joseph” (verse 21).

Joseph and Moses are both closely associated with Egypt. Joseph spoke of the exodus of the children of Israel (verse 22). Moses turned his back upon the treasures of Egypt (verse 26). Israel and Rahab conclude the series. Both are associated with the fall of Jericho and with being spared during judgment. Israel were saved, while Egypt’s first-born perished and the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea (verse 29). Rahab “perished not with them that believed not” (verse 31). Thus we have the perfect white light of faith split up into its seven parts:--

A | Faith in connection with DEATH.—Abel and Enoch.

B | Faith in connection with INHERITANCE.—Noah and Abraham.

C | Faith in connection with PILGRIMAGE.—Isaac and Jacob.

D | Faith in connection with RESURRECTION.—Sarah and Abraham.

C | Faith in connection with BLESSING.—Isaac and Jacob.

B | Faith in connection with EGYPT.—Joseph and Moses.

A | Faith in connection with DELIVERANCE.—Israel and Rahab.

The three chief features, viz., beginning, middle, and end, emphasize death, resurrection, and deliverance.

A principle of interpretation.

The way in which we are to interpret this series is suggested in Heb. xii. 24. Concerning Abel’s faith Heb. xi. 4 says, “He being dead yet speaketh”, and in Heb. xii. 24 we read of the blood of sprinkling that “speaketh better things than Abel”. Here is the principle of interpretation. Heb. xi. are types, “the better things” are found in Christ. We can say that Christ’s well-pleasing walk speaketh better things than that of Enoch, and so of all the rest. It is helpful to see the rays of light separated and set forth in this example, but their chief good is that they enable us the better to appreciate the fullness that there is in Christ.

“Each sees one colour of the rainbow light,
Each looks upon one tint and calls it heaven,
Thou art the fullness of our partial sight,

We are not perfect till we find the seven.”

#47. The perfecting of faith (xi.).
Encouragement and reproof.
pp. 44 - 47

The sevenfold analysis of perfected faith that occupies the bulk of Heb. xi. is introduced by a statement that reveals the underlying and essential character of this faith in all and every one of its manifestations; “Now faith is the SUBSTANCE of things hoped for, the EVIDENCE of things not seen.” This passage may be taken apart from its context as a general definition of faith, but its real force can only be appreciated as it is seen at the head of this sevenfold exposition of perfected faith.

Moreover, viewing the statement in its context, it cannot be separated from the closing words of chapter x. There the believer is seen “losing” in this life, but sustained by the consciousness of that “possession of a better and more lasting nature” (x. 34), which was held in faith and prospect. The words immediately preceding the definition of faith in Heb. xi. 1 speak of a future day when those who have “lost their soul” for Christ’s sake shall “gain” or “acquire it”. Now it is evident that if these believers were to really take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, they must have had very vividly before them “the better and more lasting possessions” that awaited them in glory.

Substance and evidence.

As we examine the testimony of this chapter to the faith of Abel, Abraham, Moses and others, we shall see how much and how readily they gave up life, home, and wealth for the Lord’s sake, and of them all it could be said that they were sustained by that faith which is the substance of things hoped for. Moses “endured as seeing Him Who is invisible”. What therefore are we to understand by the words “substance” and “evidence”.

In preparation for this article we covered a fairly wide circle in the examination of this word substance, and its usage, but nothing revealed the intention of the apostle so well as the way in which it is used in the LXX, or Greek version of the O.T. Hupostasis, the word translated “substance”, is found in a number of passages in the O.T., a few of them being given hereafter as illuminating Heb. xi. 1: “And now, Lord, what wait I for, my hope is in Thee” (Psa. xxxix. 7). Where the Hebrew has the simple word “hope”, the LXX has “My hupostasis (or ground of hope) is in Thee”. “I sink in deep mire where there is no standing.” In the next reference it is difficult to avoid a lengthy explanation if a literal rendering, together with the LXX parallels, be demanded. It so happens that in the A.V. the two adjoining verses contain the word “substance” as a rendering of other words. We think, however, that sufficient for our purpose will be provided by ignoring

the surrounding difficulties, and lifting out the word translated by hupostasis. Spurrell's translation avoids some of the pitfalls.

“My own person was not concealed from Thee, when I was formed in a secret manner; curiously wrought in the lower bowels of the earth. Thine eyes beheld me in embryo; and my members, each one of them was recorded in the book” (Psa. cxxxix. 15, 16).

“My bones which Thou hast made in secret, were not hidden from Thee, nor my SUBSTANCE, in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes saw my unwrought (substance)” (LXX translation).

There is much in the passage for meditation. Faith is to the things hoped for as the unborn embryo is to the fully formed and living child. There is much that is secret, dark and mysterious, but the whole presses forward to fullness of life. Such is the underlying thought of Heb. xi. 1. The things hoped for were at the moment “not seen”, they were as yet “unborn”, yet very real to faith. As we watch the expectant mother lovingly and quietly preparing the little garments for the life that is not yet manifest, we have God's own illustration of that faith which is the substance of things hoped for. Let us now examine the second statement. “Faith is the evidence of things not seen.”

Elenchos occurs but twice in the N.T., Heb. xi. 1 and II Tim. iii. 16. The A.V. translates it once “evidence” and once “reproof”. When we turn to the verb elengcho we have a wider field for investigation. The following are the renderings in the A.V., convict, convince, rebuke, reprove, tell one's fault. In no one place is it ever translated “prove” or “demonstrate”, or by any such word that is parallel to “evidence”. We find the word in Heb. xii. 5, where it is translated “to be rebuked”. Now structurally this passage balances Heb. xi. 1 thus:--

- A | Heb. xi. 1. Faith. Substance and elengchos.
- B | xi. 2-40. The cloud of witnesses.
- B | xii. 1, 2. The cloud of witnesses.
- A | xii. 3-5. Faith. The elengchos.

Now if the last passage is rightly rendered “rebuke”, how can the only other occurrence of the word in Hebrews, bound as it is by all the ties of structure and consistent argument, how can Heb. xi. 1, we say, be rightly translated “evidence”? The reader may by this time be ready to consult the LXX again, and the first passage we note will be Hab. ii. 1, “I will stand upon my watch what I shall answer upon my reproof”, which is in the immediate context of the quotation, “the just shall live by faith”. Instead of “proof” we find “reproof”. Let us search this matter further. Now elengchos occurs some 21 times, and elengcho come 53 times. It is manifestly impossible with our limited space to provide a concordance of the occurrences here. We will give a few, but would here assure the reader that everyone of these 74 occurrences has been investigated, and that all point in one direction, namely, that elengchos does not mean “evidence”, but “rebuke”. Let us see a few examples:--

“And Abraham REPROVED Abimelech because of the well of water” (Gen. xxi. 25).
“Thou shalt in any wise REBUKE thy neighbour” (Lev. xix. 17).
“The Lord had REBUKED him” (II Chron. xxvi. 20).
“Behold, happy is the man whom God CORRECTETH” (Job v. 17).
“My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord, neither be weary of His CORRECTION, for whom the Lord loveth He CORRECTETH” (Prov. iii. 11, 12).

The apostle has quoted this passage of Prov. iii. 11, 12 in Heb. xii. 5, 6, and there, instead of giving the word “correction” twice as does the LXX, he uses the word “chasteneth”. For confirmation of this synonym we may turn to Rev. iii. 19, “As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten”. Those desirous of searching out this matter more fully will doubtless find opportunity. Sufficiency has been here noted to show that the primary idea of Heb. xi. 1 is “faith is a substance of things hoped for, a reproof of things not seen”. This, however, does not convey sense to English ears, so we must consider the matter further. As the verse stands in the A.V. we have a repetition. Faith is a substance and an evidence. When we look at the actual thing in progress and in fact we find that faith has a twofold association: (1) It looks forward to future glory; (2) It endures present suffering.

The Hebrew believers would readily believe that faith was the substance of things hoped for. They would rejoice in Enoch’s translation; but would they so readily rejoice in Abel’s death? They would rejoice in Noah’s preservation and inheritance, but would they so readily rejoice Abraham’s surrender? Were they ready for the fact to be applied to themselves that these examples of faith “All died NOT HAVING RECEIVED the promise”? Were they ready to follow Moses not only for the future reward, but in the reproach and suffering of the present? What is this “reproof” then? It is the Lord’s discipline meted out in love to every son, to every one of the “many sons” who by this very selfsame “Author”, “Captain”, and “Perfecter” of faith are being led as He was Himself through suffering to glory (Heb. ii. 10). It is the Gethsemane experience of Heb. v. 7-9, for there in the garden the Lord sweat as it were great drops of blood, and in Heb. xii. 4 is the application to “every son”: “Ye have not yet resisted unto blood.” Here then is the twofold character of perfected faith. A hand that reaches out on either side to join together suffering and glory. No one can fail to see the tremendous value of such a word to those who were passing through the experiences of the Hebrews at the time of writing the epistle. Here then, in this present time, faith is hope in embryo, with its accompanying sorrows; it is both substance and reproof, both crown and cross.

(To be continued).

#47. (contd.). The perfecting of faith (xi.).
Encouragement and reproof.
pp. 61 - 63

In attempting the translation of Heb. xi. 1, and retaining the rendering “reproof”, care must be exercised in ascertaining the meaning of the genitive case expressed by “of”. It may be the genitive of character, like “the bond of perfectness”; or of origin, “the gift of God”; or of possession, “the sword of the spirit”, i.e., “the spirit’s sword”; or of apposition, “the firstfruits of the spirit”, i.e., “the firstfruits (of our inheritance), that is to say, the spirit”; or of relation, “the reproach of Christ”, i.e., reproach in connection with Christ. Of all these the last appears nearest to the meaning of Heb. xi. 1, “The reproof in connection with faith” being very parallel with “The reproach in connection with Christ”, and in this way we should translate the passage. Faith assumes the invisible. Every believer should be able to say, though with purer intent than she who first uttered the words,

“Thy letters have transported me beyond
This ignorant present, and I feel now
The future in the instant.”

This faith characterized “the elders” who received a good report. Report is martureo, and this constitutes them the great cloud of witnesses (martur of Heb. xii. 1). These elders come before us again at the close of the chapter, “These all, having obtained good report through faith received not the promise” (Heb. xi. 39), but although they received it not, “These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them” (Heb. xi. 13). They had both the substance and the discipline, and these alone will enable the believer to go on unto perfection.

Dispensational truth and faith.

According to the A.V., verse 3 turns aside to speak of the creation of “the worlds”. It is reserved for the speculative mind of man to conceive of “worlds”. Scripture speaks of the “world”. Creation however is not in view here. An age was drawing to its end. A dispensation that was secret was about to be introduced. The Hebrew believer could see nothing tangible, things were being shaken, and the apostle draws attention to the fact that:--

“By faith we understand that the ages were readjusted by the word of God, so that

things which are seen were not made of things that do appear” (Heb. xi. 3).

The word translated “framed” in the A.V., and which we render “readjust”, is *katartizo*, and occurs in Heb. x. 5, where it is translated “prepared”, also in xiii. 21, where it is translated “perfect”. In both passages “adapt” seems the best translation. That there is a sense of repairing or readjusting in the word can be seen in Matt. iv. 21, the first occurrence, where it is translated “mending”, and in Gal. vi. 1 where it reads “restore”. The peculiar work of the gifts of the ascended Lord at the inauguration of the new dispensation seems to combine both words. The apostle, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers of Eph. iv. were to “readjust and adapt the saints”, owing to the cleavage that had come at Acts xxviii.

The Hebrew believers were being shown that a change was imminent. The setting aside of Israel involved a change in the economy of the ages. Not only had these Hebrew believers to have a faith that could grasp the realities while the types and shadows passed away, but they must be prepared to exercise a faith that would appear to have nothing substantial beneath it, except the bare Word of God, and blessed hope of resurrection. This faith saw no “land” or “city”, saw no evident prosperity as a reward for faithfulness and obedience, all its possessions were afar off, and those who were exhorted to “live by faith” were also told of those who “died in faith” without having received the promises, but who saw them “afar off”.

These words, weighty in themselves, introduce the seven-fold series of those who each in their turn set forth some one aspect of that faith which in its perfection was exhibited in Christ.

#48. The perfecting of faith
Abel’s offering (xi. 4).
pp. 75 - 79

The first of the series of examples of perfected faith that is given in Heb. xi. is the twofold witness of Abel and Enoch, who though unlike in some respects, are alike in this that they both have to do specifically with the death in connection with their faith. Let us give attention in the first instance to the witness of Abel.

The first feature of perfected faith emphasizes the atonement. Elsewhere we have drawn attention to the two words that mark the difference between redemption (*exodus* = a leading out), and atonement (*eisodus* = a leading in). Abel does not speak so much of redemption from sin, as access and acceptance. There are many things that belong to the life of faith, but all service, witness, suffering or warfare are secondary when compared with Abel’s initial witness, which gives first place to the recognition of the claims and provision of the holiness of God. Enoch’s faith corresponds with this in the fact that it emphasizes both the walk that is pleasing to God, and further that “he that cometh to God

must believe that He is”.

The faith of Abel.

“By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than that of Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh” (Heb. xi. 4).

Here the good report becomes both “witness” and “testifying”, and the correction should be made in our translation of the passages. We must turn to Genesis in order to see for ourselves the record that is referred to here:--

“And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering. But unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him” (Gen. iv. 3-7).

“In process of time.”—Literally, “At or after the end of some days”, “Some” being often expressed by the plural form alone. Nothing certain as to what days are intended. Some think the Sabbath, some the end of the year, or at some set time like harvest. The important fact to observe is that there was some recognition of appointed time, and hence the implication is that Abel’s faith was connected with “a word of God” as all faith has ever been.

“An offering” (minchah).—This word is often used as a contrast to zebah, a sacrifice with blood, but standing alone it is often used for sacrifice in general.

As the passage stands in the A.V. the word “also” in verse 4 (“And Abel, he also”) simply adds the action of Abel to that of Cain. If, however, the word “also” be read after the verb, as it actually stands in both the Hebrew and in the LXX, there is a possibility that a deeper lesson is intended. There is something suggestive in the Greek of Heb. xi. 4 too. There is no word for “excellent” there, that must be supplied. Translating the words just as they come we read, “By faith more sacrifice Abel than Cain offered”. Is it possible that in this simple and literal statement we have fuller light on Gen. iv. than the A.V. gives us? In what way did Abel offer “more sacrifice”?

Coming back to Gen. iv. and reading the “also” after the verb we have, “And Abel he brought also of the firstlings of his flock”, and this at least opens the way for the implied thought that Abel brought a bloodless gift as Cain did, but he “brought also” the lamb which alone made any other offering acceptable. This at least is exactly the teaching of the epistle to the Hebrews. All the typical offerings even though they were of bulls and goats, were in measure but the offering of Cain in this sense, that they sought to render the offerer accepted without the precious blood of Christ which alone cleanses and gives access. On the other hand a bloodless sacrifice was acceptable (see Heb. xiii. 15), but

only when sanctified by the blood of Christ.

The LXX rendering of Gen. iv. 7 is somewhat strange, and the relation of the existing Hebrew text with the Greek is too complicated to be dealt with in this paper. We give it, however, for what it may be worth, for it seems to suggest that the mistake of Cain was not so much in the offering that he bring, as in the offering that he refused:--

“If thou hast brought rightly, but not rightly divided* it, hast thou not sinned?”

[* - To avoid wrong associations, we may explain that this word is not the same as used in II Tim. ii. 15, but is diaireo.]

However difficult it may be for us at this date to reconcile such a rendering with the Hebrew of Gen. iv. 7, we must give the credit of common sense to the translators of the LXX that they felt that such a translation expressed the teaching of the passage. Cain sinned through a failure to discern the difference between the offering of fruit, which had in it no confession of human unworthiness, and the offering which involved the shedding of blood, which pointed to the one sacrifice for sin and for acceptance which was to be offered by the Lord Himself.

If we understand the word “sin” in verse 7 to mean Cain’s own transgression, the sense is not very clear. “If thou doest not well” indicates sin, and the statement resolves itself into, “If thou art a sinner—thou art a sinner”. But “sin” is spoken of in Exod. xxix. 14 as having flesh, and skin, and capable of being “burnt with fire”; it has “blood” according to Exod. xxx. 10; the worshipper could “lay his hand” upon his head according to Lev. iv. 19, and it could be “eaten” according to Lev. x. 17. This is sufficient to prove that “a sin offering” in the shape of a bullock, a goat, or a lamb could be the true meaning of the word “sin” in Gen. iv. 7. The statement “sin lieth at the door” is to-day a proverb, but a proverb that has arisen from this very translation, and therefore not a proof that such would be the interpretation which Cain would give to the term. The idea that sin was typified as in the act of springing upon Cain is hardly justified by the usage of the word “lieth”.

When we read in Psa. xxiii. 2, “He maketh me to lie down in green pastures”, we certainly have no thought of a beast of prey in the act of taking a spring. We are not to suppose that when Jacob saw the flocks of sheep “lying” by the well that they were preparing to spring at him, or at one another (Gen. xxix. 2). The word is indeed spoken of a leopard, but not in the act of springing on its prey: “the leopard shall lie down with the kid” (Isa. xi. 6). The word is spoken of the couching of sheep, and wild beasts, lions, leopards and asses, of the needy that shall “lie down” in safety (Isa. xiv. 30); of flocks that “rest” (Song of Sol. i. 7), but not one passage can bear the meaning often read into Gen. iv. 7. “The door” is neither the door belonging to Cain or Abel. So far as the Scriptures actually state it can just as well be the door of the primal tabernacle mentioned in Gen. iii. 24. Over 40 times in the Pentateuch is this word used of the “door of the tabernacle”. The sense therefore of Gen. iv. 7 seems clearly to be:--

“If thou does not well, a sin offering coucheth at the door of the tabernacle.”

Cain was without excuse. Inasmuch as faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, Abel must have “heard”. Cain also would have heard likewise, and even if he had misunderstood, the Lord graciously pointed out his error, and gave him full opportunity for repentance and acceptance. Cain, Korah, and Balaam make up a terrible trio that fitly prefigure the state of the things at the time of the end (Jude 11). The hymnology of Cain’s successors harps upon the string:--

“Something in my hand I bring”,

while the language of faith is expressed by:--

“Nothing in my hand I bring,
Simply to Thy cross I cling.”

We must not lose sight of the Epistle to the Hebrews, nor the fact that Abel is mentioned as one of a series that sets forth the fact that the just shall live by faith. Abel’s example is given here as an encouragement to the Hebrews who were losing heart, were in danger of drawing back, and to whom he writes at the close of Heb. xi.:--

“For consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin” (Heb. xii. 3, 4).

The rock upon which faith rests is the blood of Christ, and that is the rock upon which unbelief is broken to pieces. Our next study deals with Enoch, whose life and witness is the complement of Abel’s witness; this, however, we must reserve for another paper. A principle of interpretation is supplied by Heb. xii. 24. Whatever is good in Abel is better in Christ. Whatever will be found good in Enoch, or Noah, or Abraham, or the rest will likewise be found better in Christ. He is the Perfecter of faith. In Him the whole spectrum meets, all others are so many broken facets reflecting something only of His ineffable perfection:--

“By faith Abel offered unto God more sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God bearing witness of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh” (Heb. xi. 4).

“The blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than Abel” (Heb. xii. 24).

#49. Enoch,
or the faith that transfers (xi. 5, 6).
pp. 106 - 111

While it is misleading as a rule to speak in generalities, it seems clear from Scripture that, so far as the human side of the purpose of the ages is concerned, all doctrine may be reduced under two heads, (1) Adam, (2) Christ. As practice flows from doctrine, practical teaching will also have reference to these two heads of mankind. With this thought in mind it will not be difficult to see that each successive witness to faith in Heb. xi. in some way reverses the action and attitude of Adam.

For example, Adam's refuge in the covering of fig leaves is reversed in Abel's refuge in the atonement by blood. Adam's sin spoiled that fellowship which he enjoyed when it could be written, "I heard Thy voice and I was afraid". This is reversed in Enoch's walk with God. Adam's sin involved his house in death, and his heritage in a curse, whereas Noah's faith prepared an ark to the saving of his house, and he became the heir of the righteousness of faith. The reader may continue the parallel. Enoch was the seventh from Adam; he lived 365 years, and evidently completes a typical cycle of time. In Enoch we have full restoration typified. We have seen moreover that Enoch and Abel make one dual witness, showing that man's restoration can come only along the lines of the great sacrifice for sin.

ADAM walked with God.
ADAM covered himself with leaves.
ABEL covered by the atonement.
ENOCH walked with God.

Not only do the numbers "the seventh" from Adam, and the 365 years, point out Enoch as the end of a cycle, but his name means "Initiated", and his translation appears to have left its mark upon the old world, for it is highly probable that the Phoenix, is simply Pa-phenoch, "The house of Enoch".

Enoch, the perfected.

We are apt to forget in our studies that all Scripture, though universal in its application, and true for all time, nevertheless had a primary and restricted origin. Heb. xi. is so full, each character so great, that we forget that the writer was addressing "Hebrews", and urging them to "go unto perfection", and that every item of Heb. xi. has been divinely selected with that fact in mind. Abel showed the absolute necessity for the "one sacrifice" of Christ, and the danger of the way of Cain should that one offering be despised or rejected. Enoch's case sets forth the goal, summed up in the "walk", and the "translation". Toward the close of Heb. xi. the apostle speaks of:--

"Others (who) were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a BETTER RESURRECTION" (Heb. xi. 35).

It must be observed here that the obtaining of a better resurrection is directly connected with not accepting deliverance, and the question arises, How can Enoch's example have any bearing upon this, or upon the Hebrews, seeing that Enoch did not die?

It is time therefore to search and see. The sources of direct information are the following. The passage in Gen. v., the LXX translation, and the passage in Heb. xi. These we must give first.

“And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him” (Hebrew of Gen. v. 24).

“And Enoch pleased God: and he was not found, for God translated him” (LXX version of Gen. v. 24).

“By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God” (Heb. xi. 5).

It will be noticed that the record grows as we proceed. The Hebrew is the shortest statement. Paul does not quote the Hebrew original, but quotes the LXX version as more suitable to his purpose, and more familiar to his readers, who used that version daily.

Did Enoch die?

Let us examine the actual statements used before we come to any conclusion.

“He was not.”—Identical words are used in Jer. xxxi. 15, “Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not”. There is now ambiguity in Reuben’s meaning when he cried, “The child is not” (Gen. xxxvii. 30), or of Jacob’s lament “Joseph is not, and Simeon is not” (Gen. xlii. 36), indeed Jacob said “Me ye have bereaved”.

“For God took him.”—The Hebrew word *laqach* is used both of death and of translation:--

“Behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke” (Ezek. xxiv. 16).

“Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?” (II Kings ii. 3).

The case of Elijah is somewhat parallel with that of Enoch. Elijah is take up to heaven by a whirlwind, and Elisha “saw him no more” (verse 12). When the sons of the prophets urged Elisha to send the fifty men to look for Elijah, the result is recorded, “They sought three days, but they found him not” (verse 17). It is the LXX that adds the word “found” in Gen. v. 24. While this reference to Elijah strengthens the conception that Enoch did not die, Psa. xxxvii. 35, 36 shows that the avoidance of death is not necessarily implied by the word, “I have seen the wicked . . . yet he passed away, and lo, he was not; yea, I sought him, but he could not be found”.

By faith Enoch was translated.—It is usual to suppose that the use of the word “translation” is the end of all controversy, and that such a word could not apply to any who had died. Yet, notice the first occurrence of the word in the N.T.:--

“So Jacob went down into Egypt, and DIED, he, and our fathers, and were TRANSLATED into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre” (Acts vii. 15, 16).

It is evident that the word “translation” of itself does not necessitated escape from death. Heb. vii. 12 has already used the word to speak of the change of the priesthood and the law.

That he should not see death.—The fifth chapter of Genesis is punctuated by the words, “and he died”, eight times. Enoch’s translation breaks the sad sequence of mortality and provides the exception. Heb. xi. 5 does not say simply “Enoch was translated that he should not die”, but “that he should not see death”. We found that in the words of Heb. ii. 9 and Matt. xvi. 28 “tasting death” was not exactly synonymous with dying (Volume X, page 180). May there not be a reason for the choice of the expression “see death” here? In John viii. 51 we have a parallel expression, though a different word is used for “to see”.

Verse 52 in most MSS paraphrases the expression by the words “taste death”, although the Vatican MS here retains the word “see”. The idiom is explained for us in Acts ii. 26, 27:--

“My flesh shall rest in hope; because Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy One to SEE corruption.”

It will be observed that death is contemplated here, but not corruption. In verse 29 Peter expands the idea: “The patriarch David is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.” To this add Acts xiii. 36, 37:--

“David fell on sleep, and was laid with his fathers, and SAW corruption.”

Peter’s further remark, “David is not ascended into the heavens” (acts ii. 34), shows that the idea involved in “not seeing corruption” was not so much that of dying, or even of being buried, but of being left in the tomb, of not ascending into the heavens. We venture nothing in speculation upon the holy nature of the Son of God. We know not what would have taken place had He remained in the tomb for a long period. What we do know is that He was raised on the third day, “was not left in Hades, neither suffered to see corruption” which says as much as we can bear.

Leaving the resurrection of dead ones.

The ambiguity that surrounds the translation of Enoch serves a good purpose. While we cannot say with certainty that Enoch did die, or that he was taken away by God without dying, this very uncertainty enabled the apostle to use the example of Enoch to encourage the Hebrews “to go on unto perfection”. We may be better prepared to follow the teaching of Heb. vi. having come so far. Among the items that were to be “left” as they pressed on to perfection” is included, strangely, “the resurrection of dead ones”.

This does not mean a denial of the resurrection, but the giving up of the hope of a general resurrection of dead ones, for a special and prior hope of “a better resurrection” of those who, though dying, should not “see” death, who in other words should attain unto an “out resurrection”. The parallel with Philippians is apparent and instructive. This “better resurrection” which could be illustrated by Enoch’s translation is seen in Heb. xi. 40 compared with xii. 23:--

“God having foreseen some better thing for us, that they without us should not be perfected.”

“But ye are come to the spirits of just men perfected.”

Just as the blood of Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, speaks better things than that of Abel, so the resurrection that awaited those who pressed toward the mark, and who laid aside every weight and ran with patience, surpassed the translation of Enoch. The parallel with Philippians is found even in the word “better”. Hebrews speaks of a resurrection that was “better”, while Paul in Phil. i. 23 says, “To depart, and be with Christ; which is far better”.

Metathesis occurs three times in Hebrews, so also does metatithemi. It will be wise to allow these references a place before concluding. Heb. vii. 12 speaks of a “change” of both priesthood and law. Heb. vii. 12 speaks of a “change” of both priesthood and law. Heb. xi. 5 speaks of the translation of Enoch, and Heb. xii. 27 says:--

“Yet once more, signifieth the translation of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things that cannot be shaken may remain.”

Apart from inspiration altogether we would expect that so important a word would be used with judgment, and that the reference to Enoch’s translation was not made in forgetfulness of the presence of the word in chapter vii., nor of its appearance in chapter xii. It is evident that “translation” does not express the meaning in xii. 27 or vii. 12, but “transfer” does. The important point in the interpretation of this epistle is that a change had come, bringing with it the possibility of a transfer. Heb. xi. opens with the fact that the ages were framed or adjusted by God, and seeing that some things had become shaken, and were set aside upon the failure of Israel, a transfer was held out to faith, whereby the “word of the beginning” could be left for “better things”. Abel will stand for the “better sacrifice”, and Enoch for the “better resurrection”, and while these Hebrews may indeed die in faith, not having received the promise, they may nevertheless be able to entertain a better hope, founded upon better promises, embracing a better country, that is a heavenly.

The closing down, for the time being, of the earthly section of the purpose of the ages, opened for the believing Hebrews the prospect of a transfer as more fully detailed in Heb. xii. 22-29, and being in some degree a secret. This while being by no means the same either in sphere, calling, or character as the dispensation of the mystery, did hold out, to those who believed the added revelation, a prize connected with this heavenly calling, which could be attained only by “going on unto perfection”. The subject will not

be dropped until we reach the end of chapter xii. It may be helpful as a side light upon this theme to note what the wisest King of Israel is alleged to have said:--

“For honourable age is not that which standeth in length of time, nor is it measured by number of years. But wisdom is the gray hair unto men, and an unspotted life is old age. He pleased God, and was beloved of Him: so that living among sinners he was translated. Yea speedily was he caught away, lest that wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul He, being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time” (Wisdom of Solomon iv. 8-13).

The reader may have missed the familiar comment which sees in Enoch’s translation the rapture of the church, but we trust he will have gained by having attention drawn both to the difficulties of the case, and of its fitness with the theme of the Hebrews:--

“Let us go on unto perfection leaving a resurrection of dead ones for a better resurrection and the spirits of just men made perfect.”

That the prize of Phil. iii. may be considered parallel, the reference to “reward” in Heb. xi. 6 will show, and that “to walk and please God” is the high goal of faith, Heb. xi. and the bulk of the epistles testify.

#50. Noah.

The faith that inherits (xi. 7).
pp. 140 - 143

However personal we may feel the application of this or any other scripture, we deprive ourselves of much that is helpful in its interpretation when we lose sight of the original purpose of its writing, and the conditions under which it was written. Heb. xi. is so full of teaching that we are apt to isolate it from its context in the appreciation of its present application. The aspect of faith we are to consider under the names of Noah and Abraham, while containing much that has a direct personal application to ourselves, was nevertheless written in the first place to the Hebrews, and written to them in circumstances that make the examples cited of supreme importance in the process of the apostle’s instruction.

The faith that inherits.

Among the items of prominence in the message to the Hebrews is that which deals with the relation of faith to inheritance. Chapters iii. and iv. are devoted to the idea of the necessity of faith in connection with inheriting. “So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief” (iii. 19). It is time, however, that we saw for ourselves that

inheritance is the connecting theme of this second pair of examples:--

“By faith Noah became HEIR of the righteousness which is by faith” (xi. 7).

“By faith Abraham went out to the place he should afterward receive for an INHERITANCE” (xi. 8).

Without the scriptures before us we should doubtless assign the position of “heir of the righteousness by faith” to Abram, rather than to Noah, as so much is said of him in that connection in Romans and Galatians as well as in Gen. xv. The fact that Noah is also associated with righteousness by faith, shows that from earliest days this principle has been in operation, and but the more emphasizes that unpalatable fact, that “the law made nothing perfect”; that Sinai is a transition, not a goal (Heb. xii. 18-24), and that the gospel committed to Paul, and which reaches back as far as Adam, and as wide as the ends of the earth, is the gospel that carries with it age-lasting issues. It separated in Eden, and was believed by Abel.

The epistle to the Hebrews looks at righteousness by faith from a different angle from that of Romans. Here we see faith at work. “By faith Noah prepared an ark”. Such is the simple statement. We must, however, not omit the moving causes that assisted Noah’s faith to prepare, against all reason, an ark on dry land. Noah’s act is the result of (1) divine warning, and (2) a pious fear.

A divine warning.

We are not allowed to forget the important truth that “faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God”. Noah was doubtless wise in consequence of his 600 years of experience, his fellowship with God, and his purity of life, which would all be in favour of enabling him to foresee the goal toward which the ungodliness of his day was fast heading, but this wisdom would never have evolved “an ark”. Chrematizo = to warn, is used in the N.T. to indicate a warning given by means of a dream (Matt. ii. 12-22); by the Holy Spirit (Luke ii. 26); or by an angel (Acts x. 22). Its direct connection with the body of the epistle to the Hebrews will be seen by looking at Heb. viii. 5 and xii. 25. Moses was “warned” by God in connection with the tabernacle which he “prepared” (see Heb. ix. 2). Heb. xii. 25 applies this “warning”:

“See that ye refuse not Him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused Him who WARNED them on earth, how much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from Him that WARNS us from heaven.”

The verse following reveals that the two “warnings”, the one so much greater than the other, were the voices of Sinai and Calvary. Heb. ii. 1-4 is here repeated with solemn emphasis, AND with the same sequence. The warning of Heb. ii. 1-4 is followed by a reference to the “world to come” and its dominion; the warning of Heb. xii. 25 is followed by a reference to a kingdom that abides the terrific “shaking” of the last days. So, to come back to Noah, we have the warning, the flood (parallel with the shaking), and the world to come, the dominion restored after the flood, called in Heb. xi. 7 “the

inheritance of the righteousness which is by faith”. Though we may have passed these close parallels lightly by, the originally exercised readers of this epistle would have found the very pointed.

Both Noah and Abraham received a message from God that put a great test upon faith, for Noah was warned of things “not seen as yet”, and Abraham went out “not knowing” whither he went. What they did know was the faithfulness of Him who spake. So these Hebrews, taught from infancy to believe the law of Sinai to be eternal and unalterable, to believe their ritual to be not only of divine appointing, but to be as lasting as God’s throne, found an almost insuperable difficulty in the teaching of the apostle that such things were waxing old and vanishing away, that God Himself found fault with the first covenant and had set it aside for the aionian covenant sealed by the blood of Christ Himself.

A pious fear.

The second motive that is revealed is that Noah was “moved with fear”. The word “fear” has to stand for (1) phobos, a “fear that flees”, from phebomai = to flee; for (2) deilos, a “fear that shrinks”; and for (3) eulabes, a “fear that worships”. This last is the word used in connection with Noah in Heb. xi. 7. He certainly did not have the fear that flees, not the fear that “draws back unto perdition”, but the fear that reverently acquiesces in the will of God. We find the word, or its cognates, translated “devout” in Luke ii. 25; Acts ii. 5 and viii. 2. The true translation of Heb. v. 7 is “He was heard for His piety” (godly fear), and so it is translated in Heb. xii. 28, adding one more link to the record of Noah that we have already seen exists. Phobos and eulabes are definitely contrasted in Heb. xi., so that we need make no mistake. Moses was NOT moved with phobos (Heb. xi. 23-27); Noah WAS moved with eulabes (Heb. xi. 7), and both acted “by faith”.

Practical piety.

This is once more a needed lesson to the tried, persecuted and wearied saints. This godly fear, this piety, despised as it is by the so-called practical world, is a great force in the realm of godliness. “Noah moved by godly fear prepared” (kataskenazo); in other words, we have an example of the somewhat trite expression, “practical piety”. Kataskenazo, translated “prepared”, is used of creation in Heb. iii. 3, 4; of the tabernacle in ix. 2-6, and of the ark in xi. 7, & I Pet. iii. 20, and is derived from a utilitarian word skenos = an instrument or vessel; the very human body itself (I Thess. iv. 4). Noah, in faith, acting upon a divine revelation, and in godly fear, not by sentiment, nor precipitately, prepared an ark. The border line between faith and its works is too fine to be of service to us. If we believe God concerning wrath to come, shall we not flee to the refuge provided. If we say that we believe God, and refuse to act accordingly, do we not really deny Him? Noah provides an example of the “faith-obedience” that Paul speaks of in Romans:--

By faith Abel OFFERED

| By faith Enoch was TRANSLATED.

By faith Noah PREPARED | By faith Abraham OBEYED.

(To be continued).

#50. (concluded). Noah.
The faith that inherits (xi. 7).
pp. 152, 153

Saved condemned.

Noah's faith moved him to prepare an ark "to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world". While from one point of view Christian charity knows no bounds, from another point of view it is very drastic and provoking. This is not limited to the Christian faith. It belongs to all propositions, and to all issues. The man who is convinced that the Teetotaller is right, cannot avoid the alternative that the Drinker is wrong. The man who sees in Socialism the panacea for all evils, cannot avoid condemning Conservatism and Capitalism by his very conviction. The church by its very constitution condemns the world. There is no justification for bitterness, for wrangling, for strife, but even among professing Christians it is not possible to hold certain vital doctrines without condemning those who deny them. Christian charity is a lovely thing, but it does not enable us to hunt with the hounds and run with the hare.

The inheritance.

All that we have seen concerning Noah has been leading to this last clause, "He became the HEIR of the righteousness which is by faith". The warning, the preparing, the saving of his house had one thing in view—the inheritance. Noah was not moved to construct an ark either to demonstrate his own prowess, or even his faith, but as a means to an end.

Redemption is for a purpose; it is not an end in itself.

So marvelous is that redemption, that we have spoken of it as though it was the end of itself of the purpose of God. Eph. i. 1-14 shows as clearly as any passage the intermediate position of redemption, with the will of God stated first, the inheritance reached at the last, and the "mystery of His will" coming between. This has been touched upon more fully in articles dealing with redemption, and cannot be developed here.

The blessing of God upon Noah, when he stood upon the restored earth with his saved house, was practically a repetition of the dominion given to Adam, modified by the

changed circumstance (Gen. ix. 1-7).

“In the six hundred and FIRST year, in the FIRST month, the FIRST day of the month, the waters were dried from off the earth” (Gen. viii. 13).

Thus Noah and his inheritance anticipates that day when He that sits upon the throne shall say, “Behold, I make all things new”, faintly suggested also by the “no more curse” of Gen. viii. 21. We have further light upon the faith that inherits in the case of Abraham, who pairs with Noah; this we must reserve for another paper. Meanwhile, let us rejoice in the fact revealed in Rom. viii. 17, “If children, then heirs; heirs of God”.

#51. Abraham.
The obedience that inherits (xi. 8).
pp. 183 - 188

The association of faith and inheritance is set forth by the two great examples of Noah and Abraham. In our last example, the great contributing motives were a divine warning, a godly fear, and a preparation. Abraham’s example supplies other facets of the jewel of truth.

The obedience of faith.

“By faith Abraham obeyed.” This simple statement is supplemented by illuminating clauses which we must earnestly consider.

- A1 | He was called to GO OUT.
- B1 | Unto a place an inheritance.
- A2 | And he WENT OUT.
- B2 | Not knowing whither he went.

First let us observe, “He was called to go out and he went out”. Such is the record on the tablets of faith. Abraham’s actual record is not so simple. His obedience was partial, and in stages; this we can read in Genesis. The record in Heb. xi. 8 indicates how many seasons of our lives are blanks in the roll of faith. The story of Abraham’s obedience is written for our learning. Let us seek grace to be humble disciples in this school of grace. The first movement is indicated by Stephen:--

“The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Haran, and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I will shew thee” (Acts vii. 2, 3).

The second movement is revealed in Gen. xii. 1:--

“Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee.”

The third movement is given in Gen. xiii. 14, 15:--

“And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: For all the land that thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.”

The fourth and crowning movement is given in Gen. xxii. 11-18:--

“Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from Me in blessing I will bless thee because thou hast obeyed my voice.”

The old man.

It is very evident when we compare Acts vii. 2, 3 with Gen. xii. 1 that the Lord spoke to Abram twice. Gen. xii. adds to Acts vii. by saying not only “country” and “kindred”, but “thy father’s house”. In the first movement, instead of leaving his father’s house, we find Terah, his father, accompanying Abram.

“And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran his son’s son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, his sons Abram’s wife; and they went forth from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they came to Haran, and dwelt there” (Gen. xi. 31).

Here Abram is seen leaving his native land, and Stephen declares that “he came out of the land of the Chaldeans”, but we feel a little uneasy about the presence of Terah and Lot in the face of the command “from thy kindred”. Notice the failure also in the effort suggested in the words:--

“And they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and they came to Haran, and dwelt there.”

If the map is consulted it will be seen that Abram and Terah made a journey of some 600 miles, but when they stayed at Haran they were still on the wrong side of the Euphrates. The whole story is repeated at the time of the Exodus. Nothing but a “three days’ journey” could satisfy the command of God, and Pharaoh, it will be remembered, tried to play the part of Terah by suggesting first that Israel should worship God “in the land”, and then, this being rejected, that Israel should go “not very far off”, anything except that which set forth resurrection ground. In spite of the 600 miles’ journey, Abram was no nearer entering the inheritance. He must cross the river. He must become “Abram the Hebrew”, the one who crossed over. This, however, could not take place while Terah lived. Stephen’s words echo the doctrine of Rom. vi. when he said, “When

his father was dead, he removed him into this land". Terah stand for the old man, and the old man is a hinderer. Not until we can realize that our old man has been crucified, and that we are alive unto God, can we proceed.

The flesh.

The second movement sees Abram leaving Haran and his father's house, and actually entering the land of Canaan. Then to him is made the great sevenfold covenant. Famine, however, soon puts Abram to the test. A question which perhaps cannot be answered presents itself. Had Lot not been with Abram, would Abram have stood true? The analogy of Israel in the wilderness gives light. Just as Abram took Lot with him across the Euphrates, so we read in Exod. xii. 38, "A mixed multitude went up also with them". And just as trouble with Lot and the latter's inability to resist the well watered plain of Sodom was directly connected with flocks and herds, so with this mixed multitude is enumerated "flock, herds, even very much cattle". Numb. xi. 4, 5 reveals the evil effect of this company:--

"And the mixed multitude that was among them fell a lusting, and the children of Israel ALSO we remember the fish we did eat in EGYPT."

Famine tested Abram while Lot was with him, "And Abram went down to Egypt" (Gen. xii. 10). All this period in Egypt is so much waste of time. Abram returned with Lot (Gen. xiii. 1) unto the place of the altar which he had made there at the first, and there Abram called on the name of the Lord. Lot stands for the flesh which clogs and trips the true child of God. So far as Terah was concerned, Abram moved not from Haran until Terah was dead. With Lot, however, it was different. Abram began to realize the need of separation, and the moment the trouble arose about the flocks and the herds Abram seemed to seize the opportunity: "Separate thyself I pray thee from me" (Gen. xiii. 9). Lot "lifted up his eyes" and chose the plain of Sodom. The Lord spoke to Abram after that Lot was separated from him, "Lift up now thine eyes". Lot had lifted up his and seen Sodom. Abram, when separated from Lot, saw his inheritance. Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom—odious name! Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord. Hebron means fellowship. Abram's fellowship with God was impossible while Lot remained with him. How would the Hebrews, to whom this epistle was written, understand all this? Would not some of them begin to see the need for the separation from the "Lots" of their profession? Would they not perceive the true Abrahamic spirit in the call to go outside the camp?

Faith perfected.

It was after Abram's victory (where Lot met with such humiliating defeat) that he met the high priest whose name so fills the epistle to the Hebrews (Melchisedec), and it is immediately after the meeting with Melchisedec that we arrive at the inheritance and righteousness of faith. This close association of righteousness and inheritance is a feature lost sight of by too many, for us to pass it by. Gen. xv. 6, the great passage concerning

justification by faith, is introduced by Abram's question concerning his heir, and the Lord's answer concerning this is the groundwork of Abram's faith. Rom. i.-iii. lays the foundation of justification by faith, and is followed by chapter iv., which is nothing more nor less than an exposition of Gen. xv. 6. In the midst of this chapter we read:--

"The promise, that he should be the HEIR of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law are HEIRS, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect" (Rom. iv. 13, 14).

In like manner Gal. ii. and iii. conclude with the words:--

"If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise if a son, then an heir of God through Christ the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman" (Gal. iii. 29, iv. 1, 7, 30).

Titus iii. 7 also testifies to the same truth:--

"That being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of aionian life."

The perfecting of Abraham's faith, however, is seen in Gen. xxii. There he not only stood before God, having left his native land, his kindred, his father's house, but he had also foregone his rights in the matter of Lot, and now he goes to the full limits and voluntarily gives his best, his beloved son in whom all the promises of God were vested. The Hebrews were exhorted to:--

"Be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience INHERIT the promises. For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself" (Heb. vi. 12, 13).

Abraham "patiently endured" and "obtained the promise". So, continues the epistle to these tried Hebrews:--

"Ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise" (Heb. x. 36).

James ii. 22 declares that in the offering of Isaac Abraham's faith was "perfected", brought to its true end, the key-word of Hebrews. Translated into terms of doctrine the several steps in Abraham's faith are seen to be so many approximations of the cross of Christ:--

1. The step that follow the death of Terah stands for the crucifixion of the "old man" (Rom. vi. 6).
2. The separation from Lot, and the vision that followed, with the dwelling at Hebron, the place of fellowship, stands for the crucifixion of the flesh (Gal. v. 24).

3. The repudiation of all reward from the king of Sodom “lest he should say, I have made Abraham rich”, stands for the crucifixion of the world (Gal. vi. 14).

4. The offering up of Isaac, the beloved son, is the fellowship of His sufferings, the conformity to His death, which is on the one hand intimately connected with the perfecting, the prize, and the heavenly citizenship, and on the other is strongly contrasted with those who mind earthly things, and constitute themselves “enemies of the cross of Christ” (Phil. iii. 10-21; Heb. vi. 6).

So far we have traced the meaning of the statement, “By faith Abraham obeyed”. Looking to the opening paragraph of this article we see that there is another pair of statements to consider. The obedience of faith is found in A1, A2, “Go out”, “He went out”. As we read Heb. xi. 8 it might appear that the fact that Abraham knew all about the inheritance enabled him to step out in faith. “By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed.” This, however, is not the meaning. When he obeyed he did not have the inheritance so definitely revealed, for the verse continues, “and he went out, not knowing whither he went”. This brings Abraham into line with the other examples of faith. “Faith is the substance of things not seen”. Noah was warned of the things not seen as yet. Abraham knew that he was to go into a land of the Lord’s providing, and he knew that it was to be his inheritance, but the revelation of that inheritance grew with his obedience.

Is there no parallel experience suggested in Eph. i. 18? “That ye may know what is the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints.” Is there no parallel in I Cor. ii. 9, 10? We shall learn presently that Abraham received a higher call and a fuller revelation that eclipsed the original inheritance of the land, but this we must deal with in its true place. For the time being we must stop. The thread is taken up in the record of the next pair, Isaac and Jacob.

Let us not set aside this word “obey”. True we are of faith, true we are not under law, but under grace, true we are sons, not servants. Does this mean that obedience, the obedience of faith, is not for us? “Though HE were a Son, yet learned He obedience all them that obey Him” (Heb. v. 8, 9). The words obedience and obey mean “to hear with submission”. It is translated simply “hearken” in Acts xii. 13. It is incipient in Heb. iii., iv. in the words, “To-day if ye will hear His voice”. Faith comes out of hearing (Rom. x. 17), and the obedience of faith is simply that hearing continued throughout the walk of life.

The Man Christ Jesus.

#1. Jesus Christ come in the flesh.

pp. 81 - 84

We have in a recent Volume of *The Berean Expositor* reviewed the testimony of Scripture on the subject of the deity of Christ. We propose to take up the teaching of the same Scriptures concerning the humanity of Christ.

It is not our intention to speculate upon the question as to *how* Christ could be both God and man, for we have not the faintest idea. We do believe that we know *why* God became man, at least in one important particular, and that is explained by the Kinsman-Redeemer. Without therefore attempting things beyond our scope, we believe that the strong emphasis which we have placed upon the deity of Christ demands an equally strong emphasis upon His humanity.

The denial of antichrist.

Antichristian teaching denies both the deity and the humanity of Christ. It denies the deity, for it ascribes divine honour to "The man of sin" (II Thess. ii. 4), and it denies the humanity, as the following Scriptures show:--

"Every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ to have come *in the flesh* is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh* is not of God: And this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (I John iv. 2, 3).

"For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not Jesus Christ coming *in the flesh*. This is a deceiver and an antichrist" (II John i. 7).

The word used in I John iv. 2 for "is come" is in the perfect tense, and refers to the *past*.

The word used in II John i. 7 for "coming" is the *present* participle. The antichristian denial therefore is twofold. It denies that Christ did come, or will come *in the flesh*. It goes without saying therefore that true scriptural confession will believe that Christ did come and will come *in the flesh*. Yes as we say these words we wonder whether there are not many of God's children whose conceptions of the resurrection and future life are so beclouded that they have practically reduced the state of glory to that of an abode of phantoms. Some seem at least to need the words of Christ repeated again to them:--

"Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see; for a spirit (some read 'a phantom') hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have" (Luke xxiv. 39).

Scripture reveals that there is not only a "natural body", but also a "spiritual body" (I Cor. xv. 44, 45). The first body is connected with Adam who was made a living soul, for the word "natural" is the word *psuchikon*, from the word "soul" (*psuche*). The second

body is connected with the risen Christ, the last Adam, Who is a “life giving Spirit”. In order to go step by step with the Scriptures, and leave nothing assumed, we must not go on into other departments of this truth before we have seen just what Scripture says concerning “Jesus Christ come in the flesh”.

The Word became flesh.

“And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth” (John i. 14).

We have quoted from the A.V., but must draw attention to the omission of the article in this verse. Literally we must read, “A glory as of an only begotten from a father”, and the teaching is that the glory that John beheld was just such a glory as one would associate with such a begettal, and such a father. Moreover, the word translated “only begotten” is clearly connected with “becoming flesh”. John’s other references to the “only begotten” are John i. 18; iii. 16, 18; I John iv. 9. The last reference takes us back to the passage already considered, namely, the antichristian denial that Christ came in the flesh. Luke uses the word three times, vii. 12; viii. 42; ix. 38, and in each case it means literally an only child. Heb. xi. 17 completes the references, and uses the word of Isaac.

It will be seen that the word cannot have reference to the period before the Word became flesh, but that the title “only begotten” must be taken strictly literally. To tamper with the literal begettal, birth, and humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ is to tamper with the foundations of our faith. Several issues arise here to tempt us aside, but we shall do more service by dealing with one feature at a time.

“His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead” (Rom. i. 3, 4).

The focal points of this passage are the terms, “according to the flesh”, and “according to the spirit”. The Son of God according to the flesh was of the seed of David. The resurrection marked Him off as the Son of God *with power*, and that according to His holy spirit, which made it impossible for death to hold Him, or for Him to see corruption.

“For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. viii. 3).

The inability of the law was because of the weakness of the flesh. In dealing with the expression “the likeness of sin’s flesh” we must beware of putting out a hand to save the ark of God. That ark at the moment is the sinlessness of Christ. Scripture declares “He knew no sin”. Let us not, therefore, because we fear for the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ, so emphasize the word “likeness” as to make it amount to unreality. A parallel passage is Phil. ii. 7, where we read, “and was made in the likeness of men”. His flesh and blood humanity was real but sinless. Therefore the passage does not say “sinful

flesh” as the A.V., but “sin’s flesh”, the flesh which in all the sons of Adam had become the instrument of sin.

“Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for the ages. Amen” (Rom. ix. 5).

Omitting for the time II Cor. v. 16 and Eph. ii. 15 as demanding too long an argument to assign their true connection with our theme, we pass to:--

“In the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unrepveable in His sight” (Col. i. 22).

“Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh” (I Tim. iii. 16).

After a long search into the question of the readings “*God* was manifest”, “*Who* was manifest”, and “*which* was manifest”, which search includes the latest evidence of the camera, revealing letters and marks no longer visible to the eye, we have come to the conclusion that the A.V. presents the true reading. If a sufficient number of readers would appreciate the demonstration we would gladly devote a number of the magazine to this debateable point, but we rather fear that so highly technical a subject would be appreciated but by the few.

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy and deliver” (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

“Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications was heard for His piety” (Heb. v. 7).

“By a new and living way through the veil, that is to say, His flesh” (Heb. x. 20).

“Christ being put to death in the flesh” (I Pet. iii. 18).

“Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh” (I Pet. iv. 1).

Such is the testimony of the Scriptures to the truth which lies at the basis of redemption, viz., *Jesus Christ has come, and will come in the flesh*. Other aspects of this theme we hope to present in subsequent articles.

#2. The last Adam, the one Mediator. pp. 124 - 126

In our last paper we considered the testimony of Scripture as to the fact that “the Word became flesh”, and in dealing with Rom. viii. 3, “the likeness of the flesh of sin”, we made a comparison with Phil. ii. 7, “in likeness of men”. Let us therefore observe the teaching of Scripture with reference to the word “man” as used of Christ. This witness must be divided into three parts, (1) The Lord’s own testimony to Himself; (2) The testimony of those who knew Him; (3) The testimony of the apostles.

“Man shall not live by bread alone” (Matt. iv. 4; Luke iv. 4).
“A man that hath told you the truth” (John viii. 40).

These are the two passages that come under the first heading. In the Lord’s own estimation he was a man who depended upon the Father, and He was a man Who had been sent by the Father to speak the truth.

Under the second heading we have the testimony of both friend and foe:--

“A gluttonous man” (Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34).
“I know not the man” (Matt. xxvi. 72, 74; Mark xiv. 71).
“No fault in this man” (Luke xxiii. 4, 14).
“A righteous man” (Luke xxiii. 47).
“Never man spake like this man” (John vii. 46).
“Doth our law judge any man” (John vii. 51).
“A man that is called Jesus” (John ix. 11).
“This man is not of God this man is a sinner” (John ix. 16, 24).
“Thou, being a man” (John x. 33).
“This man doeth many miracles” (John xi. 47).
“That one man should die for the people” (John xi. 50; xviii. 14).
“One of this man’s disciples” (John xviii. 17).
“What accusation bring ye against this man?” (John xviii. 29).
“Behold the man!” (John xix. 5).
“This man’s blood” (Acts v. 28).

In these references no doctrinal utterance is found except that of the Pharisees in their attempt to browbeat the man who had been born blind (John ix.), and even in these cases the manhood of the Lord is never questioned, but only His mission, His relation to sin, and His relation to God. Some misunderstood His free intercourse with publicans and sinners, while some marvelled at the manner and matter of His message. He was looked upon as a man that could die, as a man that could be judged, and Pilate concludes the list of references in the Gospels by saying, “Behold the man”.

The references in the third series are those that are used in the epistles. We find six occurrences of the word *anthropos*, and one of *aner*. It may be as well to remark that *anthropos* is the name of the species without reference to sex, for while individually “a man” could not mean “a woman”, *anthropos* covers humanity, and includes both sexes

and all ages. *Aner* on the contrary means an adult male person, and is often translated husband.

Aner.

“Ye men of Israel Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God’ (Acts ii. 22).

Anthropos.

- “By one man, Jesus Christ”(Rom. v. 15).
- “By man came also the resurrection” (I Cor. xv. 21).
- “The second man is the Lord from heaven”(I Cor. xv. 47).
- “In the likeness of men” (Phil. ii. 7).
- “In fashion as a man” (Phil. ii. 8).
- “The man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. ii.5).

These doctrinal passages confirm the testimony of those who were eye witnesses and contemporaries, and illuminate the necessity of the Lord’s humanity. [Users of Young’s Analytical Concordance should see whether their edition contains a misquotation in Rom. v. 15 under Man (*anthropos*), as some editions quote the wrong half of the verse]. The references in Romans and I Corinthians set forth the Lord as “the second man and the last Adam”. It is noteworthy that in Paul’s early epistles he speaks of the Lord as man only in the two epistles in which he speaks of Adam. In the epistles written after Acts xxviii. Adam is not mentioned, but the emphasis seems to be that of mediation. Note I Tim. ii. 5 in full:--

“For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and MEN, THE MAN Christ Jesus.”

In this one verse the whole problem of the Lord’s deity and humanity is solved.



For God to meet man the mediator must be divine; for man to meet God the mediator must be human. The problem of sin, death, resurrection, redemption, and atonement are all solved in the Mediator, “the Man Christ Jesus”.

#3. The Son.
“The Word became flesh.”
“The second man is from heaven.”
pp. 145 - 149

We turn our attention to the titles of the Lord which speak of His Sonship. We find this title “Son” distributed under the following sub-headings: Son; Beloved Son; Son of God; Son of the Highest; Son of David; Son of Abraham; Son of man; Only begotten Son; Son of Joseph; and Son of Mary. The title “The Son” without further qualification is used many times by the Lord Himself. For example:--

“If the Son therefore shall make you free” (John viii. 36).

“Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost”
(Matt. xxviii. 19).

It is not possible however from such passages to decide just exactly what is intended by the title, and therefore we must allow the remaining titles that carry explanatory additions to help us. Coming to the human parents of the Lord we find the following important fact. Christ is spoken of as the Son of both Mary and of Joseph, but with such clear distinctions that never allow the reader to misunderstand the meaning of the term. Let us first consider the Sonship of Christ as connected with Mary.

“Now the begetting of Jesus Christ was thus. When as His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. i. 18).

The Companion Bible comments on this verse as follows:--

“Now; or, But, in contrast with those mentioned in vv. 2-16. Render: The begetting, then, of Jesus Christ was on this wise (for after His mother was espoused to Joseph [before they came together] she was found with child) of *pneuma hagion*.”

Here we have the first of a series of features concerning the Sonship of Christ that we must notice. He was begotten of *pneuma hagion*, holy spirit. Luke i. 31-35 must be read in order to obtain all the evidence written: “Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call His name JESUS.” The language is uncompromisingly plain; so plain that Mary was troubled; so literal that she did not give two thoughts to a figurative interpretation of the words: “Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?” The answer is in line with the passage in Matt. i.:--

“*Pneuma hagion* (holy spirit, power from on high) shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore that holy Thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God” (Luke i. 35).

This passage moreover enables us to understand another important feature of the Sonship of the Saviour. “The power of the Highest” is placed in correspondence with “*pneuma hagion*”. In verse 32 the angel had said: “He shall be great and shall be called

the Son of the Highest”, and in verse 35, “He shall be called the Son of God”. Now there can be no possible doubt but that the “Highest” stands here in the relation of Father, and the relation of Father in the sense that Mary was the mother. This being so, the title Son of God must not be taken to assert Deity, but must be held to refer to the Lord as the Son of Mary His mother, and of God His Father by the operation of *pneuma hagion*.

A passage in John i. must now be noticed. The thirteenth verse reads: “which were born”, and refers to “those that believe on His name”. Antecedent to any extant manuscript there is found in the writings of the Fathers the reading “Who” instead of “which”. This is not accidental, for Tertullian develops an argument on the subject, and charges the Gnostics with altering the original. If this testimony is to be accepted, verse 13 supplies another link in the chain—a negative one:--

“Who was begotten, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.”

Bringing together the two features that we have seen, we find the Lord (1) *was* begotten by *pneuma hagion* = spirit, and (2) *was not* begotten of blood, nor flesh, nor man.

Before we pass on to the birth of Christ, it will be proper to note how the scripture assures us that Joseph had no part in the matter. How did he act? As soon as it became evident that Mary was about to become a mother, his one thought was that she must be “put away”. Being a “kind” man, for such is often the O.T. meaning of the word, he was minded to take the merciful course, and put her away privately. The law that governed Joseph’s action is painfully plain as a reference to Deut. xxii. 22 will prove. Joseph’s qualms are stilled by the message of an angel, saying:--

“Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of *pneuma hagion*, and she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name JESUS: for He shall save His people from their sins. Now ALL THIS was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, behold, THE 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.”

Joseph is directed to the prophecy of Isaiah, and to the birth of Christ as its fulfillment. The Hebrew word in Isa. vii. 14 for virgin is *almah*, and is a wider term than our word “virgin”, although it includes it. The Greek word *parthenos*, however, does mean a virgin in its strictest sense, and consequently settles for us the meaning of Isa. vii. 14.

If the begetting of the Son is proved to be supernatural, the birth is found to be normal. So careful is Scripture to make this plain that we dare not shirk the exposition. Let us go back a little. Luke i. tells us of Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth, and that they had no children. Then an angel reveals to Zacharias that his wife, though old, should have a son. Luke i. 24-27 says, “And after those days his wife Elizabeth conceived and hid herself five months and in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a virgin”, and announces to her that she of all women has been highly favoured, and should be the mother of the Christ. In order to strengthen Mary’s faith, God in His

condescension bade Gabriel to say: “And behold, thy cousin Elizabeth, *she* (emphatic) hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren” (verse 36). With this encouragement we can fully appreciate the fact that Mary went to her cousin for asylum during the waiting time: “And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house” (verse 56). The reason why the stay with Elizabeth could be no longer protracted is because Elizabeth’s “full time” had come. Then came the decree of Caesar that compelled Joseph and Mary to make the journey to Bethlehem, and we are told that:--

“Mary, his espoused wife, was great with child, and so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her firstborn Son” (Luke ii. 5-7).

It is evident that Mary went the full time before the child was born. He was in the fullest sense “made of a woman” though not begotten of man. We do not feel that words could be more plain to teach the fact of the Virgin birth, and the divine begetting of the Son of God. To this, and to this alone, refer the words “The only begotten Son”. When the Word became flesh, men beheld the glory as of an only begotten of a father, but never before. Men had beheld His glory long before His birth at Bethlehem, and John himself tells us so (John xii. 41), but when Isaiah saw the Lord high and lifted up in the temple, he saw not the same glory that John was permitted to behold. We have seen the teaching of Scripture concerning both the divine begetting and the human birth of the Son, and thereby understand how He could be called Emmanuel, God with us, and how He could be, though very man of flesh and blood, entirely disconnected from any taint of sin or corruption inherited from Adam. In other words, we have been permitted to look into the inner meaning of the primal prophecy, and have beheld “The seed of the *woman*”.

There is a passage which speaks of Christ as the Son of Joseph. There are four altogether, but three are the expression of human and popular opinion. The one that calls for attention is that of Luke iii. 23. The Lord Jesus had gone to be baptized of John in Jordan, and there had been publicly acknowledged from heaven in the words, “Thou art My beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased”. The Lord was now about thirty years of age. He was the Son of God at His birth as we have seen, but this public recognition *sets Him forth* as the Son. While the genealogy of Matt. i. leads up to the birth of Christ, the genealogy of Luke iii. leads off from the public announcement of Christ.

The whole crux of the matter lies in the word translated “as was supposed”. *Nomizo* means to reckon in law. Matthew’s genealogy gives the Sonship of Christ by nature; Luke gives the Sonship in law. There is no ambiguity in the words of Matt. i. 16, that “Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary”, nor that Jacob’s father was Matthan, and so back to Solomon the son of David (Matt. i. 7). It is equally true that Joseph was the son of Heli, and so back to Nathan the son of David. Now it is positively impossible for both Nathan and Solomon, two sons of David, to be the forefather of Joseph, but the whole thing is explained by the words “in law”. By marriage to Mary Joseph became the son-*in-law* of Heli before the child was born (Luke ii. 5), and thus all the problems arising out of the connection with Adam’s corruption or Coniah’s curse are set aside, and every prophecy concerning the promised Seed finds its goal in Christ.

See how perfect Scripture is. It never calls the Lord the Son of Adam. No, He is: (1) The Seed of the woman (Gen. iii. 15); (2) The Seed or Son of Abraham (Gal. iii. 16; Matt. i. 1); and (3) The Seed or Son of David (Rom. i. 3; Matt. i. 1). Such is the testimony of the Word. Begotten of the Father, of the Highest, by *pneuma hagion*, not of blood, neither the will of the flesh or man, but of God. Born of a virgin, in fulfillment of O.T. prophecy. Perfectly formed and fashioned as a man, He came into the world in the body prepared for Him (Heb. x. 5), to do the will of God as the Seed of the woman, the Seed of Abraham, and the Seed of David.

His title “Son of man” means that He was very man, the representative man. This title will occur in other studies, and therefore we will not embark upon its investigation here. If our hearts are moved as we contemplate the overwhelming fact that our Saviour is *God* manifest in the flesh, are not our hearts equally moved at the great *kenosis*, the condescension that did not abhor the virgin’s womb, but was made flesh and tabernacled among us, lived for us, suffered for us, and at last died for us? The name of the Lord be magnified.

#4. The Apostle of apostles. pp. 178 - 183

The heading of this article, “The Man Christ Jesus”, and its sub-heading, “The Apostle of apostles”, may strike the reader as somewhat incongruous. Scripture indicates Peter as “the chiefest of the apostles”, and Paul as being “not one whit behind” in his office as the apostle to the Gentiles. Let us not forget, however, that both Peter and Paul were ministers of Christ. While Peter was equipped as the apostle of the circumcision, and Paul as the apostle of the uncircumcision, the Lord they represented was the Apostle of both Jew and Gentile, the Saviour and Head of *all* that call upon Him.

The propriety of the title “Apostle” as applied to the Lord may be questioned by some, as we have been surprised to find well-taught believers who seem to have no knowledge of its existence. The title is found in Heb. iii. 1:--

“Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus.”

We are apt to limit the term “The Anointed” or “The Christ” to the three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King. Have we ever stopped to think that had the Lord never been the Apostle, no other office could have been held? The essential meaning of the word Apostle is “The Sent One”, and the Lord as High Priest could never have *gone back* to God had He not first of all *come from* God. Inasmuch as every good and perfect gift cometh from above, inasmuch as the gospel, salvation, peace, and life, are all “of God”, it is absolutely essential that whosoever shall bring that gospel, accomplish that salvation,

make that peace, and restore that life shall be sent from God too. Therefore we see that in this office, as the Man Christ Jesus, He has the pre-eminence.

We have given unstinted precedence in these pages to the claims of the apostle Paul, but never to the exclusion or the eclipsing of the One who Paul so lovingly and so faithfully represented. He who is King of kings and Lord of lords; He whose Priesthood transcends Aaron's; in all things He has the pre-eminence.

The Apostle and High Priest.

These two titles practically cover the record of the Gospel according to John. Most readers know that this Gospel is divided into two parts. The first occupying chapters i.-xii., and the second xiii.-xxi. The first section is concerned with the outer ministry of the Lord; the second is occupied with the Lord's more private ministry among His own. The first section manifests the Lord as the "Sent One"; the second prepares us for His return to God. The Gospel that so strongly emphasizes the Lord as the "sent", records the passages which reveals that the Lord "went to God", long before the visible ascent from the Mount of Olives: "Jesus saith unto her, Touch Me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father" (John xx. 17). Eight days after the same Lord could say to Thomas: "Reach hither thy finger and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side" (John xx. 27).

The double title of Apostle and High Priest is suggested in the opening of chapter xiii., the second section of the Gospel:--

"When Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father and that He was *come from God*, and went to God" (John xiii. 1-3).

Seeing therefore that the office of Apostle, or the "Sent One" is so important, and takes precedence over all other aspects and phases of His ministry, let us turn to the Scriptures to learn something of this neglected but vital feature.

The Sent One.

The Gospel according to John contains more occurrences than any other of the two words translated "to send", viz., *apostello* = "to send forth", and *pempo* = "to send". From chapter iii. to chapter xx. it is safe to say that every section speaks of the Lord as the Sent One in some vital sense, and directly connected with the argument. Let us follow this and learn as we go. John iii. 17 focuses the Lord's words to Nicodemus, and runs on as an immediate extension of John iii. 16:--

"For God *sent* not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved."

Here is the first object stated, *Salvation*. Not condemn but save, or, as John iii. 16 teaches, not perish but have everlasting life. This connection with John iii. 16 moreover reveals that the word "sent" embraces all those passages where the Lord is said to "come"

and the Father is said to “give”. Truly a fulness dwells in *this* word. The next section deals with the relationship that existed between Christ and His forerunner John the Baptist:--

“He must increase, but I must decrease. He that *cometh from above* is above all
He Whom God hath *sent* speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by
measure unto Him” (John iii. 25-36).

This second statement shows the full enduement of our great Apostle for *Service*. Another aspect of the service of the Sent One is exhibited in John iv. 4: “He must *needs* go through Samaria.” Why? The woman wondered why, the disciples marvelled, but the Lord revealed why He must needs go through Samaria.

“His disciples prayed Him, saying, Master, eat Jesus saith unto them, My meat
is to do the will of Him that *sent Me*” (John iv. 31-34).

Here, then, is revealed His great unseen *Sustenance*. The next set of occurrences is connected with one of the great signs of John’s Gospel—the healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda. The outcome of the opposition that this miracle brought to the surface is expressed by the words, “He said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God” (John v. 18). To this the Lord replied: “The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do” (verse 19), and, after showing that this extended to judgment and equal honour, focuses the argument in the words:--

“He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath *setn* Him
He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that *sent Me*, hath everlasting life”
(John v. 23, 24).

Here we have demonstrated the true “equality” of the Son with the Father. The centurion who said “I also am a man under authority”, recognized the full power of the Lord as “The Sent One”, and manifested a faith that had not been seen in all Israel (Matt. viii. 5-13). The Lord proceeds to the great power of resurrection. This authority is given Him because He is the Son of man, the Sent One.

“I can of Mine own self do nothing I seek not Mine own will, but the will of
Him that *sent Me*” (John v. 30).

Here in this divine sending is the Lord’s *Authority*. Next comes the Lord’s appeal to the *Witness* that He had:--

“I have a greater witness than that of John, for the works that the Father hath given
Me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of Me that the Father hath *sent Me*,
and the Father Himself, which hath *sent Me*, hath borne witness of Me and ye
have not His word abiding in you: for Whom He hath *sent*, Him ye believe not”
(John v. 36-38).

Both the witness of the Father and the Word of God testify of Christ, and the Lord’s indictment was: “And ye will not come to Me, that ye might have life” (verse 40). Chapter vi. is devoted to the feeding of the five thousand with five loaves and two small

fishes, and the subsequent teaching given by the Lord concerning Himself. Rebuking the people because they followed Him merely because of “loaves and fishes”, He said, “Work not for the meat that perisheth”. They reply: “What shall we do that we may work the works of God?” to which the Lord answers:--

“This (great miracle) is the work of God, with the object that ye believe on Him Whom He hath *sent*” (John vi. 26-35).

Here Christ is set forth as the *Bread of Life*. Again the Lord testifies that He came to do the will of Him that sent Him, and explains that will as comprising the eternal security of everyone given to Him, and their resurrection at the last day (John vi. 38-47). In these verses the Lord uses the word “sent” five times, and emphasizes the “will of Him that sent Him” as issuing in *Resurrection Life*, the manward side being expressed by “believing” and “eating”, believing the Sent One being symbolically expressed as eating the sent bread from heaven.

In chapter vii. we find the Jews marvelling at the knowledge exhibited by the Lord, and to this the Lord replies, “My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me”, and declares that He sought only the glory of Him that sent Him (John vii. 16-18). Here we have the source of the Lord’s *Doctrine*. The fact of His rejection becomes patent, and the Lord cries out in the temple:--

“I am not come of Myself, but He that *sent* Me is true, Whom ye know not yet a little while and I go unto Him that *sent* Me” (John vii. 28-33).

Here, in spite of all opposition and rejection, the Lord rests His claim and His *Commission*. We will not pursue this throughout the book. The reader can continue the study for himself. To help all to do so we give the remaining occurrences of both *apostello* and *pempo*:--

Apostello.—John viii. 42; ix. 7; x. 36; xi. 3, 42; xvii. 3, 8, 18, 21, 23, 25; xx. 21.

Pempo.—John viii. 16, 18, 26, 29; ix. 4; xii. 44, 45, 49; xiii. 16, 20; xiv. 24; xv. 21, 26; xvi. 5.

Two passages perhaps demand notice by reason of their importance. The first is a note in chapter ix. It speaks of the healing of the man born blind, and in verse 7 at the command, “Go, wash in the pool in Siloam”, the writer adds the suggestive comment, “Which is by interpretation, *Sent*”. Even the pool of Siloam is made to yield its typical teaching. John xvii. is the other chapter that demands attention. The Lord is here about to enter into the second phase of His great work. His work as the apostle is seen as drawing to a close, and His High Priestly work is about to begin. The standpoint of the great prayer of this chapter is expressed in the words of verses 4 and 11:--

“I have glorified Thee on earth: I have finished the work Thou gavest Me to do I am no more in the world, and I come to Thee.”

This is but continuing the key note given in chapter xiii. 3, “Jesus knowing that He was come from God and went to God”. The first occurrence of the word “sent” in John xvii. is in verse 3:--

“And this is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true god, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast *sent*.”

This is the great covering reference, the six remaining occurrences dealing with the fact of the Lord being Sent One, and its relation to the believer and the world.

“Sent” in John xvii.

- A | 3. Life by believing.
- a | 8. The disciples *believe*.
- b | 18. As the Lord.
- | 18. So the disciples.
- b | 21. Unity—world believe.
- | 23. Unity—world know.
- a | 25. The disciples *knew*.

If we doubted the importance of the fact that the Lord was the Sent One before, the place that it occupies in this solemn prayer must surely convince us. He could not be a Redeemer or a Priest apart from being a partaker of flesh and blood, and to partake of flesh and blood He must be the Sent One. We cannot leave this subject without a glance at John’s first Epistle. There, in chapter iv., the sending of the Son is the great manifestation of the love of God:--

“In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God *sent* His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him He loved us, and *sent* His Son to be the propitiation for our sins we have seen and do testify that the Father *sent* the son to be the Saviour of the world” (verses 9-14).

Here are life, propitiation, and salvation arising out of love, and manifested in the sending of the Son.

In conclusion let us ask ourselves, What wait we for? Setting aside the fact that the hope of the Church of the One body differs in detail from the hope of Israel, it is one with all the redeemed of whatever calling in that it is centred in the coming, or the revelation, or the manifestation of the Lord Himself. He was sent to be King, but He was rejected. God in His grace condescends to send Him the second time. “Repent ye therefore and He shall send Jesus Christ” (Acts iii. 19, 20) may well summarize the position of all with regard to the realization of our hope. Blessed be God, He did not withdraw His mercy because of the rejection of His Son. He who was sent once to suffer and to die, shall be sent again. He who went back to God with no crown but that of thorns shall as a result of the second sending gather up all crowns, dominions, and thrones into one universal kingdom, that it may be laid at the feet of the Father, in order “that God may be all in all”.

“Wherefore consider the Apostle, of our profession.”

The Ministry of Consolation.

#22. Sympathy.

pp. 59 - 61

The word sympathy does not occur in the A.V., but that is not to say that it does not occur in Scripture. Sympathy is a Greek word in English dress, and is composed of *sun* = “with”, and *pathein* = “to suffer”. The LXX uses the word in Job xxix. 25, and the version of Symmachus uses it in Job ii. 11. Before turning to the N.T. it will help us to take a note of these passages in Job:--

“Now when Job’s three friends heard of all this evil that was come upon him, they came every one from his own place for they had made an appointment together to come and mourn with him and to comfort him” (Job ii. 11).

Here is sympathy. They came not only to comfort, but to *share*—“to mourn with him”, sym-pathy—“suffer or feel together”. Further, they had the grace to keep their sympathy in its right place, they did not obtrude. They did not come blustering into Job’s grief, slap him on the back and cry, “Cheerio!” It has been said that the pessimist is he that is obliged to live with an optimist. These friends of Job seeing that his grief was great sympathized *with* him:--

“So they sat down with him upon ground seven days and seven nights, and none spake a word unto him; for they saw that his grief was very great” (ii. 13).

Yet they failed; “miserable comforters are ye all” is Job’s protest (xvi. 2). Wherein did these worthy men fail? If we examine the utterances of these three friends we shall find the fly in the ointment of their sympathy was that they could not refrain from lecturing Job, from giving the benefit of their experience, from exasperating the *facts* of his sorrow with their *unfelt theories*. Eliphaz’s lecture is an expansion of the principle that no innocent man can perish, that he who sows evil must reap it. The beauty and the superficial truth of his speech is spoiled by the assumption that Job must have sinned in secret. This was but added gall to Job’s bitterness (iv. & v.). Job in his reply in vi. & vii. likens his friends to a dried up brook, and speaks feelingly upon their lack of sympathetic understanding:--

“Do ye reprove by fast’ning on my words,
When one in sheer despair (at random) speaks
Like to the wind?” (vi. 26)

Human nature is much the same in all ages.

“I then, all smarting with my wounds being cold,
To be so pestered with a popinjay,
Out of my grief and my impatience,
Answered neglectingly, I know not what;
He should, or he should not

* * * * *

And I beseech you let not his report
Come current for an accusation.
Betwixt my love and your high majesty” (King Henry IV).

Both the patient Jobs and the impatient Hotspurs of our acquaintance need *sympathetic* treatment if we would speak the word in season. Bildad and Zophar but follow Eliphaz in stirring up rebellion where they might have soothed and calmed. They brought their dead theories up against Job’s living experience and failed. Job himself in the days of his affluence had been a royal sympathizer.

“’Twas mine to choose their way, and sit as chief;
As king among his subjects so I dwelt;
And among mourners as a comforter” (Job xxix. 25).

Here the LXX uses the word *sympathy*. Turning to the N.T. we find *sumpatheo* in Heb. iv. 15; x. 34; and *sumpathes* in I Pet. iii.8. The great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, in all His greatness knows by experience the pilgrim pathway.

“For we have not an high priest who cannot sympathise with our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, apart from sin” (Heb. iv. 15).

Christ is the true sympathizer.

“For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted” (Heb. ii. 18).

Note how truly sympathetic this is. It does not say He is able to succour because He is Divine, because He is the Saviour, or even because He is High Priest, but because He Himself hath suffered being tempted. In Heb. x. 34, 35 we have sympathizers ranking with those who endured a great fight, and who lived by faith:--

“Ye became *companions* of them that were so used, for ye had *sympathy* with those in bonds.”

Some passed through active conflict for the truth, others “sympathized”, silently stood with them, outwardly perhaps escaping the suffering, inwardly sharing and supporting those who were afflicted.

Have you a dear one, one for whom you pray, who at present does not enjoy the fullness of blessing that you have received? Are your overtures resented, do you often feel sore wounded by their refusal to hear or consider? Have you ever stopped to review your own attitude? Are you riding rough shod? Are you giving all “doctrine” and little “practice”? Perhaps the one thing needful is a little sympathy. Where crude doctrine may repel, a loving word, a kindly thought, a sympathetic act, look, or silence may break the barrier. You may be a wife, a husband, a lover, a parent, a child. Go out of your way to seek to understand the point of view of the other. Put yourself in their shoes, view the truth and your own actions from their point of view. Let us remember the present office

of the Lord Jesus, and let His great sympathy be our inspiration. “Thy condescension hath made me great” (Psa. xviii. 35).

#23. Earthen vessels.
p. 79

One of the consolations of Scripture for the servant of God is the fact that the Lord Who uses us, knows us, and while sin is never excused, or slackness condoned, it is a consolation to read, “He knoweth our frame, He remebereth that we are dust”—a knowledge and a remembrance sometimes lacking among His people. It is for our help that Scripture draws our attention to the fact that “Elias was a man subject to like passions (or infirmities) as we are” (James v. 17). Elijah who confronted the king, who dared the whole priesthood of Baal, who prayed and with his prayer closed the heavens for three-and-a-half years, was nevertheless mortal, fallible, and feeble in himself. Scripture not only records his daring, but as faithfully records his flight and his despair.

Abraham for his faith received the enviable title, “The friend of God” (James ii. 23), yet who does not remember Abraham’s journey to Egypt, his equivocation concerning Sarah? These things are recorded alongside of that most marvelous act of faith and simple obedience, viz., the offering of Isaac (Gen. xxii.). David, the man after God’s own heart, the sweet singer of Israel, type of His greater Son, and victor of Goliath, has left for all time that confession of sin that we now call Psalm li; truly a man of like passions as we are!

(To be continued).

#23. (contd.). Earthen vessels.
p. 94

Paul, chosen vessel that he was, who could say with all good conscience, “for me to live is Christ”, was a man as we are. When not defending his “office” he is careful never to magnify himself. He had a treasure it is true, but that treasure was contained in an earthen vessel. He had received a commission higher than had ever been given to man, yet in the midst of its acknowledgment he says, “Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given” (Eph. iii. 8), and lest he should be exalted above measure, by reason of the abundance of revelations he had received, he had a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan sent to buffet him.

Neither Elijah, nor Abraham, nor David, nor Paul give the least warrant for trading upon our conscious weakness, nor for excusing our slightest fall, but they do, in the midst

of much frailty and weakness, give us heart to continue rejoicing that God has not only called Himself “The Holy One of ISRAEL”, but also, blessed be His name, “The God of JACOB”.

#24. Ourselves. pp. 94, 95

There are several passages in Paul’s second epistle to the Corinthians where he speaks very emphatically about *ourselves*. The first passage is introduced as a “ministry of consolation”, for God is called “The God of all comfort”, and Paul says that both his affliction and his consolation are for our benefits (II Cor. ii. 4-7).

“For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life: But we had the sentence of death *in ourselves*, that we should not trust *in ourselves*; but in God which raiseth the dead” (II Cor. i. 8, 9).

Paul was brought very low, but the object was glorious, his trust in himself died, and he learned something of “the power of his resurrection”. What was true in the wide experience of his life, was true in the narrower experience of his ministry:--

“Not that we are sufficient *of ourselves* to think any thing as *of ourselves*; but our sufficiency is of God” (II Cor. iii. 5).

The passage goes on to show that the sphere of Paul’s ministry was in resurrection power, “spirit”, “life”, “glory”. Yet again in II Cor. iv. 5 he says:--

“We preach *not ourselves*, but Christ Jesus the Lord, *and ourselves* your servants for Jesus’ sake.”

To these same Corinthians the apostle had said:--

“Who then is Paul, but a minister by whom ye believed?” (I Cor. iii. 5).

“Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” (I Cor. i. 13).

Once more, in II Cor. x. 12, he says:--

“For we dare not make *ourselves* of the number, or compare *ourselves* with some that commend themselves: but they, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise.”

Paul’s one standard of measurement was the will of God, all boastful comparisons he set aside, and so should we. Here are lessons for us that should help. Let us not trust in ourselves, but in God that raiseth the dead. Let us not think that we have any sufficiency of ourselves, but let us gladly acknowledge that our sufficiency is of God. Let us preach

Christ, as Lord, and ourselves as servants for Jesus' sake, and finally, let us be neither downcast nor elated by comparing ourselves with ourselves, but leaving all judgment until "that day" (I Cor. iv. 4, 5), let us seek closer conformity to the only standard that matters, the will and word of God.

#24. Sympathy. **pp. 156, 157**

We have looked at the subject of sympathy as exhibited to others. Shall we just look at the way in which a truly sympathetic nature must be developed. If we have grasped the meaning of the word we shall know that no amount of reading or study can give us this priceless Christ-like thing, for it means "suffering together".

Have we not felt at times how impossible it has been for a big healthy man, tanned by sun and wind, with never an ache or a pain, to have real sympathy with the delicate invalid, the sufferer from chronic headache, the one whose nerves are all on end, whose digestion makes life a burden. He may give kindly words, but however well intended we can sense the one fact that renders them of little value—he has never suffered. When we reach out to Christ for sympathy as we fall into this or that trial along the way, we know that His words will not be of the unfeeling variety, but that when we tell Him our griefs He *knows*. Well then, this has a bearing upon ourselves. If we seek a life all sunshine, all roses, with no clouds, no thorns, we are but seeking a life of self. We are avoiding the opportunity of helping our fellow-members in their time of trouble. Paul gives full expression to this secret process in II Cor. i. 3-5:--

"Blessed by God Who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, BY THE COMFORT wherewith we ourselves are comforted OF GOD. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ."

Paul had been taught many things by revelation, but it was necessary that he should himself be in tribulation, and have an abounding share of the sufferings of Christ, before he could be the channel of the comfort of God. Paul could not minister comfort by passing on a mere recipe; the only comfort he found available was "The comfort wherewith he himself had been comforted of God". In the midst, therefore, of your tears, let this rainbow be seen. You stand by the sick bed or the open grave; you lie prostrate, and despair even of life, you know the bitterness of no employment. You may let these things embitter you, make you murmur and complain, or permit them to mellow you, and send you on the Christ-like ministry of soothing others with the balm you yourself received from God. Christ Himself has suffered being tempted, and because of this He can succour and sympathize. May we all therefore be blessedly exercised by our experiences, and reckon that we have been "graciously given on the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake".

There are also two points of view as to the length of this endurance. One may say, Oh to think that I must endure this for a whole lifetime, while another may say, Praise God, this suffering can only last a lifetime. To both the time is the same, but how different the point of view. One may say, Why am I thus afflicted and burdened? while another may say, What a privilege to be counted worthy to share any part of the sufferings of Christ for His body's sake, the church. Beloved readers, there can be no two thoughts as to which should be our attitude.

“Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.”

#25. The bowed soul, and the fixed heart (Psa. lvii. 6, 7). pp. 158, 159

It is a consolation beyond our powers of estimation that while we so harshly and sometimes so cruelly judge one another, the Lord remembereth our frame, and while sin is never treated less than sin (and no evil can ever be called otherwise by a Holy God), He condescends to use those who are of like infirmities with ourselves. A word in season is found in Psa. lvii. It is the coming together of two apparently opposed conditions:--

“My soul is bowed down My heart is fixed” (Psa. lvii. 6, 7).

Three times in this Psalm does the writer speak of his soul:--

“My *soul* trusteth in Thee” (verse 1).

“My *soul* is among lions” (verse 4).

“My *soul* is bowed down” (verse 6).

Here we may learn the necessary lesson, that trust in God does not mean exemption from trouble. What it does mean is triumph in spite of trouble. The Psalmist did not practice what is called “auto-suggestion”; he did not seek to strengthen himself by saying, “I am growing stronger every day”, for he knew a better way: “I will cry unto God most high; unto God that *performeth* for me” (verse 2), which *Spurrell* translates as “my accomplishing God”. At first sight, when the several occurrences of this word “perform” are considered, the true meaning underlying all is not readily apparent.

“The godly man *ceaseth*” (Psa. xii. 1).

“Doth His promise *fail*?” (Psa. lxxvii. 8).

“Let the wickedness of the wicked *come to an end*” (Psa. vii. 9).

“The Lord will *perfect*” (Psa. cxxxviii. 8).

“God that *performeth* for me” (Psa. lvii. 2).

The reader who remembers that the N.T. word “perfect” (*teleios*) indicates one who has gone unto the “end”, will see that the same idea is found in this word *gamar* = “to end”. Because the Psalmist trusted in God Who was able to bring all things through to their appointed end, he could, even while his soul was bowed down, truly say: “Oh God,

my heart is fixed.” By observing the words used in I Cor. x. 13 we shall see the same truth at work there. The A.V. speaks of a “way of escape”, but this is not “enduring” to “bearing”. The word occurs in Heb. xiii. 7 where it is translated “end” in the A.V. and “issue” in the R.V.:-

“There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, Who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able: but will with the temptation also make the end (or the issue), that ye may be able to bear it.”

While therefore, in common with our fellows, we may have to say many times, “My soul is bowed down”, let us remember that our trust is in God Who “perfect”, or brings to an issue, and so be enabled also to say, “My heart is fixed”.

Studies in the Prophets.

NO.1.

The theme of all the Prophets.

January 1927

Great stress has been placed upon the necessity for the right division of Scripture in the pages of this magazine, and with sixteen years of study and publicity we realize more than ever how fundamental, how essential 2 Tim. ii. 15 is to the true interpretation of all Scripture. This division, however, never loses sight of the organic, oneness of the Scriptures, a truth expressed in our key pamphlet which we have entitled "*United, yet Divided.*" The prophets of the O.T. spoke to Israel, Judah, or the nations. The church as understood by Paul in his later ministry was never in view, yet although this is so, it by no means indicates that the Gentiles, saved by grace and called to share the glories of the heavenly places, have no interest in these O.T. prophets, or that no spiritual blessings can be received by their prayerful study. On the contrary, while we see the essential difference that there is between Jew, Gentile, and Church, between Kingdom, Bride and Body, between earth, heaven and the super heavens, yet we also rejoice in the fact that all are the objects of the love of God, redeemed by the same precious blood, and parts of one great and majestic purpose. As fellow-partakers, therefore, of the grace of God, it warms our hearts and helps us to understand our own pathway better to trace His hand and see His ways with His typical people Israel.

We therefore propose to study the teaching of the O.T. prophets in this series. We are immediately confronted with the question of time and space, for the O.T. prophets equal two-thirds of the complete N.T. in bulk, and therefore anything like an exhaustive study is quite outside the possibilities of these pages. Our studies therefore will have to be broad views, with a descent into details where the passage is peculiarly representative, leaving the student to pursue by means of these helps and hints the delightful task of closer study of God's wonderful purposes for His ancient people.

The underlying theme.

The unity of theme that is traceable through the prophets (omitting Jonah, whose message was to Nineveh and not to Israel) is of greater importance as an aid to understanding than the observation of the individual peculiarities of each prophet. The fact that God used a great variety of human agents, who were called in a variety of circumstances "at sundry times and in divers manners," would necessarily leave its impress upon the mode of revelation without altering for one moment its full inspiration. Isaiah wrote his messages before the captivity, and spoke particularly though not exclusively "concerning Judah and Jerusalem"; Ezekiel and Daniel receive their visions during the captivity, both describe wonders and heavenly visions, but from different standpoints. Zechariah and Daniel prophesy at the close of the captivity. Sometimes the bulk of a prophet's burden is that of judgment, burning indignation, or bitter tears; terrible threats or tender entreaties may characterize this prophet or that, but whether dominant or recessive, whether minor or major, whether subdued or overflowing, we find one grand theme runs through every prophet's utterance.

Israel's restoration.

ISAIAH.-This great prophet, to whose rapt visions and burning words we turn for, perhaps the fullest Messianic prophecies, is divided into two parts:-

Chapter i.--xxxix. . . . Israel's dispersion . . . "The Voice" (vi.).

Chapter xl--xlvi Israel's restoration . . . "The Voice" (xl.).

These main sections have, of course, many sub-divisions. Moreover, we do not suggest that the prophet's words are to be considered as being in water-tight departments. Anticipations of coming glory find their way into the early section. References to dispersion and judgment are to be found in the later section, but speaking generally of the book as a whole the above is a fair presentation of its trend.

JEREMIAH.-The analysis of Jeremiah is much more complicated than that of Isaiah. Chronological sequence at times gives place to the necessities of prophetic and dispensational instruction. There is nevertheless a very complete parallel with Isaiah in the use and distribution of one important feature, to which we shall have to devote a separate paper owing to its length and importance. Two passages in Jeremiah, however, may be looked upon as the foci of his prophecy:

"See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant. Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond tree. Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for *I will hasten My word to perform it*" (Jer. i. 10-12).

"And it shall come to pass, that like as *I have watched* over them to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict: so *will I watch over* them, to build, and to plant, saith the Lord. . . . If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever" (Jer. xxxi. 28,36).

The connection between these two passages is seen the better when we note that the Hebrew word for the almond is *shaged*, and the word for "to hasten" and "to watch" is *shaqad*. These and other connections we must leave until we give the various books an individual examination. The main theme, however, is similar to that of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and may be expressed in the words of Jeremiah xxxi. 10, "He that *scattered* Israel will *gather* him."

EZEKIEL.-When one first approaches the prophecy of Ezekiel with its living creatures full of eyes, its wheels, its wings, its flames of fire, and wonderful imagery, unity of theme or comparison with other prophets at first seems too difficult to yield to the circumscribed space at our disposal. Ezekiel, however, has the same basic theme as that of Isaiah and Jeremiah, namely, Israel's fall and restoration. Isaiah gives us an indication of his purpose in the two voices of Isa. vi. and xl. Jeremiah accomplishes the same object by his use of the almond tree, the "watcher." Ezekiel encompasses the same end by his visions of the glory of the Lord.

The departing Glory.	Ezek. ix. 3 Removed to the threshold. Ezek. x. 18, 19. Removed to the east gate. Ezek. xi. 22 Removed to the mountain.
The glory among the nations	Ezek. xxxix. 21. Set among the nations, as a witness against Israel's iniquity.
The returning glory.	Ezek. xliii. 2 . . . Returning from the east. Ezek. xliii. 4, . . . Returning by way of the east gate. Ezek. xliv.4Returning glory fills the house.

That these visions of the departing and returning glory are connected with Israel's history as a nation may be gathered from Ezek. xxxix. 25-29, "Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob."

DANIEL. - The minor prophets must now be given a brief review. Daniel's prophecies may be subdivided into two parts: - .

- 1, Those which speak of the kingdom being given to the Gentiles.
2. Those which speak of the kingdom being restored once again to Israel.

This prophet in his own way adds his quota to the development of the one great theme.

HOSEA.- The opening and closing chapters of this prophecy indicate the trend of the book :

Israel called 'Lo-ruhamah' and 'Lo.ammi' - not having received mercy, and not My people.
Finally called 'Ruhamah' and 'Ammi' (Hosea i.).

"O Israel return. . . . I will heal. . . . they shall dwell" (Hosea xiv.).

Thus Hosea is seen to have the one great theme before him.

JOEL.-Joel reveals the purpose of his prophecy by the double reference to the locusts:

"That which .the palmerworm hath left hath the locust eaten, and that which the locust hath left hath the cankerworm eaten, and that which the cankerworm hath left hath the caterpillar eaten" (Joel i. 4).

"And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and .the caterpillar, and the palmerworm, My great army which I sent among you" (Joel ii. 25).

The purpose remains the same, however varied may be the manner of its presentation.

AMOS.-The theme of Amos may be expressed in the closing chapter:

"I will sift the house of Israel among all nations like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth" (Amos. ix. 9).

"In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen and close up the breaches thereof. . . . and I will plant them upon their land. . . ." (Amos. ix. 11-15).

OBADIAH. - This prophecy is directed to Edom, and therefore does not fall so exactly into line; nevertheless Israel's restoration is not forgotten in verses 17-21.

JONAH. - Jonah is also not concerned with Israel, but with Nineveh; no mention is therefore made of Israel or the restoration.

MICAH.-Micah resumes the theme of the prophets, which may be expressed in the words of chapters iii. and iv.:

"Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest" (Micah iii. 12).

" But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out and her that I have afflicted" (Micah iv. 1-6).

NAHUM.-Nahum, like Jonah, is devoted to the burden of Nineveh, and therefore does not pursue the theme of Israel's fall and restoration.

HABAKKUK.-Habakkuk sets before us the individual, the just who lives by faith, waiting for the promises of the Lord.

ZEPHANIAH.-Zephaniah returns to the theme of Israel's restoration, which can be expressed in the closing verses of the last chapter:

"Behold, at that time I will undo all that afflict thee. . . . I will set them for a praise and fame in every land where they have been put to shame. And at that time will I bring you again, even in the time that I gather you: for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the Lord" (Zeph. iii. 19, 20).

HAGGAI.-Haggai addresses his message to the remnant that returned from captivity, and its whole setting is prophetic of the great return at the end of the age. This typical foreshadowing is expressed as follows:

"The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts; and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts" (Haggai ii. 9).

ZECHARIAH.-It is proverbial with students that Zechariah is the prophet of the restoration, e.g.:

"Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls" (Zech. ii. 4).

"I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem" (Zech. viii. 3).

"It shall come to pass, that as ye were a curse among the nations, o house of Judah, and house of Israel, so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing" (Zech. viii. 13).

These are specimens only of the continual statement of this glorious theme.

MALACHI.-Malachi rebukes Israel for their rebellion and despising of the Lord, prophesying the coming of the Messiah and the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem:

"The Lord, Whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple . . . behold He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts.

. . . Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years" (Mal. iii. 1-4).

"All nations shall call you blessed; for ye shall be a delightsome land" (Mal. iii. 12).

The prophecy ends upon the promise of the sending of the prophet Elijah, and the repentance of the people.

We believe the evidence is too clear to be denied that the burden of the prophets who spoke concerning either Judah or Israel is their ultimate restoration. Let us keep this glorious goal in mind while we follow the footsteps of erring Israel and redemptive love, from Egypt's slavery, Sinai's law and Babylon's captivity to that day when they shall look upon Him Whom they pierced.

Studies in the Prophets.

NO.2.

Israel's restoration and the new covenant.

In the series of articles entitled *Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth* we have considered the covenant made by the Lord with Israel at Sinai, and seen it to be the basis of His dealings with them as a nation. Coming to the prophets, and endeavouring to find further indications of their great purpose, we find that much is said about this covenant. Turning to the prophecy of Isaiah we find that the references to the covenant exactly harmonize with the twofold division of the book. There are twelve references to a covenant in this prophecy, four occurring in the first section, and eight in the second. These references set forth most vividly the factors that led to the fall, and that will lead to the restoration of Israel, the burden indeed of all the prophets.

The two covenants.

Let us first of all look at the first and the last mention of covenant by Isaiah;

"They have broken the everlasting covenant" (Isa. xxiv. 5).

"I will make an everlasting covenant with them" (Isa. lxi. 8).

Words could not more eloquently express the twofold theme of this prophecy; Israel forfeiting all by breaking the covenant, God establishing and restoring all by making the covenant Himself in Christ. With this encouragement to go forward in the study, let us notice the distribution of this word more carefully.

	A. xxiv. 5. Covenant broken.
First part of Isaiah	B. xxviii. 15. Covenant made with death.
--Desolation. i--xxxix	B. xxviii. 18. Covenant with death disannulled
	A. xxxiii. 8. Covenant broken.
	A. xlii. 6; xlix. 8. Messiah given as a covenant of the people.
	B. liv. 10. Covenant of My peace.
Second part of Isaiah	C. lv. 3. I will make an everlasting covenant
--restoration xl. – lxvi	A. lvi. 4, 6. They who take hold of My covenant
	B. lix. 21. This is My covenant.
	C. lxi. 8. I will make an everlasting covenant.

The most prejudiced reader can hardly deny that the distribution of this word is, to say the least, suggestive. In the first part, which deals with Israel's failure, we have a covenant broken, or a covenant made with death, but no reference to a covenant established or made by the Lord. In the second part there is no broken covenant, but instead the Messiah is given as a covenant of the people, and God Himself promises to make an everlasting covenant. Design is rendered more evident when we notice that the double reference in xlii. and xlix. instead of causing a difficulty is exactly balanced by the double reference to those who take hold of this covenant. Let us observe the contexts of some of these references.

The broken covenant.

The context of the broken covenant is one of chaos:

"Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. . . . The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled: for the Lord hath spoken this word. . . . they. . . . have broken the everlasting covenant, therefore hath the curse devoured the earth" (Isa. xxiv. 1-6).

The parallel reference says:

"The highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth; he hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regardeth no man. The earth mourneth and languisheth: Lebanon is ashamed and withered away: Sharon is like a wilderness: and Bashan and Carmel shake off their fruits" (Isa. xxxiii. 8. 9).

It is very probable that the passage in xxxiii. has immediate reference to Sennacherib, and prophetic reference to Antichrist. The breaking of the covenant by Israel drew down upon them the judgment of invasion:

"And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel unto Assyria . . . because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord their God, but *transgressed His covenant*" (2 Kings xviii. 11, 12).

This desolation and affliction of the land of promise is reversed under the application of the new covenant:

"O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires" (Isa. liv. 11).

Such large sections of Isaiah would have to be quoted to justly present this aspect of their glorious restoration that we trust the reader will read through Isa. xl.-lxvi. in order to apprehend the full effect of these passages.

The new covenant.

While the new covenant is very plainly in view in Isaiah, inasmuch as the Messiah Himself is given as the covenant for the people, it is not so called in Isaiah. Jeremiah very definitely gives expression to this fact:

"Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, . . . the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken My covenant which I made with their fathers" (Jer. xi. 1-10).

Immediately following the reference quoted in the previous paper where the Lord declares that He will watch over Israel in blessing, even as He had watched over them in judgment, the basis of the new covenant is revealed:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they break, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord" (Jer. xxxi. 31, 32).

The new covenant of Jeremiah is evidently in view in Isaiah, for there we have a, "new song," a "new name," and a "new heavens and a new earth" (Isa. xlii. 10; lxii. 2; and lxv. 17). These items are repeated in the Apocalypse, to which we may add the "new Jerusalem" (Rev. xxi. 2). The new covenant also is in view in Ezekiel, for there we have a "new spirit," and a "new heart" (Ezek. xi. 19 and xxxvi. 26). Without pursuing this feature further and multiplying examples, the reader may remember the prayer of Daniel ix., and the close of the prophet Micah:

"Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham which Thou hast sworn unto our fathers from days of old" (Micah vii. 20).

The song of Zechariah at the circumcision of John the Baptist:

"The mercy promised to our fathers, and remember His holy covenant: The oath which He sware to our father Abraham" (Luke i. 72, 73),

carries this hope of restoration on into the N.T. The Lord on the eve of His death on the cross took the cup connected with the Passover, and said, "This is My blood of the new covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 28). We can understand the believer who has never questioned traditional teaching accepting without demur that the new covenant is the basis of the Christian church, but it is difficult to understand how students of the Word, with all the evidence from Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel before them, cannot see that the new covenant is essentially associated with Israel's hope and restoration.

We hope that readers will realise the fact that the law of Moses can be better understood in the light of the prophets who enforce its claims, denounce those who break it, and who see afar off its realization in the blood and righteousness of Him Who was given as a covenant for the people, and that this series on the Prophets may be read together with the series on *Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth* with profit.

Studies in the Prophets.
NO.3.
"To obey is better than sacrifice"

May 1927

We have seen that departure from the covenant is at the bottom of Israel's dispersion and loss of blessing. The first clause of that covenant which Israel broke is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me" (Exod. xx. 3). This command is comprehensive and includes all the moral law. Alas, Israel imagined that God could be placated with sacrifices and soothed with incense, forgetting that the mere externals of a divine religion are valueless and vain without heart obedience. It has ever been the same. Saul the king was reminded of this vital truth by Samuel in the words of I Sam. xv. 22, 23:

"Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offering and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams, for rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king."

Here we have an epitome of Israel's failure, ending in rejection. The same spirit was manifested by the Pharisees in the days of the Lord on earth, for He said to them:

"But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13).

"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes 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 out a gnat, and swallow a camel" (Matt. xxiii. 23, 24).

In these words the Lord teaches (1) A complete agreement with the testimony of the prophets, as we are about to see; (2) A revelation of the spiritual character of the "weightier matters of the law," viz., judgment, mercy, and faith; (3) A full confirmation of the ceremonial law of Moses, by the added words, "these ought ye to have done." Here the Lord's attitude is seen to be in opposition to the critical theory that the prophets were opposed to a priestly caste who sought to impose a ceremonial system upon Israel. This we must remember as we read the scathing words of the prophets. They do not in any sense question the divine origin of the sacrificial law, they only tear off the hypocrite's cloak of mere ritual observance that but hides disobedience and corruption within. Indeed, it is the testimony of the selfsame prophets that when Israel are blessed under the new covenant, and obey with the new heart, that instead of repudiating sacrifice and offering they shall then for the first time offer them with true acceptance (*see* Jer. xvii. 21-27; Psa. li. 19; Mal. iii. 3).

The testimony of Isaiah.

The opening message of Isaiah reveals the condition of Israel. They had "rebelled," they did not "know or consider," they had "forsaken" the Lord, and had "gone away backward" (Isa. i. 2-4). The result was that the blessings of the covenant were taken from them: "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire; your land, strangers devour it in your presence" (Isa. i. 7). Had it not been for a very small remnant, Israel would have been overthrown like Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa. i. 8, 9). This reference to the doomed cities of the plain is now taken up to characterize the moral condition of Israel, and it is here that the great repudiation of sacrifice and offering comes:

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? saith the Lord; I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats" (Isa. i. 11).

The "treading" of the Lord's courts (Isa. i. 12) by such offerers is really a "trampling" (*see* the word in 2 Kings vii. 17; ix. 33; Dan. viii. 7; Isa. lxiii. 6). Their oblations are called "vain," their incense instead of ascending as a sweet smell is called "an abomination," their solemn assemblies were "unbearable" and "a weariness." The reason for all this is not found in the offerings themselves, they remained as ever the command of the Lord, and types of the great offering of Christ: the reason is found in the moral condition of the offerers, "Your hands are full of blood" (Isa. i. 15). Instead of making ceremonial observances a refuge, Israel is urged to repentance:

"Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before Mine eyes; cease to do evil.; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow . . . though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow. . . if ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword" (Isa. i. 16-20).

To the same effect, and with apparent reference to this passage, are the words of James i. 26, 27:

"If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

No explanation is offered in Isa. i. as to how Israel's sins which were as scarlet should ever be as white as snow, but in the next reference to which we turn, a step nearer to its understanding is provided. Before passing from the teaching of this first chapter we should notice the parallel testimony of the last chapter, viz.:

"To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at My word" (Isa. lxvi. 2).

Apart from this spirit the very offering of sacrifices is wickedness:

"He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol" (Isa. lxvi. 3).

The whole sequence of thought expressed in these two chapters on this subject, and in those about to be considered in Isaiah, is wonderfully expressed in Psa. li.: "Blot out"; "wash me"; "whiter than snow"; "Thou desireth truth in the inward parts"; "Thou desireth not sacrifice"; "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise"; "Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness," i.e., when Jerusalem is rebuilt, and Israel restored. How this blotting out and washing whiter than snow can be accomplished Isaiah shows.

The second half of Isaiah proceeds upon the assumption of redemption. *Gaal* ("to redeem") occurs in Isaiah for the first time in xliii. 1. "The redeemed" are mentioned for the first time in Isa. xxxv. 9, and "the Redeemer" for the first time in Isa. xli. 14, and as these different words occur over twenty times in the second half, which deals with Israel's restoration, and not once in the first half, it becomes evident that Israel can have no hope of restoration "by the deeds of the law," but are shut up to that new covenant which finds its strength and its sanction in the precious blood of Christ. For the sake of clearness we point out that the word "redeem" in Isa. i. 27 and xxix. 22 are not translations of *gaal*, the word that is used so much of the redemption accomplished by the great kinsman, the man Christ Jesus.

Coming then to Isaiah xliiii., and remembering that there the people are addressed in verse I as "redeemed," the Lord says:

"But thou hast not called upon Me, O Jacob; but thou hast been weary of Me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought Me the small cattle of thy burnt-offerings; neither hast thou honoured Me with thy sacrifices. I have not caused thee to serve with an offering nor wearied thee with incense. Thou hast bought Me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled Me with the fat of thy sacrifices; but thou hast made Me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied Me with thine iniquities. I, even I, am HE THAT BLOTTETH OUT THY TRANSGRESSIONS FOR MINE OWN SAKE" (Isa. xliiii. 22-25).

It is evident from this passage that the Lord had no further use for the sacrifices of bulls and goats until this people were blessed and redeemed by a more perfect sacrifice, and called under the terms of a better covenant. By so saying we but paraphrase the teaching of the epistle to the Hebrews, where both covenant and sin-offering are "set aside" by reason of a "better," viz., "the blood of the everlasting covenant."

The next reference to the offerings takes us into the very heart of the subject, for we must turn to Isa. liii.:

"When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin. . . . He shall hear their iniquities. . . . He bear the sin of many" (verses 10-12).

But Isa. liii. is too full, too deep, too sacred a passage to deal with as one of many in an article of this character. The connection with our theme is obvious, and we would rather leave it there, reserving a fuller study of the passage for another time. That it is vitally connected with the restoration of Israel a glance at the context will show:

"Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion. . . . O captive daughter of Zion. . . . My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause. . . . the Lord hath comforted His people, He hath redeemed Jerusalem. . . . For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of My peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee" (Isa. lii.-liv.).

Jeremiah's testimony is not so full as that of Isaiah upon this subject, but what he does say is to the point:

"Hear, O earth; behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto My words, nor to My law, but rejected it. To what purpose cometh there to Me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto Me" (Jer. vi. 19, 20).

"I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or SACRIFICES, but this thing commanded I them, saying, OBEY My voice" (Jer. vii. 22, 23).

Sinai's law was given and the covenant made before sacrifices and offerings were elaborated. Here we have in another form the age-abiding truth, "to obey is better than sacrifice." In I Cor. xiii. "obey" is translated into "love," for all the law is fulfilled by love, and there again to give one's body to be burned is nothing without love. To love is better than martyrdom, and charity than the fat of rams. Closely parallel with Jeremiah's testimony is that of Hosea:

"For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings, but like men they have transgressed the covenant" (Hos. vi. 6, 7).

"They sacrifice flesh for the sacrifices of Mine offerings, and eat it, but the Lord accepteth them not; now will He remember their iniquity, and visit their sins; they shall return to Egypt. For Israel hath forgotten his Maker, and buildeth temples" (Hos. viii. 13, 14.).

The great things of the law were counted strange, Israel forgot his Maker, yet such is human nature, though the great things of the law were counted strange, and the weighty matters of the law (judgment,

mercy and faith) were omitted, yet they multiplied sacrifices, and though Israel forgot his Maker, *he built temples*. Unless the Lord find a temple in the heart of His people, what temple on earth can please Him, what society represent Him, what "church" manifest Him? Is Israel alone in this mistaken zeal for sacrifice and temple? Are we not all liable to be taken up with externals, and the tithing of mint? That the offering itself, when presented in the right spirit, is a type of a precious experience is manifested by comparing the words of Hos. ix. 3 and 4:

"They shall not dwell in the Lord's land."

"They shall not offer wine offerings unto the Lord."

An accepted people can offer an accepted offering, but a wicked and disobedient people turn all such symbols into abominations and cloaks for Pharisees. Amos says to Israel:

"Bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes after three years, and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free offerings, for this liketh you, O ye children of Israel, saith the Lord God. I *also* have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places" (Amos iv. 4-6).

It was right to bring sacrifices every morning, for this was the law (Numb. xxviii.); it was equally right to bring tithes after three years (Deut. xiv. 28). Even the presence of the leaven in the thank-offering was according to the law (Lev. vii. 13), all was in order; "the form of godliness" was intact, it was "the power thereof" that was denied. So in the next chapter, "the Lord, Whose name is the God of hosts," says:

"I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer Me burnt-offerings. . . I will not accept them. . . let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Have ye offered unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" (Amos v. 21-25).

They had apparently expressed a desire for the coming of the day of the Lord, for the same chapter says:

"Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! To what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light" (Amos v. 18).

Here we perceive the difference between believing the "Second Advent," and "loving His appearing," and the same distinction permeates the teaching of the prophets in connection with the offerings. By the time Malachi uttered his message, even this external punctiliousness had disappeared. The blind, the lame, the sick were used for the offerings. The table of the Lord was held to be contemptible. They sacrificed unto the Lord a corrupt thing, meet exhibition of the corruptness within. The sepulchres had ceased even to be whitened. The tithes had been withheld, and Israel was cursed with a curse.

Whilst we have no ceremonial whatever, and whilst our all in all is Christ Himself, let us read the epistles written for our instruction, and realize that though called with quite another calling, the flesh in the redeemed member of the body of Christ is the same flesh that manifested itself without mercy in Israel's sacrifices, and without the knowledge of God in their burnt offerings.

Studies in the Prophets.

NO.4.

Times and Seasons.

July 1927

The great burden of the Prophets is Israel's restoration, its basis is the new covenant, and its blessings can only be enjoyed by a new heart. So far we have seen. Another item that must of necessity be considered is that of time. All events that happen within human ken must be related to space and time. *The place where* this restoration takes place we must consider, but for this present article we will look into the question of *the time when* this promised blessing shall take place.

When we speak of time in connection with prophecy, we must remember that we have no warrant from Scripture to fix dates. It is a pathetic sight to see upon a second-hand bookstall, books that most solemnly and seriously fix the date of the Lord's return, and the end of the age, all discarded and self-condemned. Such attempts are foredoomed to failure. We should remember the reply of the Lord to His disciples when they enquired concerning the time of Israel's restoration, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts i. 7). What is provided for us in the word of prophecy is a sequence of events which must be fulfilled, and as we by faith see this fulfilment of Scripture, we are exhorted to look up, and lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh (Luke xxi. 28).

It ought not to be necessary, yet for clearness sake we would state that this passage from Luke, while providing us with a principle of interpretation, is not quoted here as though the hope of our calling is in any way connected with Israel's restoration, other than the broad inference that if *Israel's* time of blessing is obviously near, how much nearer must our own hope be. We are therefore to look into the prophets to note any features concerning the period of restoration, and shall expect that as these particulars accumulate, so the time of Israel's restoration will become more clear. Among the expressions that recur in this connection are (1) "The day of the Lord," (2) "In that day," and (3) "In the last days," or "In the latter days."

Prophetic periods in Isaiah.

The first reference to prophetic periods in Isaiah is that of chapter ii. Here we read of "the last days," "in that day," and "the day of the Lord of hosts." If we are to give careful examination of these passages, Isa. ii. will occupy the remainder of our available space. We feel, however, that the reader will be better served if we continue to take a broader view, and give a general impression. Therefore we shall assume that the passages will be studied and read while we content ourselves with outlines and salient points.

Isaiah ii.

- A.** In the last days (1-5).
- B.** a. The Lord's house exalted. All nations flow.
b. Many people say. Come ye, let us go . . . we will walk.
a. The Lord shall judge among the nations.
b. O house of Jacob, Come ye, let us walk.
- C.** 6-9. The land full of idols.
- D.** 10. Enter into rock, and hide in dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty.
- A.** In that day The Lord of hosts. (11-17)
- B.** a. The lofty humbled. The Lord alone exalted.
b. The day of the Lord of hosts "upon" ten features of human pride.
a. The loftiness of man bowed down. The Lord alone exalted.
- C.** 18. The idols shall utterly pass away.
- D.** 19-21. Go into holes of rocks, and caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty.

This brief analysis brings forward several features which are severally expanded in the remainder of the prophets:

1. The exaltation of the mountain of the Lord's house, and
2. The exaltation of the Lord Himself.
3. The coming of the nations to learn of the law from Jerusalem.
4. The abolition of war.
5. The abolition of idols.
6. The terror of man.

7. The shaking of the earth.

Passing over several allusions to the condition of the people, and the final blessedness of Israel and Jerusalem that occur in chapters iii. and iv., we notice another full statement in chapters xi. and xii.:

"In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and His rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of His people. . . and He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. . . . and there shall be an highway for the remnant of His people, which shall be left, from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt" (xi. 10-16).

One or two more important items are added here, which we will indicate:

1. This restoration is connected with some One who is a descendant of Jesse.
2. The ensign mentioned suggests the protection of a kinsman.
3. The Gentiles are again included.
4. There is a comparison between the exodus from Egypt, and the great restoration of the future,

This section of Isaiah is brought to a conclusion in chapter xii.

- A And in that day thou shalt say,
 - B O Lord, I will praise Thee. God is my salvation. The Lord Jehovah is my strength.
 - C And my song.
- A And in that day ye shall say,
 - B Praise the Lord. Declare His doings.
 - C I Sing unto the Lord.

Here is the song of Moses and the Lamb, for there is a linking of the song sung by the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 2) with the song of triumph of the Revelation, this of course being but an expansion of the truth already expressed in Isa. xi. 16. This will prepare us to find parallels between the day of the Lord, and its characteristics with earlier deliverances of Israel. We shall find that both Pharaoh, and Sennacherib, and Egypt, and Babylon foreshadow the beast of the Apocalypse. Moses and Aaron foreshadow the two witnesses, and the plagues of Egypt anticipate the vials of wrath, the one being the activities under the old covenant, which covenant Israel broke, the other being the result of the new covenant which cannot be broken. The very next chapter (Isa. xiii.) is occupied with Babylon, and speaks of its overthrow in the day of the Lord. This overthrow is accompanied by apocalyptic signs:

"Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger. . . . the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in His going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. . . . Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place. . . . and Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah" (Isa. xiii. 6-22).

In chapter xiv. 12-14 the king of Babylon foreshadows the pride and the fall of the great adversary himself. Passing to chapter xxvi. we come to another prophetic song in which the title "The Lord Jehovah" comes as in the song of chapter xii. Chapter xxvii. devotes one verse to the slaying of the dragon, and then takes up again a song of redeemed Israel, where the words come, "Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit" (verse 6). And once again at the end of the chapter is a reference to the exodus from Egypt as a prophetic type. Several other items will bring Isaiah's testimony to a conclusion. The deaf hear, and the blind see (xxix. 18), thus indicating the reversal of vi. 10. Isa. xxx. 22-26 shows that in that day idolatry shall be abolished (as we saw in chapter ii.), plentiful increase shall be upon the earth for man and beast, and the light of the sun shall be increased seven-fold, "in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound."

When we pass into the second section of Isaiah, prophecy concerning the day of the Lord is absent. This is quite in keeping with the two-fold teaching of the book, for prophecy is a light that shines in a dark place *until* the day dawns. Isaiah brings before us both vengeance and redemption, punishment and restoration, and while Israel as a nation occupy the foremost place, the nations are not forgotten or left out, in fact, one reference that we have passed over, namely Isa. xix. 24, 25, reveals that Israel shall be the third with Egypt and Assyria, whom the Lord shall bless saying:

"Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance."

Surely the day of the Lord, though cruel with fierce anger, is also a day of grace beyond our dreams, if this passage be, as it is, the Word of God. A fuller consideration of this phase will be more possible when we deal with the nations, and the land under separate titles. So far we have followed the witness of Isaiah. Jeremiah and Ezekiel add their quota, but the minor prophets are practically full of this theme. It is important enough to demand a separate notice, and so we hope to return to the subject in our next article.

Studies in the Prophets.

No.5.

Times and Seasons (cont).

Sept. 1927

We have found while studying the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah that the future deliverance of Israel in the day of the Lord is frequently compared with the first deliverance of Israel out of Egypt. This is repeated in Hosea:

"Therefore, behold, I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably with her...and she shall sing there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt" (Hos. ii. 14, 15).

The speaking "comfortably" is parallel with the opening of the restoration section of Isaiah xl.

"And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call Me *lshi* (that is my husband); and shalt call Me no more *Baali* (that is my Lord). For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name" (Hos. ii. 16, 17).

We have here stated in brief the marriage relationship of restored Israel and the abolishing of idolatry (both being vitally connected with the old covenant where idolatry and spiritual adultery are interchangeable terms), which are dealt with in Isaiah and other prophets at length.

"And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground: and I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth, and I will make them lie down in safety" (Hos. ii. 18).

This covenant of world-wide peace is followed by the betrothal of Israel unto the Lord: -

"And it shall come to pass in that day, I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens. . . . earth. . . . corn. . . . wine, and the oil, and great shall be the day of Jezreel" (Hos. ii. 21, 22).

Hosea's three children are brought forward at the close because of the prophetic intention of their names.

"And I will sow (Jezreel) her unto Me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy (*lo-ruhamah*): and I will say to them which were not My people (*lo-ammi*), Thou art My people; and they shall say, Thou art my God" (Hos. ii. 23).

Here the great repudiation is cancelled, restoration is complete, and the figure of "sowing" used here is parallel with the introduction of the new covenant (Jer. xxxi. 27-33), and partly explains the reason for the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii.). This day of *restoration* is literally, as well as symbolically, a day of *resurrection*, and this is more than suggested in Hos. vi. I, 2:

"Come, and let us return unto the Lord, for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up. After two days will He revive us, and in the *third day* He will *raise us up* and we shall live in His sight."

The great and terrible day of the Lord.

The prophet Joel contains some terrible descriptions of "that day." Joel introduces his prophecy by speaking of a great judgment that had fallen upon the earth in the form of locusts, which devoured the fruits of the earth (i. 4), and of the invasion of a great army that laid the land waste (i. 6, 7); and of the withholding of the meat offering and of the drink offering in the house of the Lord (i. 8-13).

"Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come" (Joel i. 15).

The second chapter elaborates this awful character of the day of the Lord:

"A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations" (Joel ii. 2).

The words used here are parallel with the statement of Dan. xii.1 concerning the "time of trouble," and the description of this invading army given in Joel ii. 3-11, especially the effect upon the heavens, the sun, moon and stars, shows that no ordinary army is intended:

"And the Lord shall utter His voice before His army: for His camp is very great: for He is strong that executeth His word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" (Joel ii. 11).

The next reference provides God's own interpretation of the meaning and dispensational position of the day of Pentecost, for Peter quoted the book of Joel in explanation:

"And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My spirit upon all flesh. . . . and I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call" (Joel ii. 28-32).

With this passage before us, and with the authority of the inspired apostle, we can unhesitatingly

say that Pentecost:

1. Directly anticipates the great and terrible day of the Lord.
2. That dispensationally, Acts ii. and Revelation i. are joined together as one subject, and
3. That the company of believing Jews who came out on the day of Pentecost, and were "added to the church," were the "remnant" of O.T. prophecy spoken of in Isa. i. 9; xi. 11; Micah ii. 12; Zech. viii. 12.

The recognition of these facts, and the due appreciation of Eph. i.-iii. must surely dispose of the tradition that the church which is His Body began at *Pentecost*.

The gathering of Israel for blessing is the signal for the gathering of the nations for judgment:

"For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down in the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for My people. . . . whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted My land . . . the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision. . . . And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountains shall drop down new wine. . . ." (Joel iii.).

This reverses the period of barrenness indicated in Joel i., where the meat offering and drink offering failed (*see also* Joel ii. 21-27).

The day of holiness unto the Lord.

The grand object of the day of the Lord is the establishment upon the earth of a holy people. All the instruments used have this as their goal. The restoration of Israel, the marriage relationship of Israel, the burning judgments that descend upon Israel, all lead to this end. This is implied in a brief statement of Obadiah:

"For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen. . . . but upon Mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions. And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble. . . ." (Obad. 15-18).

Here we have the gathering out of the kingdom of those that offend, Israel's deliverance and restoration, and the statement "There shall be holiness." The prophet that speaks much of Israel's restoration, and concludes with their position of holiness unto the Lord, is Zechariah. Tracing the steps in this prophet which lead to this goal, we observe the references to "the day." The Lord, choosing Jerusalem again, and dwelling in the midst of Israel, brings about the gathering of the nations, and Israel's holiness (Zech. ii. 11-13). This last feature is set forth under the figure of the High Priest in Zech. iii. 1-7 (*note* verse 2). In Zech. iii. 9 we read, "I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day." This is followed by Israel entering into her possessions in peace. "In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, shall ye call every man his neighbour under *the vine* and under *the fig tree*" (Zech. iii. 10). It is a pity that the chapter ends here. What is it that comes to mind when thinking of Israel, and "the vine" and "the fig" are mentioned? Why, the "olive." This occupies chapter iv., and reveals the fact that Israel's restoration cannot be accomplished by leagues, parliaments, or movements, but by the Spirit of the Lord. Grace will as surely be manifested in Israel's restoration as in Gentile salvation (Zech. iv. 6, 7).

The three closing chapters, xii., xiii. and xiv., are very full with regard to the character of "that day." This day is spoken of about twenty times in these three chapters, and "Jerusalem" still more frequently, showing how closely this prophetic period is associated with that city, and all connected with it. First we read that the Lord will make Jerusalem "a cup of trembling" and "a burdensome stone" for all people (Zech. xii. 2, 3). Then, the nations that besiege the beloved city are smitten with madness, and Israel comes into favour with God (Zech. xii. 4, 5). A parallel comes next with Obadiah 17, 18, where the restoration of Israel is synonymous with the burning up of the stubble of the nations. Judah is saved first, and upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem is poured a spirit of grace and supplication, and, saith the Lord, "They shall look upon Me Whom they have pierced" (Zech. xii. 10).

There follows this national mourning for the crucifixion of the Messiah, the opening of a fountain "for sin and for uncleanness" (Zech. xiii. 1). The very remembrance of idolatry shall be blotted out, and the unclean spirit shall pass out of the land. Chapter xiv. reverts to the day of battle of which Jerusalem shall be the centre, and the coming of the Lord to the mount of Olives for Israel's deliverance. Living waters are to flow from Jerusalem into the dead sea, wondrous symbol of the blessings of that day. Then after a reference to the nations and their relation to restored Jerusalem, we have the closing words both of Zechariah, and the day of the Lord;

"In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses,

HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD;

and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take them, and seethe therein; and in that day there shall be

NO MORE THE CANAANITE

in the house of the Lord of hosts" (Zech. xiv. 20, 21).

Israel's history in its turn is symbolic of the race, the universe, the individual, and the church, for although each has a separate path and individual destiny, yet in broad outline "Holiness unto the Lord" and "No more Canaanite"; "Jacob shall possess their possessions" and "There shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau"; "The mystery of Godliness" and "The mystery of iniquity"; "The kingdom of the Lord," and "The kingdoms of this world" are so many facts indicating the one great conflict and goal. The course and the destinies of the two seeds are vividly set forth in this people of signs and symbols, and the day of the Lord foreshadows a yet greater day, the sequence being suggested in 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12 and 18. "The day of the Lord"; "The day of God"; "The day of the age."

Studies in the Prophets.

No.6.

The nation and the nations.

Nov.1927

Israel, though a separate nation, can never be separated from the nations, and a due recognition of this apparent paradox would, humanly speaking, have saved Israel from their pharisaic exclusiveness, while enabling them to maintain their true exclusiveness as the Lord's appointed channel of blessing. This two-fold relationship is the first feature of Israel's calling.

"And I will make of thee *a great nation*. . . and in thee shall *all families* of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 2, 3 and xviii. 18).

Among the peculiar characteristics of Israel as a nation may be indicated the following;

1. A kingdom of priests, and an holy nation (Exod. xix. 6).
2. This nation is Thy people (Exod. xxxiii. 13).
3. Not reckoned among the nations (Numb. xxiii. 9).
4. A nation so great by reason of the presence of the Lord, and the possession of His law (Deut. iv. 7, 8).
5. Taken as a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and wonders (Deut. iv. 34).
6. This nation shall reign over many nations (Deut. xv. 6).
7. This nation shall be set on high above all nations (Deut. xxvi. 19).

Among the nations whose destinies are intimately bound up with that of Israel, and which are mentioned by name in the prophets, are the following;

AMMON (Gen. xix. 88; Neh. ii. 10; Isa. xi. 14).
ARABIA (Isa. xxi. 13; Neh. ii. 19).
ASHKENAZ (Gen. x. 3; Jer. li. 27).
ASSYRIA (ASSHUR) (Gen. x. 11 (margin); 2 Kings; Ezra. vi. 16-22).
BABYLON (Gen. x. 10; 1 and 2 Kings; Ezra. v. 13-17).
CANAAN (Gen. xi. 31 ; Psa. cv. 11).
CHALDEA (Gen. xi. 28; Isa. xiii. 19; Hab. i. 6).
CUSH (ETHIOPIA) (Gen. x. 6 ; Isa. xviii. 1; Ezek. xxx. 5).
DEDAN (Gen. x. 7; Ezek. xxv. 13).
EDOM (Gen. xxxvi. 1; Jer. ix. 26).
EGYPT (MIZRAIM) (Gen. x. 6; Isa. xix. 25).
ELAM (Gen. x. 22; Isa. xi. 11; Jer. xlix. 39).
GOG, MAGOG AND GOMER (Gen. x. 2; Ezek. xxxviii. 21).
GRECIA (JAVAN) (Gen. x. 2; Isa. lxvi. 19; Zech. ix. 13).
LIBYA (PHUT) (Gen. x. 6; Ezek. xxvii. 10; Dan. xi. 43).
LUD (Gen. x. 22; Isa. lxvi. 19; Ezek. xxvii. 10).
MESHECH (Gen. x. 2; Ezek. xxvii. 13).
PERSIA (Ezra. i. 1; Dan. viii. 20; Ezek. xxxviii. 5).
SEBA (Gen. x. 7; Isa. xliii. 3).
SHEBA (Gen. x. 7; 1 Kings x. 1; Isa. Ix. 6).
TUBAL (Gen. x. 2; Isa. lxvi. 19).
TARSHISH (Gen. x. 4; Isa. ii. 16, lxvi. 19).

Here is a list of twenty-four different nations that figure in prophecy. It does not pretend to be complete, for it has been compiled in circumstances that prevent access to books of reference, but it is sufficiently full for our immediate purpose. Considered as a list of names it can serve no spiritual purpose, but if this list of names shall compel us to accept a true canon of interpretation, then its compilation shall not indeed have been in vain. First as to the spiritualizing of such names. We know that sometimes names of nations or cities must be understood spiritually or figuratively. As a case in point we note Isa. i. 10, where the prophet addresses the rulers and people of Israel under the title, "Ye rulers of Sodom, and ye people of Gomorrah." While, therefore, we must allow for this use of names, it is nevertheless the exception and not the rule. It cannot be denied by anyone who shall take the trouble to consult the references to this list of names, that in the great majority of cases these names must be taken literally, and refer to actual nations on the earth.

The second feature of importance that must strike the reader is the number of these names that go back to the great ethnic chapter Gen. x. Chronologically Gen. x. immediately precedes Gen. xii., the nations, and the *nation*. The prophets, by speaking of these nations as figuring in the yet future day of the Lord, assert an unbroken unity of purpose; that the nations of Gen. x. and the nation of Gen. xii. are too intimately connected to be omitted from our reckoning, and link the book of Genesis with the book of the Revelation, thereby indicating that all Scripture that relates to the earthly side of the purpose of the ages is one and undivided.

The third feature is suggested by the names in this list that are put into brackets. The English version

gives the modern name to several of these ancient nations. Phut is Libya. Javan is Greece. Mizraim is Egypt. Cush is Ethiopia. These peoples are still in existence, and present no difficulty. When we look at the remainder of the list a two-fold problem is present.

1. Some names have become entirely obsolete. We have no precise information that will enable us to put our finger on the map and say "there, in such a place, this people are to be found." Yet these unknown peoples are spoken of by the prophets in the same breath with those of whose existence and continuance we are assured.
2. Modern names are not to be found. We look in vain for Great Britain, France, Germany, and the like. That does not prove that these nations are not there however. Be it noticed that we did not say modern *nations* are not to be found, but modern *names*.

If we search the Hebrew *O.T.* from beginning to end, we shall not find the name "God" mentioned once. The reader will immediately reply, that seeing that the word "God" is English, and the Hebrew word for God is "El," that does not prove that God Himself is unnamed. So with the nations of prophecy. He who could inspire the prophets with such peculiar accuracy to speak of events so far remote from their own day, could have easily caused Isaiah or Jeremiah to have given modern names to the nations spoken of. But what good purpose would this have served? The ancient nomenclature serves as a veil in some instances, so that the responsibility of the nations for their actions shall be in no sense influenced, but as surely as the nation of Israel must come into touch with the nations of the earth now in existence, so surely must these old names of Hebrew Scripture belong to many of them.

To take an example that is fairly generally known. Gomer, the son of Japheth, is named in the prophets, yet what nation does that name represent to-day? It is usually accepted that Gomer, who is called Gimirra by the Assyrians, and Kimmerii by the Greeks, and Cimbri by the Romans, is the name of the Welsh or Celtic race. The Jews have always maintained that Ashkenaz refers to Germany. Tubal is connected with a people that travelled from the Black Sea to Sicily, Spain, &c.

Without joining the ranks of those who undertake to give dates for prophetic events, we realize that it is not possible for the tribulation and restoration of Israel to take place without some reference to that nation that framed the "Balfour Declaration," whose army freed Jerusalem from the Turk, and who received the mandate for Palestine from the League of Nations. This people will follow their own ways, and be under no constraint by reason of the teaching of prophecy, any more than Israel were compelled to sin, yet nevertheless did so in full accord with the prophetic Word which was in their hands. Under one or more of their ancient names all modern nations come, and however many and multifarious the nations of the earth may appear, their number is in reality 70, and their habitations are fixed with regard to Israel and Israel's hope (Deut. xxxii. 8). It will be readily understood that a detailed examination of the teaching of the prophets lies quite outside the scope of these articles; we can but give a brief word by way of example.

The nation and the nations.

Under the title "The day of the Lord" we have quoted Isa. ii. 2 and noticed that when the Lord's house is established "*all nations* shall flow unto it." Zech. xiv. 16 gives in fuller detail:

"It shall come to pass, that everyone that is left of *all the nations* which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast or tabernacles."

Speaking of Israel, the Lord says:

"I will send those that escape of them unto *the nations*, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard My fame, neither have seen My glory; and they shall declare My glory among *the Gentiles*" (Isa. lxvi. 19).

Thus shall the evangelization of the world be really accomplished. There is, moreover, the precious promise of Isa. xxv. 7:

"And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over *all nations*."

The reader must pursue this marvellous theme in the prophets in order to discover the many features of judgment and blessing that are in store for the nations of the earth. Moreover, the tracing out of the prophetic statements concerning anyone of the nations cannot fail to be illuminating. The prophetic witness concerning Assyria and Egypt is particularly valuable. Enough has been brought forward to demonstrate the fact that the hope of Israel *as a nation* (Jer. xxxi. 36), and the nations of the earth are to be taken literally, and the discerning student will not fail to see how this literal interpretation cannot be withheld from the sequel to the O.T. prophets concerning "the hope of Israel" contained in the Gospels, the Acts, many of the Epistles, and the book of the Revelation, neither will he fail to appreciate the fact

that those epistles which professedly deal with a "mystery" hidden from the ages and the generations, which know neither Greek nor Jew, which look to heaven itself for their sphere of blessing- and citizenship, cannot possibly be "all one and the same" in doctrine, dispensation, and destiny with the subjects of the O.T. Prophets.

Redemption. New Series.

#8. A fresh enquiry into the meaning of redemption. pp. 25 - 31

Whether we listen to the Evangelist, read the everyday Christian writer, or ponder the deeper theological volumes, we shall find that redemption is used interchangeably with atonement, salvation, reconciliation, or any and all of the blessings of life, peace and forgiveness that flow from the sacrifice of Christ.

The one offering and the many.

The confusion (for such we believe it to be) is in measure due to the fact that one side of truth has been apprehended at the expense of the other. In the O.T. we find a series of offerings, including offerings that have as their primary feature acceptable and fragrant surrender, as in the whole burnt offering, offerings that as a sacrifice for sin are burned to ashes outside the camp, the annual offering of the day of atonement, the daily offerings of the morning and evening sacrifice, the Passover lamb offered at Israel's deliverance. These and the rest not mentioned are all included in the one great antitypical offering of Christ "once for all".

By the same offering He offered Himself as a sweet smelling savour unto God, died under the curse of the law, was made sin for us who knew no sin, made peace through the blood of His cross, and became the great propitiation. It is fundamental to see that all O.T. typical sacrifices are embraced in the offering of the cross. It is nevertheless the starting point of much error to confuse these varied aspects of His one great work.

Redemption distinct from atonement.

For the time being we leave unquestioned the word atonement, using it to cover the whole range of offerings instituted by Moses and offered "for sin", "for cleansing", and "for acceptance". The point we wish to make clear at the moment is that redemption is to be considered as belonging to a class by itself, and is not to be confounded with the remaining offerings which for present convenience we classify under the heading atonement. The distinction we seek to prove may be visualized if we briefly consider the history of the offerings connected with Israel, proofs of a more definite character being given later.

For our purpose, Israel's history commences in Egyptian bondage. One offering, and one only, is connected with their *redemption* from the house of bondage; that is the Passover lamb. No priest is connected with this offering; no altar is sprinkled with its blood; no hands are placed upon its head; no atonement is made by it for sin; no acceptance is said to follow. This one offering is the only sacrifice connected with Israel offered in Egypt. Before another sacrifice is offered they must leave Egypt, and pass

through the Red Sea. All the other offerings, however they may differ in their individual purposes, are grouped together in that they deal with the sin of God's redeemed people. They are all associated with an altar and a priesthood, and have the sanctuary of God in view.

The failure rightly to divide the Word of truth, and to try the things that differ, increases in importance and disastrous effects as the truth under consideration increases in importance. No doctrine of Scripture is so fundamental as that of sacrifice, and consequently no greater opportunity occurs for erecting false theories than here. Over and over again one takes up a treatise that, starting with redemption, runs off into atonement. Proofs started with redemption and belonging only to redemption are mistakenly carried over, and triumphantly applied to reconciliation. It is indeed regrettable.

What is redemption? *Padah* and *Pesach*.

Having indicated what we believe to be a scriptural distinction, we will now proceed to proofs. Let us examine the words used for redemption, and the nature of the redemption effected. Three words demand attention, viz., *gaal*, *padah*, and *pesach*. In earlier papers we have seen that *gaal* indicates that redemption which is carried out by a kinsman, and the reader is referred to Volume XII, pages 109-115. There we found that the book of Ruth provides a full presentation of what is involved in the Kinsman-Redeemer, and that Christ as God manifest in the flesh, could alone satisfy all the scriptural statements on the subject. Passing therefore to the next word we will examine the Hebrew word *padah*.

The primary meaning of *padah* is "to sever, separate, or divide". In Exod. viii. 23 we read, "I will put a *division* between My people and thy people". "Division" is *p'doth*, the margin reads "a redemption", while the LXX gives *diastolen*, which occurs in Rom. iii. 22 as "difference". Again in Isa. xxix. 22 we read, "The Lord, Who redeemed Abraham". The LXX translates redeemed by *aphorisen* = "hath separated", which occurs in Matt. xiii. 49; Rom. i. 1; II Cor. vi. 17, etc. If we take a glance at the context of Isa. xxix., we shall find that immediately following the section xxix. 22-24 comes the woe pronounced upon those who *made a league with Egypt* (Isa. xxx. 1-17). Redemption involved separation and division from Egypt, and Abraham's separation is brought to mind as a word of warning. One other use of the word will suffice. In the name *Padan-Aram* it denotes that tract of country *separated* so markedly by the two rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and so called by the Greeks *Mesopotamia*, the land lying in the midst of the rivers.

The third woe we must consider is *pesach*. This word followed by *al* ("over") means to pass or leap over. In I Kings xviii. 26 we read, "and they leaped upon the altar". In Isa. xxxi. 5 we read, "As birds flying (or hovering) passing over He will preserve it". Spurrell's translation reads, "As hen birds fluttering springing forward and rescuing". In I Kings xviii. 21 the prophet cries, "How long *halt ye* between two

opinions?" and in II Sam. iv. 4; v. 6-8; ix. 13; xix. 26, either verb or adjective, the word is translated "lame".

The Passover was God's great stepping over of Israel, wherein He made a division and a difference (*padah*) between them and the Egyptians, and this effected by the Passover lamb typified that this redemption was that of the great Kinsman-Redeemer (*gaal*).

The testimony of Heb. ii.

The Lamb of God is Christ, and He in order to redeem became flesh and blood. As Kinsman-Redeemer His first great work was redemption, not atonement. Heb. ii. brings the Lord Jesus forward under three great aspects:--

1. Made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death not with sin in view, but with the redemption of the forfeited dominion given to Adam. "All things under His feet leading many sons to glory" (Heb. ii. 5-13).
2. Made like the children of flesh and blood, He came with the object of destroying the devil, with particular reference to His hold upon DEATH, and of delivering from its bondage those who were all their lifetime held in its fear. Again, sin is not in view.
3. Made like unto His brethren in all things, this time to deal with SINS, and therefore He is presented as a PRIEST, and makes a PROPITIATION for the sins of the PEOPLE.

Here the distinction is faithfully observed. *Redemption* touches (1) inheritance, (2) bondage; this we have shewn in earlier papers, and this is taught here in Heb. ii. 5-16. *Atonement* touches the sins of a redeemed people, and is connected with a priest. No unsaved person is related to atonement; this is exclusive to the redeemed.

The kinsman and the passover.

When God would teach by type the truth of the resurrection, He had one of two ways open before Him:--

1. To perform a miracle every time the sacrifice was offered.
2. To arrange the typical offering so that it would set forth with sufficient clearness the fact of death and resurrection, without any miraculous interposition.

The second way is the way adopted. One bird is killed in an earthen vessel over running water, and in order to set forth resurrection another living bird, together with hyssop, cedar-wood, and scarlet, is dipped into the blood and set free. The blood moreover was sprinkled (presumably with the hyssop) upon the leper who was to be cleansed, and the death and resurrection of the substitutes applied to him (Lev. xiv. 1-7).

The firstborn son in Scripture occupies a unique position—a position not only of privilege, but of responsibility. This can be seen manifested in the concern of Reuben for Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 30). Israel was the Lord's son, even His firstborn, and He warned Pharaoh that if he would not let Israel go, He would slay Pharaoh's firstborn. The

Passover lamb was not selected “for sin”, but “a lamb for *a house*”, and if a household were too small to be thus represented, they were to join with another. The house was connected with death, “There was not a house where there was not one dead” (Exod. xii. 30), which was as true of Israel as of Egypt, only that in Israel’s case the lamb died instead of the firstborn. It will be seen therefore that the Passover lamb really sets forth the Kinsman-Redeemer, the great Firstborn. Had the title of Christ “the *Prototokos*” (Col. i. 15) been read from this standpoint of the exodus and the Kinsman-Redeemer, much profitless and harmful speculation would never have seen the light.

The Passover is the great type of redemption in the Scriptures, “Thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord God redeemed thee thence” (Deut. xxiv. 18). Just as the sprinkling of the living bird with the blood by means of the hyssop spoke of resurrection, so the sprinkling of the doorposts with the blood by means of the hyssop spoke of redemption and deliverance.

Redemption and its object.

The Hebrew words *gaal* and *padah* occur some 170 times in the O.T. We read of redemption from Egypt, bondage, enemies, troubles, evil, destruction, death, and the grave. We have to the best of our ability searched the Scriptures, and have to record that out of all the places where *padah* and *gaal* occur, but one passage definitely associates *redemption with iniquity*, and that passage is Psa. cxxx. 8. There is no place where redemption is ever said to be for or from sin or sins. Now this statement of itself is so opposed to popular teaching and loose thinking that we doubt not that many readers will feel impelled to put the matter to the test before going further. If they do, it will transfer the responsibility to themselves that they keep redemption to its scriptural sphere.

There are several Greek words that stand as equivalents for *padah* and *gaal*; they are *rhuomai*, *lutroo*, *lutrosis*, *apolutrosis*, *agorazo*, and *exagorazo*. We must remember that these occur in the translation called the LXX, and though valuable beyond description, can never alter the original doctrine settled in the Hebrew originals. The LXX uses some of these Greek words in translating both redemption and atonement, and therefore great care must be exercised in deciding which is in view in any one N.T. passage. Examining their associations we find a people redeemed from the hand of their enemies, from the curse of the law, from vain conversation, but rarely redeemed from sin or sins. The resurrection is spoken of as the redemption of the body, the inheritance is spoken of as a purchased possession redeemed, the dominion of sin is broken by the deliverance from this body of death. Deliverance is moreover spoken of as from darkness, wrath, temptation, evil.

Titus ii. 14 quotes Psa. cxxx., where we read of redemption from all iniquity. Heb. ix. 15 speaks of redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant. Eph. i. 7 links redemption with forgiveness of sins, and Rom. iii. 24 with justification. These four passages are the only ones that actually associate redemption with sin or iniquity. The great provision for sin is expressed by atonement, and not by redemption. Titus ii. 14, with its emphasis upon the future coming of the Lord and the peculiar people, places

this passage in line with that redemption of Israel out of Egypt when they too were made a peculiar people (Exod. xix.). Heb. ix. 15 and Rom. iii. 24 have one thing in common, namely, “the sins of the past”. Eph. i. 7 associates redemption and forgiveness, but other scriptures reveal that forgiveness arose out of atonement made for a *redeemed people*. The bondage, the enemy, the evil, the curse, from which Israel were redeemed, are all so many scriptural titles of *death*.

Redemption and death.

Where the O.T. departs from mundane things like bondage, or enemies, it translates these not into terms of sin, but of *death*--

“I will ransom them from the power of the GRAVE; I will redeem them from DEATH” (Hosea xiii. 14).

“None can by any means redeem his brother that he should not see corruption Like sheep they are laid in the grave, death shall feed on them but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave” (Psa. xlix. 7-15).

“Deliver him from going down to the pit. I have found a ransom” (Job xxxiii.24).

“I know that my redeemer liveth and though worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God” (Job xix. 25, 26).

Redemption goes back beyond our own personal sins to the one sin of Adam that involved us all in death. “By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin” (Rom. v. 12). Redemption is found in Gen. iii.—“The seed of the woman”. Atonement is found in Gen. iv.—“The offering of Abel”. Gen. iii. speaks of the curse, of an enemy, of death. Gen. iv. speaks of sin, of acceptance. In Gen. iii. it is the Lord Who slays the animal and provides the protection, symbolizing the promise already given of the Seed who, while bruising the serpent’s head, should be bruised in the heel. That is redemption, and the issue is “the way of the tree of life’. In Gen. iv. it is man that brings the offering to God, and it is accepted or rejected according as it set forth the atonement of Christ or not. The issue here is acceptance.

Throughout Scripture redemption and atonement are kept distinct. While we have seen that the Passover lamb sets forth the work of Christ as redeemer, we still have to look for some scriptural expression that shall visualize for us just what part of the exodus reveals the inner meaning of redemption. The moment we describe in one word the passage of Israel out of Egypt, we use the scriptural word we are in search of.

(To be continued).

#9. A fresh enquiry into the meaning of redemption. pp. 55 - 58

It has been the policy of *The Berean Expositor* not only to seek the truth, but to so write that true "Bereans" may have the fullest opportunity of "searching and of seeing whether these things are so". The word *exodus* is, as we know, the name given to the second book of Moses in the Greek translation known as the LXX. It is therefore no part of O.T. Scripture. It occurs however in the N.T. Peter speaks of his "decease" in II Pet. i. 15, and uses the word *exodus*. Heb. xi. 22 speaks of Joseph mentioning the "departing" or *exodus* of Israel. The passage however from which light comes is Luke ix. 31, its first occurrence. This has reference to the transfiguration of the Lord. Moses and Elijah were seen together with the Lord, and the subject of their conversation was "His *exodus* which He should accomplish at Jerusalem".

Both Moses and Elijah were personally interested in the idea of the *exodus*, for singularly they both experienced it symbolically. Is it merely a coincidence that both Moses and Elijah passed through divided waters at a crisis in their lives?

"Lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it: and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea" (Exod. xiv. 16).

"They two stood by Jordan. And Elijah took his mantle, and wrapped it together, and smote the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, so that they two went over on dry ground" (II Kings ii. 7, 8).

The passage through the Red Sea was a symbol of death and resurrection. Paul says that there Israel were "baptised into Moses" (I Cor. x. 2). This same Paul taught that the symbol of water baptism had the same message. It baptized into Christ, and if into Christ then into His death and resurrection (Rom. vi. 3-5).

Redemption from the house of bondage was by the blood of the Passover lamb, and led down through the waters of the Red Sea up to the shore beyond, where Israel could sing the song of triumph. Redemption we learned put a "division" between Israel and the Egyptians. Where Israel passed through unhurt "the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned" (Heb. xi. 29). This marks the great division of the earth in connection with redemption. Israel are redeemed and come forth from their typical death. For them the blood had been shed. The Egyptians are drowned. They do not share the miraculous triumph over the symbolic grave. To them the Passover lamb was a self-confessed "abomination". For Israel there could be burnt offerings, sin offerings, and atonement, but not for the Egyptians. These offerings were for the redeemed and for the redeemer alone. Coming back to Gen. iii. and iv. we notice that the one who had no acceptable offering was Cain, equivalent to the Egyptian, the seed of the wicked one.

The believer and death.

“The wages of sin is death.” For the moment we will not press any particular meaning into the word “death”, but are sure that whatever a person may believe as to “eternal death”, “spiritual death”, and the like, that actual, literal, physical death cannot be eliminated from the wages of sin. Adam lived 930 years and he died. He returned to the dust from which he was taken (Gen. iii. 19). Death passed upon all men. Sin reigned unto death. In Adam all die. As we have said, conceding for argument’s sake that physical death is the smallest part of the results of sin—it is a part. Now if redemption was accomplished by Christ bearing the penalty attached to sin, and if physical death be but a part of that penalty, then if as the Calvinist sings:--

“Payment He cannot twice demand,
First at my bleeding Surety’s hand,
And then again at mine,”

no believer should ever die. We need no testimony or theory other than our own painful experience, that “There is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked As is the good, so is the sinner” (Eccles. ix. 12). Death, physical death, which came by Adam’s sin, is the common end of saint and sinner. What then is the blessing of redemption? *Life from the dead*. It is an *exodus*. It leads down into the symbolic grave of the Red Sea on its path to glory.

The Lord did not die to save us *from dying*, He died to save us *from death*. There is much teaching connected with this fact that must occupy our attention, but which lies outside the immediate scope of our enquiry. The great work of the kinsman Redeemer is expressed in I Cor. xv. 22, “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ, shall all be made alive”. The “all in Adam” are those for whom the great “division” and “stepping over” (*padah* and *pesach*) by the kinsman (*gaal*) has been made. It is impossible to predicate both *universality* and *division* of redemption, one or the other must be false. The doctrine of the two seeds, whether seen in Cain and Abel, or in Israel and the Egyptians, fits the whole case and cannot be ignored. Reconciliation and atonement cannot be deduced from redemption; they belong to an entirely different sphere. As related themes, we must deal with the teaching of the various sacrifices offered under the law, but such a study demands a section to itself.

A word may be necessary in conclusion on the occurrence of the word “redemption” in Heb. ix. 12, 15, because at first sight it would appear that the setting of these words contradicts our findings. The redemption of Heb. ix. 12 is an “aionian redemption”, and is connected with “the blood of the aionian covenant” (xiii. 20). Now this covenant is vitally connected with an “aionian inheritance” (ix. 15). An inheritance that was forfeited could only be regained by redemption, and inasmuch as transgressing the terms of the covenant was the occasion of the forfeiture, we have the strange expression, “the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant” (ix. 15), and in the

circumstances the apparent exceptional use of the word redemption is justified. This is seen the more clearly when we remember:--

1. Redemption deals with Adam, his sin, his forfeiture, his death, all of which pass through to his seed.
2. Israel in type set forth this in their failure to keep the terms of the old covenant. Consequently their recovery to favour, to inheritance, and to the blessings of the new covenant are also due to a redemption, but this time, for distinction, the inheritance is called aionian, the covenant aionian, and the redemption aionian.

A similar difficulty may arise over the occurrence of redemption in Rom. iii. 24. The previous verse says, "For all sinned, and are coming short of the glory of God". The two tenses "all sinned" and "are coming short" take the mind back to Adam's "sin", and then to individual "sins". *Sin* needs redemption: *sins* need propitiation; hence in verse 24 we have redemption followed by the "mercy seat" in verse 25. This observes the same order that we have pointed out already. The "mercy seat" is for none but a redeemed people.

It is only natural that the presentation of a new aspect of truth should be beset by difficulties. These arise both from lack of clarity on the part of the writer, and from the pressure of accepted teaching on the part of the reader. A pioneer will often make mistakes, but small retractions do not prove that the whole course is wrong. Our readers are not "babes" but *Bereans*, and we desire to be free to share our discoveries in divine truth while their freshness is unsullied by too much handling and paring. "We have redemption through His blood"—let us glorify Him by seeking a true understanding of this purchased of His cross.

#10. The way out and the way in. pp. 89 - 91

We have on different occasions found that a truth has been expressed in *The Berean Expositor*, but that owing to a somewhat compressed style of writing, which our limited space necessitates, such teaching has passed unheeded largely because we have not stayed long enough to give it prominence and expansion. In our last paper we sought to draw the distinction which is observable in Scripture between redemption and atonement, but feeling that the second aspect may not have been expressed fully enough, we give it space here.

The exodus.

Proof was given that redemption is the great exodus of the Lord's people. It leads them *out*, out of bondage, out of death, out of darkness, out of spiritual Egypt. We saw that redemption in its primary character is unconnected with altar, priest or tabernacle. Now if redemption is expressed by the Greek word *exodos*, the atonement may be expressed by the Greek word *eisodos*. This latter word occurs in Heb. x. 19-22:--

“Having therefore, brethren, boldness respecting the *eisodos*, the entrance into, the holiest by the blood of Jesus let us draw near.”

The same order may be observed in the epistle to the Ephesians, chapter i., exodos; chapter ii., eisodos.

REDEMPTION.—“In Whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins” (i. 7).

The word “forgiveness” (*aphesis*) is translated in Luke iv. 18 “deliverance” and “to set at liberty”. There is another word which should be reserved for the idea of “forgiveness”, which is used in Eph. iv. 32. Redemption leads out, it sets at liberty, it delivers.

ATONEMENT.—“Ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ” (ii. 13).

Here we have the complement to redemption. That leads us out, this leads us in.

Following redemption the Spirit seals with a view to the purchased inheritance. Following atonement the Spirit gives access and builds us up into a holy temple. It is not only helpful in a general sense, but it is also a scriptural principle, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. We will therefore give the testimony of Peter as well as of Paul.

REDEMPTION.—Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from (*ek*) your vain conversation but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (I Pet. i. 18, 19).

ATONEMENT.—“Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us (*pros*) to God” (I Pet. iii. 18).

Here we have once again redemption *from* and atonement *to*. The word “to bring” in I Pet. iii. 18 (*prosagoge*) is translated “access” in Eph. ii. 18. The same order and effect is observed in Titus ii. 14:--

“Who gave Himself for us, that He might *redeem* us FROM (*apo*) all iniquity, and purify *unto* Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”

John’s Gospel opens with the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and his Epistle opens with the cleansing power of the blood for all who have fellowship and the propitiation for their sins. The Gospel is in order that sinners may believe. The Epistle is in order that saints may know: redemption and atonement once again. Reconciliation does not arise out of redemption, but out of atonement. Moreover (in spite of the usual indiscriminate use of the term) atonement is not for unsaved sinners. None but the redeemed could have an interest in the atonement. Israel had first to be delivered from the thralldom of Egypt before they could learn of the way into the holiest.

The one offering of Christ, the once shed blood is both our redemption and our atonement, both our way *out* and our way *in*, but that does not mean that we are to be careless in the use of these solemn terms, or to allow false argument to be built up from their confusion. Gen. iii. and iv. present a similar sequence, Gen. iii. indicating redemption, and Gen. iv. atonement.

We do not intend making this a lengthy article, nor dealing with any other feature. We shall have to give attention to the teaching of both Old and New Testaments respecting the atonement, and the related offerings, but that we must do in another paper. Let us remember with gratitude the *exodos* and the *eisodos*, the leading *out* and the leading *in*, that are ours through the blood of Christ. We trust that the reader will, moreover, realize that we are here using the word “atonement” in a very general way, as a convenient term to set over against “redemption”.

#11. Atonement: a covering by cancellation. pp. 118 - 124

The essential difference between redemption and atonement has been discussed in preceding articles. It will, however, be convenient to include the study of the doctrine of atonement as a branch of the wider theme of redemption. This we now propose to do. A glance at the concordance reveals a long column of references under the word “atonement” for the O.T., but one reference only for the N.T., and if our concordance notifies us of the changes made in the R.V., we shall find that even that one N.T. reference disappears.

Atonement: is it a N.T. doctrine?

The alteration of the word “atonement” in the A.V. of Rom. v. 11 is justified on the ground of correct interpretation and the avoidance of false connections. The ordinary reader would naturally assume that Rom. v. 11 referred back to the O.T. equivalents. The Greek word translated atonement here is *katallage*, but whilst the LXX version uses more than twenty Greek words to translate the Hebrew word “atonement”, it never uses *katallage*. Apart from this possibility of making a false connection, *atonement* is quite as good a rendering as reconciliation, for the English word at the time of and preceding the A.V. bore the meaning *at-one-ment*, a meaning abundantly proved by more than one passage in Shakespeare. What does seem to be a pity is that the word was employed in the O.T. It is too deeply imbedded to think of removing or altering it, so we must rid our minds of anything that pertains merely to the English word, and seek the meaning warranted by studying the original. Before we do so, however, we must answer the question that arises, Is atonement a N.T. doctrine?

Now we can easily trip here. It does not follow that those who say that the atonement is not a N.T. doctrine deny the sacrificial work of Christ. What they mean is something like this: "The conception of the O.T. *atonement* is not full enough to set forth the actual work of Christ. That merely *covered* sin, He puts it away." If the Hebrew conception does really mean a mere covering up, then we are sure that Christ's work was something infinitely more blessed and perfect. We do not, however, believe this is a true presentation of the O.T. doctrine, and therefore reject it. On the other hand it does not follow that because the one word "atonement" is expunged by the R.V. that the doctrine itself is not found in the N.T. This we would prove in two ways. (1) by the presence of the actual word, and (2) by the presence of the results that alone follow it. By the presence of the actual word we mean of course the Greek equivalent, and not the English.

We must anticipate our O.T. investigation so far as to say that "mercy-seat" is from the Hebrew *kapporeth*, from *kaphar*, which is rendered "atonement" 72 times. Now the Greek translation of *kapporeth* is *hilasterion*, which is found in Heb. ix. 5. We read in Rom. iii. 25 that "God has set forth (Christ) as a propitiation through faith in His blood", and the word propitiation is *hilasterion* ("mercy-seat"). Moreover, *hilaskomai* and *hilasmos* are Septuagint renderings also of *kaphar*, and these occur in I John ii. 2 and iv. 10 where the epistle is not speaking of redemption, but *cleansing* by blood; of those who walk in the light, and who have an Advocate with the Father. Hence the word "propitiation" in these two passages speaks of atonement and atoning blood. So *hilaskomai* is used in Heb. ii. 17, where the R.V. alters the A.V. rendering to "propitiation". Here we have a series of definite references to the O.T. doctrine of atonement. But more than that, when the Lord used the word "ransom" in Matt. xx. 28, He used a word which is used several times to translate *kopher*, viz., *lutron*. So also the words *katharizo* and *katharismos* have undoubted reference to the atoning work of Christ, being used by the LXX to translate *kaphar*, and are used in such passages as the following:--

"When He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down" (Heb. i. 3).
"How much more shall the blood of Christ purged your conscience"
(Heb. ix. 14).
"If we walk in the light we have fellowship and the blood cleanseth"
(I John i. 7).

In each of the above passages one would be justified, with the O.T. rendering in view, to put the words "make atonement" where "purge" and "cleanse" occur. Moreover, *hagiazō* is used to translate *kaphar*, and brings in the many passages which speak of sanctification in connection with the blood Christ. To these examples must be added the *effects* of atonement such as "access", "fellowship", "acceptance", "made nigh", etc., which run through the teaching of the N.T. Surely we need go no further to find our answer to the question, Is atonement a N.T. doctrine, and does it describe adequately one phase of the work of Christ? If Christ be a propitiation, if He gave His life a ransom, if His blood cleanses and sanctifies the redeemed, then undoubtedly the O.T. doctrine of atonement as surely as the O.T. doctrine of redemption finds its fulfillment in the sacrifice and priestly ministry of Christ.

What does the O.T. word “atonement” mean?

There is hardly a student of Scripture worthy of the name who does not know that the Hebrew word translated atonement means “to cover”. It may therefore be deemed a waste of time to ask the question again. Yet when we say “to cover”, are we sure that we all mean the same thing? “To cover” may mean “to hide”, or “to conceal”; it also may mean “to shelter or protect”. It further means “to be sufficient for”, “to comprehend” and “to include”, “to compensate for damage done”. Which of these meanings do we intend when we say that atonement means “to cover”? That question can only be answered by an examination of the original words and their varied usage.

The words translated “atonement”.

Every occurrence of the word atonement in the O.T. is a translation of *kaphar*, or one of its derivatives. Both the noun and the verb occur together for the first time in Gen. vi. 14, where the words are used in a non-doctrinal sense, and are therefore all the more valuable.

“Make thee an ark of gopher wood thou shall pitch (*kaphar*) it within and without with pitch (*kaphar*).”

The LXX renders the words in question: “*asphaltoseis autem te asphalto*”, which words are easily recognized as our English asphalt or bitumen. We need be no students of divinity to understand why Noah was instructed to use “pitch”; it was simply to *keep the water out*. Another non-doctrinal use of the word is found in I Sam. vi. 18, where it is translated “village”, and answers to the Arabic *khephre*, which is observable in Caper-naum, and Chephar-haammonai in Josh. xviii. 24. Yet another use of the word is found in Song of Sol. i. 14, and iv. 13, where *kopher* is translated “camphire”. This is an odoriferous shrub named henna in almost universal use in Egypt and many parts of the East for “staining” the skin and the nails. We have therefore the idea of *protecting* from a deluge, as in the pitch used on the ark, a *shelter* or home as in the village, and a *stain* as in the henna plant.

We now come nearer to the doctrinal meaning of the word by noticing the way in which *kopher* is used in connection with the law. We have “a sum of money” laid upon a man for the ransom of his life (Exod. xxi. 30); a “ransom” described as “atonement money” (Exod. xxx. 12, 16); a “satisfaction” for a life forfeited (Numb. xxxv. 31, 32); a “bribe” (I Sam. xii. 3 and Amos v. 12). In none of these passages is there the idea of “covering” in the sense of concealing, but “covering” in the sense of *compensating* for damage done, and in the sense of a “bribe” covering the eyes of the judge as Deut. xvi. 19 declares: “for the gift doth blind the eyes.” The plural form *kippurim* is translated atonement or atonements in all passages, and for the sake of exactness, users of Young’s Analytical Concordance should note that the second entry in some editions (Exod. xxx. 10) is inserted in error; there are only eight references. To complete the score of translations we must add:--

HOAR FROST which covers the ground (Exod. xvi. 14).
BASONS, that probably had lids (I Chron. xxviii. 17), and
LION from its habit of lurking in dens or coverts (Jer. xxv. 38).

The feminine form *kaphoreth* is translated “mercy seat” in each of its 27 occurrences. So far we have considered the usage of the noun. The verb *kaphar* is translated in the A.V. as follows: To appease, pacify, put off, cleanse, disannul, pitch with their various verbal modifications, such as “make reconciliation”, which we have not chronicled. These translations account for 29 occurrences. The remaining 72 are translated by the word “atonement”. The only passage, apart from Gen. vi. 14, that uses *kaphar* before the law given in Exodus is Gen. xxxii. 20, “I will *appease* him with the present”. We are all, alas, too truly human to pretend that we do not understand Jacob’s action and motive. He had prayed for deliverance from the hand of Esau, for he knew he had wronged him in days gone by. So he took for his brother Esau a present of goats, sheep, camels, cows, and asses. When Esau asked Jacob, “What meanest thou by all these droves that I met?” Jacob replied, “These are to find grace in the sight of my lord” (Gen. xxxiii.8). When Esau would have refused the gift, Jacob urges him saying:--

“If I have FOUND GRACE in thy sight, then receive my present at my hand, for therefore have I seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God, and thou wast pleased with me” (verse 10).

Here is Jacob’s own interpretation of what he meant when he said, “I will appease him with the present”. Any attempt to use the idea of “covering” (except perhaps as Rotherham renders the passage, “I will cover his face with the present”, and so shelter myself from his anger) yields no congruous meaning. The at-one-ment or reconciliation was the result; the present the basis or cause. This is an example of the idea of a covering being applied to the person. We have atonement applied to sin as well as to the sinner: “Deliver us, and purge away our sins” (Psa. lxxix. 9). Surely the Psalmist did not merely mean “cover up our sins”? Rather, has he not expressed his meaning in verse 8: “O Remember not against us former iniquities”? In some cases the idea of “covering by a full and equivalent compensation”, in short “an eye for an eye”, is to be found, as in Numb. xxxv. 31-33:--

“Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer the land cannot be *cleansed* of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him who shed it.”

What sense is there in saying: “The land cannot *be covered* of the blood” unless we intend covering by compensation, and so canceling? This comes out prominently in another case. Suppose a man is found in the country, slain. No one knows who the murderer is. Yet blood has been shed. The elders of the city that is nearest to the spot are obliged to offer an heifer, and to wash their hands over its dead body, affirming their innocence, and praying that innocent blood be not laid to their charge. The passage concludes: “And the blood shall be forgiven them” (Deut. xxi. 1-9). The word in verse 8, “be merciful” is *kaphar*, and in verse 9 we read as an explanation: “so shalt thou *put away* the guilt of innocent blood.” Therefore “covered” sin is sin “put away”, for God says so. That this “putting away” was no mere “covering up” the false prophet knew

when he was put to death (Deut. xiii. 5), and the idolators knew when they were stoned (Deut. xvii. 6, 7). To put away the evil is interpreted in Deut. xix. 21 as “life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot”. Is this “covering up” sin? Is it not “covering” in the sense of canceling by an equivalent? This is the way in which the word is used in Isa. xxviii. 18: “Your covenant with death shall be *disannulled*.” Does this mean “covered up” or does it not mean “cancelled”?

Amplifications of atonement.

Did not the Psalmist have the meaning of the atonement in mind when he said:--

“Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity” (Psa. xxxii. 1, 2)?

Sin covered is sin *forgiven* and *not imputed*. Then again, is not atonement in view in the passages which speak of “blotting out” sin? Upon the occasion of the golden calf Moses said: “Peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin if not, *blot me*, I pray Thee, *out* of Thy book” (Exod. xxxii. 30-32). Again, when David prayed: “Blot out my transgressions”, and “Hide Thy face from my sins, and blot out mine iniquities” (Psa. li. 1, 9), there is a twofold reference to the “covering” by atonement, viz., “blot out” as to sins, and “hide” as to God’s face.

Moreover verse 14 shows that David had traveled beyond the type, and was looking forward to Christ, for the law provided no atonement for the murderer. In Isa. xliii. 25 “blotting out” is explained by “not remembering”. In Isa. xlv. 22 a little revision is necessary:--

“I have dissipated thy transgressions like a cloud, and thine iniquities like a vapour” (Spurrell’s Trans.).

So complete is this “blotting out” that it is used of the utter destruction caused by the flood (Gen. vii. 4). Another parallel is found in Isa. xxxviii. 17: “Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back.” If the eyes of the Lord are in *every place*, beholding *the evil* and the good, where can “behind His back” be but annihilation? No mere “covering up” can hide from His presence. Micah vii. 19 says: “Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.” Now no sea is so deep that He cannot see its bottom. The context speaks of “pardoning iniquity”, and “passing by transgressions” as synonymous expressions. One more example will suffice:--

“As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us” (Psa. ciii. 12).

Sin therefore if atoned for is said to be covered, not imputed, forgiven, blotted out, cast behind God’s back, and removed as far as east is from west. These passages do not occur in the N.T., but in the O.T. They were uttered by men who knew the true meaning of atonement, and from them we learn and not from modern speculators. The subject is

too sacred, too profound, too vital for anything trifling or speculative. We desire the rock of truth beneath our feet, and thank God we have found it.

The atonement, with the meaning that emerges from the great number of examples we have surveyed, is affirmed of the burnt offering, guilt offering, sin offering, the blood itself, the ram for the installation of the priest, the meal and peace offering, the half shekel, the appointment of the Levites, the incense, the punishment of a sinner, the offering of the spoils of war, and the blood of a murderer. Are we acquainted with all these urges, their contexts, their self-explanations? Until we are, what is the worth of our opinion? These and other features we hope to deal with in subsequent papers. Let us rejoice in that precious blood which not only redeemed us (Eph. i. 7), but made us nigh (Eph. ii. 13), and praise and adore Him who so loved us as to shed that blood as a propitiation for our sins.

#12. The five offerings of Leviticus. pp. 150 - 152

We have seen in previous articles the necessity for keeping the conception of redemption distinct from that of atonement, although in reality both the redemption and the atonement of Christ were wrought by one and the selfsame offering. Drawing nearer to the question of atonement itself, we shall find that it has a five-fold significance, and that this five-fold aspect is set forth with great care and elaboration in the opening chapter of the book of Leviticus.

It is possible that some of our readers will be aware of the fact that atonement is not predicated of the meat offering, nor of the peace offering in Lev. ii. and iii. We find, however, that it is connected with the meat and peace offerings in conjunction with the burnt offering in Ezek. xlv. 15-17.

The five offerings as a group.

Each offering has its own peculiar mission, and sets forth some one distinctive aspect of the work of Christ, but we shall appreciate the distinctions when we see how they all blend into one harmonious whole.

- A | The burnt offering. All claims of God and man perfectly met.
- B | The meat offering. Inherent holiness. All frankincense.
- C | The peace offering. Communion. God and man partake.
- B | The sin offering. Inherent sinfulness. Ashes.
- A | The trespass offering. The claims of God and man. The double tithe.

To establish the inter-relation suggested in this arrangement will necessitate a patient study of the separate offerings, but a brief anticipation of our findings may not be out of

place. The burnt offering is entirely devoted to God. All except the skin (which typifies righteousness) is consumed upon the altar. This symbolizes the perfect accordance with the will of God that was ever manifested in the Lord Jesus Christ, and how throughout His life on earth he met every claim of God and neighbour.

The meat offering is often associated with the burnt offering (*see* Numb. xxix. 6, 13 and 14). There is no blood shed in this case. Fine flour, oil and frankincense speak of inherent sinlessness, the addition of salt and the exclusion of both honey and leaven emphasizing its spiritual character. Before the question of sin is dealt with we have these positive relations set forth. On the other hand we have man's need and its remedy.

The trespass offering is the burnt offering plus sin. In both cases that which is due to God and man is met. But in the trespass offering there is the addition of the "fifth part", a making of amends. So with the sin offering. This deals with inherent sin, What I *am* rather than what I *do*; it is the meat offering plus sin. When both aspects of the divine demands have been met, common ground is found in the central offering, "The peace offering", where all parties concerned (God, the sinner, and the priest) find ground for peace and communion.

The spiritual reader will be awakened to the possibilities of real light and teaching from a contemplation of these most important offerings a careful consideration, and to devote a separate article to each one. There is, however, a necessary preliminary study that can be done here, which is to investigate wherein these five offerings differ the one from the other.

Things that differ.

THE BURNT OFFERING.—This like the meat offering and the peace offering is a *sweet savour*. In this it differs from both the sin offering and the trespass offering. It is offered "for acceptance". This is one of its peculiar distinctions. It was the offering of life-blood. In this it differed from the meat offering. It was wholly burnt; no part was eaten by either offerer or priest. The skin alone was reserved. It made "an atonement *for him*", whereas in the sin offering it makes "an atonement for him as concerning *his sin*", and issues in "forgiveness".

THE MEAT OFFERING.—This also was a sweet savour offering, and so contrasted with both sin and trespass offerings. It differs from all the others in the nature of the offerings themselves. Flour, oil, frankincense and salt. No blood was shed, no life given. It was not wholly burnt. Some part was reserved for Aaron and his sons.

THE PEACE OFFERING.—It was a sweet savour offering, and so grouped with the two former, but its chief feature is found in the emphasis upon communion. God, the offerer, and the priest all find common food together.

THE SIN OFFERING.—This is not a sweet savour offering. It was not burnt upon the altar, but in the place of ashes outside the camp. It was specially for sin as distinct

from trespass. (The reference in Lev. iv. 31 will be dealt with in the article dealing with the sin offering).

THE TRESPASS OFFERING.—The chief distinction is in the element of restitution, the making amends by the payment of the principal, and the addition of a fifth part.

We learn from these points of difference something of the fulness of the sacrifice of Christ for us. Both our sin and our trespass have been dealt with before God, and the full acceptance that inheres in a complete whole-hearted obedience to the claims of God and our neighbour is ours by virtue of the same offering. In Christ both sinful man and a Holy God find common ground, “He is our peace”. Seeing that these typical sacrifices promise so much light upon the foundation of our salvation, we trust that none will think the time ill-spent that patiently and prayerfully weighs over these weighty words of God in the balances of the sanctuary.

#13. The whole burnt offerings. pp. 189 - 191

Having looked at the five offerings of Leviticus as a whole, we must now consider each separately. The scriptural title for this offering is *olah*, or the “ascending” offering, referring apparently to the fact that this offering is wholly consumed upon the altar, and that its fragrance ascends in the smoke. While each offering has some peculiar feature that marks it off from the rest, there is one feature common to them all, and that is expressed by the word “satisfaction”. This, however, is true if we have a broad view of the word satisfaction, for in the case of the burnt offering and the meat offering sin is not in view.

It is natural but not scriptural to limit the satisfaction rendered by the Lord Jesus to the Father as related to human guilt, but was there no satisfaction in His spotless purity, His humble and wholehearted submission? When the closed heavens at length opened, and there was heard the voice of God saying, “This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased”, it was uttered at the close of His *private* life, and the opening of His *public* ministry, long before He died the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God. The *burnt* offering and the meat offering speak only of satisfaction intrinsically. The *sin* offering and the trespass offering of satisfaction for sin. The *peace* offering of satisfaction that is mutual. The first occurrence of the burnt offering is found in Gen. viii. 20, 21:--

“And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a SAVOUR OF REST.”

Noah's offering was one of thanksgiving and dedication, and not an offering for sin. The same may be said of the offering of Isaac, where the burnt offering is mentioned six times. Its inner meaning is expressed in the words:--

“Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from Me” (Gen. xxii. 12).

It is this aspect of sacrifice that comes first from God's point of view. Man, quite apart from sin, should render to God all that the burnt offering implies, although such an offering on his part is now absolutely impossible. Man must begin at the other end; trespass and sin must first of all be dealt with. Christ is presented in Lev. i. under three figures. He is the offerer, the offering, and the priest. The whole of His work was vicarious and “for us”. While in the O.T. sinful man brings the offering himself, in the N.T. fulfillment it is God Who provides the Lamb, and it is Christ Who offers Himself.

Acceptance.

In verse 2 we read: “Ye shall *bring* your *offering* of the cattle,” etc. Now the Hebrew word “bring” is *qarab*, which means “to draw near”, and the Hebrew word “offering” is *qorban*, which means “what is brought near”. Both words have the same triliteral root *orb*. So in the A.V. we find the verb sometimes translated “bring”, and sometimes “offer” as it is in Lev. i. 2, 3, 10. An essential element in all the offerings is this one of drawing near, and of giving access. Not only access, but acceptance is involved. In verse 3 the A.V. reads: “He shall offer it of his own voluntary will.”

The Hebrew word *ratsah* is sometimes rendered “self will” and “our will”. But just as the noun and verb *qorban* and *qarab* were seen to be allied, so in verse 4 the verb *ratsah* (translated “it shall be accepted”) reflects upon the noun in the preceding verse. Verse 3 should be rendered: “He shall offer it for its acceptance.” So then this wondrous offering may be said to be both for *access* and *acceptance*. Those who have, by grace, access, and who are accepted in the Beloved, make it their aim that they may be acceptable in their service. This is provided for in the burnt offering, for it was offered at the consecration of priests, levites, and kings, for the purification of Nazarites, and before battle. The three items that specially mark the burnt offerings are:--

1. It was a sacrifice of sweet savour.
2. It was offered for acceptance.
3. It was wholly burnt upon the altar, except the skin.

These offerings are called “The food of God” [*see* Lev. xxi. 17 (margin) and 21], and in the structure given on page 150 we sought to express the value of this offering by saying:--

“A | The burnt offering. All claims of God and man perfectly met.”

This is expressed very clearly in Eph. v. 2 where we read:--

“Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.”

and that such a high ideal of practical love is attainable Phil. iv. 8 testifies:--

“I have all things and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.”

Three degrees.

In the law of the burnt offering provision is made for the differing degrees of wealth among the various offerers. The burnt offering could be either a bullock, a lamb, or fowls. Bullock and bull are used interchangeably in the A.V., but it is well to remember that the true concept is a bull, for the term “bullock” to-day often means an animal that is not complete, and which is simply retained for fattening purposes. The three animals used in the burnt offering represent varying degrees of appreciation on the part of the believer, for while there is a great difference between the conception of the work of Christ as set forth by the bull and that set forth by the sheep, or that set forth by the doves and pigeons, *the result Godward* never changes. This is most blessed fact. While the appreciation of Paul may be represented by the bull, and the appreciation of the weakest child of God be set forth by the dove, yet *in Christ* and *before God* Paul is not one whit more accepted or safe than the weakest and the lowest. This can be seen if we set out the law of the offering in Lev. i.:--

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------|---|
| A1 | | Lev. i. 3-9-. THE BULLOCK. | Put his hand on.
Accepted for him.
Animal flayed.
Parts exposed and detailed. |
| B1 | | -9. THE RESULT. | A burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire,
of a sweet savour unto the Lord. |
| A2 | | 10-13-. THE SHEEP. | No hand laid on.
No mention of acceptance.
No flaying of the animal.
No detailed parts. |
| B2 | | -13. THE RESULT. | A burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire,
of a sweet savour unto the Lord. |
| A3 | | 14-17-. THE DOVES. | No hand laid on.
No mention of acceptance.
Not all on the altar; some part cast beside the altar.
Not divided into parts at all. |
| B3 | | -17. THE RESULT. | A burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire,
of a sweet savour unto the Lord. |

(To be continued).

The Epistle to the Romans

No.5.

The just by faith shall live (Rom. i. 17).

Three items of great importance remain to be considered before we can leave Rom. i.17. They are:

1. The facts involved in the word "revealed."
2. The meaning of "faith."
3. The quotation from Hab. ii. 4

The Revelation of Righteousness and Wrath

The gospel of God was promised by the prophets of the Old Testament Scriptures. With this fact Romans opens (i. I, 2). Not only so, but upon the declaration of the gospel, the law and the prophets come forward as witnesses (Rom. iii. 21). Both Abraham and David are cited in Rom. iv. as bearing witness to the initial fact of this gospel, namely, the imputation of righteousness apart from works and only by faith. The inner teaching, the mystery of it as associated with Adam and Christ, is opened up for the first time in Rom. v. 12-21, nevertheless Gen. iii. remains as originally written, and but confirms the revelation given through Paul.

In Rom. x. 6-10 a witness is found to the righteousness which is of faith in the somewhat strange words of Moses recorded in Deut. xxx. 12,13. The gospel, however, is the chosen instrument for the REVELATION of the righteousness of God by faith, which constitutes the power of the gospel, "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets" (Rom. iii. 21). Isa. Ivi. I says, " My salvation is near to come, and My righteousness to be revealed." Isaiah said " near" ; Paul said " now."

Until the Lord had made the one great offering for sin, the full revelation could not be given, the types and shadows could not be fully interpreted. Paul could preach Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret in times aionion, but was then made manifest and by the Scriptures of the prophets confirmed, as we have already seen, and made known among all nations for faith obedience (Rom. xvi. 25-27).

We must not omit from our reckoning the statement of Rom. i. 18-20. Here had been another " revelation," other facts of God had been " made known," if not since the age times, yet " since" the creation of the world. This revelation made known the " power" of God, and left the disobedient without excuse, but it was not the power of God unto salvation; it revealed the "wrath of God," but not the "righteousness of God by faith." Conscience and creation declare the glory of God, and set forth His eternal power and Godhead, but the gospel reveals that which alone can save poor sinful men, viz., "a righteousness of God by faith."

The meaning of faith.

Perhaps no simpler illustration of the essence of faith is found in Scripture than is contained in the words of Paul, "I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me" (Acts xxvii. 25). The circumstances in which this statement was made were those of human extremity. The ship on which Paul was being taken a prisoner to Rome had been caught in a violent tempest. In the graphic language of Luke, an eyewitness, we learn that when the ship could not bear up into the wind, " we let her drive." The strain on the great central mast caused the timbers of the ship to spring, which necessitated what is called " undergirding." The sailors then strake sail, " or "lowered the gear," so that the great sail should just steady the ship, "and so were driven." The danger increased and the ship was further lightened, neither sun nor stars appearing for many days, and " all hope that we should be saved was taken away." It was then that faith arose victorious. It was not just a passing mood, nor the hysteria of a religious mind, it rested upon the spoken word and promise of God :

"For there stood by me this night the angel of am, and Whom I serve, saying, Fear not Paul; brought before Caesar; and 10, God hath given thee sail with thee" (Acts xxvii. 23, 24).

Thus it was that Paul could say, "I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me." He could exhort these hopeless seamen to be of good cheer, for God had said, "Fear not." The implicit faith of Paul in the promise of God, "even as it was told me," is seen in his attitude when later some of the sailors were about to let down a boat and leave the ship. He said to the centurion, " Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved" (Acts xxvii. 31). Paul believed the angel of God when he said, "God hath given thee all them that sail with thee." Paul it was (the landsman, the prisoner) who cheered and advised the mariners and the soldiers, for faith operates where reason and skill and circumstance fail. Paul's faith made him reasonable. He exported the panic-stricken crew to take food, "For there shall not a hair fall from the head of any of you" (Acts xxvii. 34). Paul's faith led to works, confession, and confirmation :

"And when he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in the presence of them all: and when he had broken it, he began to eat. Then were they all of good cheer and they also took some meat" (Acts xxvii. 35, 36).

At length, in spite of the soldiers' murderous counsel, "It came to pass, that they all escaped safe to land" (Acts xxvii. 44).

The OT. equivalent emunah, from which we obtain the word Amen, is a derivation of the word aman, which primarily means to be steady, constant, established. "His hands were steadied" (Exod. xvii. 12). Pillars or props of a building (2 Kings xviii. 16). The constant care of a nurse is expressed also by this word in Esther ii. 7. Among the varied translations we find such expressive words as "faithfulness" (Psa. cxix. 75); "truth" (Deut. xxxii. 4); "set office" (margin "trust," 1 Chron. ix. 22); "stability" (Isa. xxxiii. 6); "faith" (Heb. ii. 4).

Faith in the N.T. sense may be described as a threefold cord, (1) A conviction, (2) A cleaving, (3) A confidence.

The conviction.-This rests upon the acknowledged faithfulness of God (1 Pet. i. 21; iii. 15; 2 Thess. ii. II, 12). The cleaving.--This is the outcome, and a necessary outcome, for hope and love are only separated from faith in idea, not in experience. The confidence.- This controls the walk and manner of life. Paul's attitude on the ship just cited was one of assured confidence. To the O.T. believer, constancy under suffering necessarily implied faith in God. To " endure, as seeing Him Who is invisible," is said of one who lived by faith (Heb. xi. 27).

The quotation from Hab. ii. 4.

The subject of N.T. quotation from the O.T. is one of far reaching importance, and cannot be entered into here. Material is slowly being gathered to show the relation of the N.T. to the Hebrew and the LXX., but this must be reserved for a separate study. The quotation of Paul from Hab. ii. 4 differs from the Hebrew considerably, and from the LXX. in one particular. For the sake of comparison with the quotation in the N.T. we give the translations from the Hebrew and the LXX.:

" Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him, but the just shall live by His faith" (Hebrew).

"If any man draw back, My soul hath no pleasure in him; but the just shall live by My faith" (LXX.).

"As it is written, The just by faith shall live " (Rom. i. 17).

"For, The just by faith shall live " (Gal. Hi. 11).

"Now the just by faith shall live : but if any man draw back, My soul shall have no pleasure in him" (Heb. x. 38).

It will be seen that the LXX. differs very materially from the Hebrew, but that the full quotation of the passage in Heb. x. 38 is in entire agreement with the LXX., except in the omission of the word " My." The Hebrew says " His faith." The LXX. says " My faith." The apostle simply says " faith."

As we have said, the pros and cons of the question of N.T. quotation involve too much investigation into the vicissitudes of the MSS., and patient searching for guiding principles for any attempt to be made here. The interested reader may look for a series when time and opportunity allow the necessary work, which is rather heavy and tedious. For the present purpose it is enough to see the use which the apostle makes of the O.T. at every turn, either to teach, illustrate, or confirm the truth he is unfolding. Habakkuk's faith rested upon the faithfulness of God, even though outward circumstances prompted the jibe of the scoffer, "Where is the promise?" During the time of trial, while the vision waited God's appointed time, Habakkuk learned, and manifested practically that "The just by faith shall live." This is the order of the words both in the Hebrew, the LXX., and in the three quotations of Paul. The very ambiguity is seized by the apostle, in one place, to emphasize the truth, "The just by faith. . . shall live," and at another, "The just. . . by faith shall live."

By keeping the passage of Habakkuk in mind we shall be saved from that rash system of interpretation that either makes faith into a work or into a fetish, that makes faith into a dead legal form instead of a warm, breathing, living organic part of the new birth. Just as man, the living soul, may be spoken of as "body, soul, and spirit," yet essentially one, so the new life is manifested by "faith, hope and love"; neither may these be separated, except mentally, without the spiritual dissolution of the new man. As we proceed through this wonderful epistle Hab. ii. 4 will unfold its three-fold fullness. We shall learn more fully the meaning of :

"The just" (ho dikaios).
"By faith" (ek pisteos).
"Shall live" (gesetai).

He who comprehends Paul's teaching concerning righteousness, faith and life, with its alternative sin, disobedience and death, will understand the basis of Paul's gospel, and can go forth to all the world with a gospel of which he need never be ashamed.

The Epistle to the Romans.

No.6.

The suppression of the truth (Rom. i. 18).

The discovery of the meaning of the term "the righteousness of God" is of the first importance, but as the apostle was as sensible of this as any of his subsequent readers of expositors, we feel that it will be better to defer an extended examination of this term until we are considering the apostle's own inspired explanations that occupy Rom. iii. and iv.

Following therefore the line of the apostle's teaching, we find that after the great thesis of the epistle has been stated in Rom. i. 17, he turns aside to establish the utter need of both Gentile (Rom. i. 18-32), and Jew (Rom. ii. 1-29), and then "the whole world" (Rom. iii. 19), and that a righteousness provided by grace has taken the place of a righteousness attained by works of law.

Rom. i. 18 to iii. 20 is one large section of this epistle devoted mainly to the establishment of the utter need of all men for the provision of grace in the gospel. It opens with the testimony of creation, and the things that may be known of God; it closes with the testimony of the law, and the knowledge of sin. Man needs something more than knowledge, he needs power to perform, and this he does not possess. Confining ourselves for the time to the revelation given of the darkness of the Gentile world, let us turn our attention to Rom. i. 18-ii. 1. The statement of verse 18 is the conclusion of the argument introduced at verse 16:

"FOR I am not ashamed of the gospel."

"FOR it is the power of God unto salvation."

"FOR herein is revealed a righteousness of God."

"FOR the wrath of God is revealed from heaven."

The necessity for righteousness is stressed by the fact of the revelation of wrath against all unrighteousness.

Wrath.

The word *orge* (translated "wrath") occurs twelve times in Romans, and of these occurrences seven are found in the first great doctrinal division (Rom. i. I-v. I I). It is an important word, and seeing that it is placed in distinct relation to righteousness in Rom. i. 17, 18, it demands a prayerful study. We observe in the first place that "wrath" is used in the outer portion of Romans only. The word is not used in Rom. v. 12-viii. 39. The word "wrath" is not used of either Adam or of man seen in Adam. Judgment, condemnation and death there are, but unaccompanied by wrath. There is no wrath either in connection with the lake of fire, or the great white throne in Rev. xx. All is calm, books are opened, everyone is dealt with in pure justice. Wrath, anger, indignation, fury, these words are of a different category.

Many times do we read that the wrath or the anger of the Lord was "kindled," as in Exod. iv. 14, or of wrath "waxing hot," as in Exod. xxii. 24, or of His anger "smoking" (Psa. Ixxiv. I), and of it being poured out in "fury" (Isa. xlii. 25). The nature of the wrath of Rom. i. 18, and of the day of wrath with which it is connected (Rom. ii. 5) is discovered in the book of the Revelation. Those upon whom this wrath is poured are the "nations," and the time is the time of the dead that they should be judged and rewarded (Rev. xi. 18; xix. 15). This wrath falls particularly upon Babylon (Rev. xvi. 19), and in direct connection with its idolatry and uncleanness (Rev. xiv. 8-10). Babylon is in view in Rom. i. 18-32. There we see that Satanic system in all its naked horror, there we see the domination of darkness and the lie. In this section we read of those who by their deeds are "worthy of death," and who "have pleasure" in deeds of evil (Rom. i. 32). This section therefore is connected with wrath.

In the inner section, which is connected not with Babylon but with Adam, it is death and not darkness and uncleanness that comes through to the race, and in some cases it is distinctly implied that some who thus die in Adam are not held to be personally "worthy of death," for it speaks of some who did not sin" after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. v. 14), and in this connection we find one who instead of "having pleasure" in the practice of evil, says that he hates the deeds he finds himself practising, while inwardly delighting in the law of God. Such is the very different point of view of these two sections.

Wrath in Romans i. -v.

- A - i. 18. Wrath revealed against unrighteousness.
- B - ii. 5. Treasuring up wrath. "Works" (verse 6).
- C - ii. 5. The day of wrath and *righteous* judgment.
- D - ii. 8, 9. Wrath rendered to Jew and Gentile alike.
- C - iii. 5. Is God *unrighteous* Who visits with wrath?
- B - iv. 15. The law worketh wrath. "Faith" (verses 14 and 16)
- A - v. 9. Saved from wrath, because made righteous.

This revelation of wrath against those who, while being ungodly and unrighteous themselves, hold down the truth in unrighteousness, is further connected with willful despising of that goodness which should lead to repentance. In two places the righteousness of this wrath is emphasized (ii. 5 and iii. 5). There is much to be learned by comparing 1 and 2 Thessalonians with this passage in Romans.

- "Wrath revealed from heaven" (Rom. i. 18).
- "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven" (2 Thess. i. 7).
- "When they *knew* God, they glorified Him not as God. . . .
- "They did *not* like to retain God in their *knowledge*" (Rom. i. 21, 28).
- "In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that *know not God*" (2 Thess. 1. 8).
- "They have *pleasure* in them that do them" (Rom. i. 32).
- "They had *pleasure* in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 12).
- "They changed the *truth* of God into *the lie*" (Rom. 1. 25).
- "They received not. . . the *truth*. . . they believe *the lie*" (2 Thess. ii. 10, 11).
- "They changed the glory of God into an image made like to *man*" (Rom. i. 23).
- "The *man* of sin. . . showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4).
- "*Wrath* revealed. . . *idolatry*" (Rom. 1. 18-25).
- "Ye turned to God from *idols*. . . saved from the *wrath* to come" (1 Thess. i. 9, 10).
- "God also gave them up to *uncleanness*" (Rom. i. 24).
- "Not in the lust of *concupiscence*, even as the Gentiles which know not God" (1 Thess. iv. 5).

If we also bring together the parallels that we find in the book of the Revelation, we shall have a full reference to that satanic system of iniquity commenced at Babel, dominating the nations of the earth from that time onward until judged at the coming of the Lord in the day of wrath.

The wrath of God in Rom. i. 18 is revealed against specific sin, viz., "Upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of those men who hold down the truth in unrighteousness." The ungodliness and unrighteousness that kindles the fierce anger of God is that which actually suppresses the truth. It is not the ungodliness of the ignorant, nor the unrighteousness of the wayward, but the conscious opposition of ungodliness to revealed truth. The mystery of iniquity has ever opposed the mystery of godliness.

Worship.

Man is disposed to place common honesty between man and his neighbour as of more importance than "worship." Many a moral person would think nothing of the charge that he was not pious, yet the deeper our insight into the basis of all things, the nearer it brings us to the footstool of God. Is there not enough in Scripture to indicate that the first sin of all had direct relation to the worship of God? (Ezek. xxviii.). Did not the tempter bait his hook with the words, "Ye shall be as God"? Did not Israel break the ten commandments when they broke the first in the worship of the golden calf? Is not the first example of living by faith that of Abel the worshipper, and was not Cain's primal sin the suppression or withholding of the demands of God's holiness? Babylonianism, author as it is of vice and cruelty, is primarily and essentially a system of false worship.

The words "hold the truth" are really "hold down" or "suppress" the truth. This word (*katecho*) occurs in the epistle we have already referred to, namely, 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7, where it is rendered in the A.V. by "withholdeth" and "letteth." A careful comparison of Rom. i. and 2 Thess. ii. will help us to realize the restraining power of Babel, this suppressing of the truth, this exchanging of the truth for the lie, this rendering of the worship due to the Creator to the creature.

Knowledge.

That this restraining of the truth is willful, and not out of pitiable ignorance (*cf.* I Tim. i. 13), is seen in the immediate context. The next verse commences with the word ., "because," and goes on to show that there has been on the part of God a revelation of Himself of sufficient clearness to make idolatry a definite perversion. With this rejection of what might be known of God came the awful descent into the slough of uncleanness that is so vividly portrayed by the apostle, and by the writers of his own day. What was true of the Gentiles was only too true, alas, of Israel also. This we shall see more clearly as we proceed. Enough for the moment if we begin to realize the utter and abject need that the world had of that provision of righteousness which is the glory of the gospel and which, as the apostle said, was the power of God unto salvation.

What the Lord revealed to the nations, how He revealed it, and their subsequent attitude we must consider in our next paper. Let us meanwhile be grateful that though children of wrath, even as the rest, grace has saved us, and instead of being dominated by the lie, we have learned the truth as it is in Jesus.

The Epistle to the Romans

No. 7

Inexcusable (Rom. i. 19, 20)

We sought to draw attention in our last article to the distribution of the word "wrath" in Romans, and to the related teaching that wrath is directed against culpable wickedness and apostasy, particularly that Babylonian phase called "the lie," and which finds expression in false worship. There is no fury, wrath, or anger to be discovered in Gen. iii., where the atmosphere is calm though sad, neither is wrath found in Rom. v. 12-viii. 39. We now turn our attention to the teaching of Rom. i. 19-32 in order to learn the history of Gentile failure and Babylonian triumph. Verses 19 and 21 both begin with *dioti* = "because." Both verses follow on from the statement in verse 18 that those spoken of "suppressed the truth." Their culpability in the matter is made evident by the fact that "they knew God." How they knew, what they knew, the limitations of this knowledge, the responsibilities of this knowledge, and the departure from it, with all that it implies, must now be the subject of our enquiry.

The knowledge of God.

In an age of intellectualism, the child of faith is liable to underrate true knowledge. Yet a moment's reflection will summon from the Scriptures abundant proof that the knowledge of God is the goal of redemption, and the strength of the pilgrim. Prophecy looks forward to no higher manifestation of glory than that the knowledge of the Lord shall one day cover the earth. It would occupy too much space in this article to deal with this aspect of the Word, but the reader is directed to the series entitled "Studies in the Prophets" appearing in these pages for its development. Coming therefore to the revelation of God to mankind at the beginning we find:

"That which may be known of God is manifest in them." Liddon makes the observation on the phrase *gnoston tou Theou*, that "according to the invariable New Testament and LXX. use, this phrase means that which is known, not *that which may be known about God* (cf. Luke ii. 44; John xviii. 15; Acts i. 19, xv. 18, xxviii. 22)." "And Paul is speaking of an objective body of knowledge which becomes subjective in the phanerosis" (Winer, Gr. N.T. p. 295). This knowledge becomes manifested in their consciousness; *en autois* does not mean "among them" since *nooumena kathoratai* point to internal manifestation. If by "natural religion" we mean that which the unaided understanding of man can formulate from the visible creation, then we have no right to use the term here, for this knowledge was as much a revelation from God as is the written Word.

"For God hath made it manifest to them." "That which is known of God": truly the written revelation makes God known in a way that can never be accomplished by the works of His hands, nevertheless the knowledge of God here indicated was very comprehensive. It was so far a revelation as to deal with "His invisible things," these things being further defined as "His eternal power and deity." The word translated "eternal" here is not the familiar *aionios* which means "age long," but *aidios*. Some there are who consider this word as coming from the same word as *Hades*, and render it "

unseen," so making it amplify "invisible" of the same verse, but this is mistaking the *paranomasia* for the real meaning. *Aidios* is derived from *aei* = "always," and so means perpetual or eternal.

There is a distinction to be observed between the words *Theiotes* (divinity), and *Theotes* (the Being, God, Col. ii. 9). Under *Theiotes* all God's attributes (wisdom, goodness, etc.) are included. These truths about God are seen through being mentally perceived; the *nous* (mind), as distinct from the senses of man, must see God in nature. This ever existing power and deity of the Lord has been made manifest by His works since the creation. *Apoktiseos* means here, as it does in 2 Peter iii. 4, "since the creation of the world."

God made known by His works.

One has but to turn to the book of Job to learn something of what "nature" can say to him that hath the hearing ear. There, in Job xxxvi.-xli., we have heaven and earth called upon to bear their testimony to the "eternal power and deity" of Jehovah. "Behold, God is great," said Elihu, and then come the marshaled host of witnesses. Small drops of water, the spreading of the clouds, thunder and lightning, snow and hail. Then the Almighty Himself speaks to Job. He speaks of the foundation of the earth, the bounds set for the sea, the mysteries of light, the signs of heaven, the marvels of animal life and sustenance, all this and more lead Job to confess the eternal power of God: "I know that Thou canst do every thing, and that no thought of Thine can be hindered" (Job xlii. 2).

Can we forget Isaiah xlv. 9-24, which exposes the folly of idolatry, saying :

"He planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it . . . he burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast. . . and the residue thereof he maketh a god!" (Isa. xlv. 14-17).

What a contrast with the true God:-

"Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb. I am the Lord that maketh all things: that stretcheth forth the heavens above; that spreadeth abroad the earth by Myself" (Isa. xlv. 24)

So in the days when Babylon and its system shall be revived and in full power, the so called "everlasting gospel" will be preached, which gospel is nothing more nor less than a proclamation of the Lord as Creator:

Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen" (Rev. xiv. 7, 8).

With this note the heavenly phase of Revelation opens. In chapter iv., the rainbow throne, the living creatures, and the twenty-four elders testify not to redemption, not to kingdom, not to church, but to creation:

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created" (Rev. iv. 11).

Not till that is confessed do we read, "Thou art worthy. . . . for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed" (Rev. v. 9).

Science in its modern acceptance has rid the universe of its Creator. An impersonal

force occupies the throne of deity. It is becoming well-nigh impossible for anyone to be a science teacher to-day who does not subscribe to the theory of evolution in some form. Finally Rev. xiv. 7 suggests that to dare to believe the scriptural doctrine of creation, as opposed to what a godless science will by theory advance, will be to believe the very gospel, and to constitute oneself a martyr for the truth. We use the word science in its modern acceptance. True science we must ever welcome, for it can never contradict the Word of God. Take for example one feature as an illustration. What room is there in modern science for the teaching of Gen. i. 7? Should anyone dare to affirm their belief that there was sea water above the firmament he would be classed as a fool, yet a modern scientist has recently said, in connection with the transmission of "wireless" waves, that there must be somewhere above the atmosphere a kind of sounding board or reflection whose density is equal to sea water! We all know Psalm xix. and its twofold division, also Psalm viii.:

"The heavens declare the glory of God" (xix. 1) CREATION.

"The law of the Lord is perfect" (xix. 7) SCRIPTURE.

"When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars,
which Thou hast ordained" (viii. 3).

Since the creation of the world therefore the eternal power and deity of God have been abundantly manifested by the works of His hands. So freely, so clearly has God "shown it unto them" as to leave all "inexcusable." When we hear and see the revolting idolatry carried on even to-day in such places as India or Africa, our hearts go out in pity to these demon ridden people, yet on every hand they have these evidences. God has never left Himself without witness:

"In that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 16, 17).

It will be observed that the apostle prefaced this statement by speaking of God as:

"The living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things therein" (Acts xiv. 15).

Or again on Mar's hill, he said to the men of Athens :

"God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands" (Acts xvii. 24-31).

and went on to demonstrate the utter folly of idol worship.

Inexcusable.

The nations of the earth were not so favoured as Israel, for to that nation were given "the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2). None of the nations received the law of Sinai, and therefore were not held accountable to it (Rom. iii. 19; iv. 15), but to all the world the witness of creation was given, and made manifest" in them" :

"There is no speech, and there are no words,
Unheard is their voice,
Yet through all the earth has gone their voice,
And to the end of the world their sayings " (Psa. xix. 3, 4).

God was the teacher, "for God hath shown it unto them." Presently we shall hear the charge reiterated when the apostle turns to the Jew (Rom. ii. I), but for the time our attention must be fixed upon the condition of the Gentile world. Mankind had a knowledge of

God, and this knowledge was (1) attested as true by conscience, "in them," and was (2) derived from the witness of God's works. This knowledge was very marvelous, for it embraced "the unseen things of God," even His eternal power and divinity, and was perceived by the mind from the works of His hands ever since the creation of the world, and hence from Adam onwards. This witness is found scattered throughout heathendom, and leaves all the nations of the earth "inexcusable." Just what it was that came in and prevented this primitive knowledge must be the subject of our next paper. What a fall is here!

The Epistle to the Romans
No. 8
Glory and thankfulness to God for His Goodness (Rom. i. 21)

The inexcusability of mankind for their departure from God is twofold :

- (1). God revealed His eternal power and deity in them by the witness of His works.
- (2). When they knew God, they wickedly perverted this knowledge.

We have given some consideration to the truth of (1), so we now turn our attention to the teaching under the heading of (2).

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened."

" *They knew God.*"- Is there any evidence extant of this primitive knowledge?

The testimony of antiquity.

Wilkinson, in his *Ancient Egyptians*, says, "The existence of a sole and omnipotent deity, Who created all things, seems to have been the universal belief." Moor, in his *Pantheon*, speaking of Brahm, the supreme God of the Hindoo, says, "Of Him whose glory is so great, there is no image" (Veda). He "illumines all, delights all, whence all proceeded; that by which they live when born, and that to which all must return" (Veda). Monier Williams, in his *Hidden Wisdom*, quotes some lines from a Vedic Hymn:-

"In the beginning there was neither nought or ought.
Then there was neither sky nor atmosphere above.
* * * * *
Then there was neither death nor immortality.
There was neither day, nor night, nor light, nor darkness,
Only the Existent One breathed calmly, self contained.
Nought else than Him there was nought else above, beyond."

Col. Vans Kennedy, in his *Hindoo Mythology*, quotes from the *Institutes of Menu*:

"He Whom the mind alone can perceive; Whose essence excludes the external organs, Who has no visible parts, Who exists from eternity Whom no being can comprehend. "

How can we account for the revolting idolatry of Hindooism to-day, with its millions of gods of inconceivable ugliness and sensuality, in the face of this testimony from their own religious literature? Rom. i. 19-32 provides the one and only answer. Among the Babylonians there was the tradition of "the only God," and a correct rendering of Isaiah lxvi. 17 gives it prominence. Spurrell's translation reads :

" They who sanctify themselves, and purify themselves, after the ordinances of Achad in the midst of the gardens, Who eat swine's flesh, and the reptile, and the mouse."

Achad means " The Only One," and is used in Deut. vi. 4, as here, without the article, of the " Only Jehovah." The Babylonians, when they intended to assert the unity of the Godhead in the strongest possible manner, used the word " Adad" (see *Macrobii Saturnalia*). *Mallet's Northern Antiquities* reveals much the same testimony in Icelandic Mythology. God is there called:

" The Author of everything that existeth, the eternal, the living, and awful Being: the searcher into concealed things, the Being that never changeth," attributing to this deity " an infinite power, a countless knowledge, and incorruptible justice."

What blight was it that settled upon mankind, turning this primitive knowledge into myths, distorting and twisting primal truth until it became servant and witness to the lie? Rom. i. 21-28 supplies the answer. This answer is manifold, but it begins with this simple statement, "They glorified Him not as God." .

The glory of God.

The glory of God underlies both creation and redemption. It is the great factor in the nature of sin and of hope. The glory of God is a topic of great importance in the epistle to the Romans. First let us notice the testimony of the verb *doxaso* (" to glorify"). Rom. viii. 30 uses it of the redeemed, and xi. 13 uses it where Paul " magnifies" or literally " glorifies" his office. This leaves us with three references, viz., i. 21, xv. 6 and 9. These references are full of teaching when seen together. Rom. i. 21 reveals the Gentile failure; Rom. xv. 6 and 9 reveal the Gentile's blessed reconciliation. What they failed to do by nature, they will do by grace. Let us put the passages together :

" They glorified Him not as God" (i. 21).

"That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God" (xv. 6).

"That the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy" (xv. 9).

Thus by this very first item, and its use in Romans, the glorious theme of the epistle is set forth. In Rom. i. we are to read of the setting aside of the nations, but in Rom. xv. we read of their blessed and happy restoration. Turning to the word *doxa* (glory) we learn from Rom. iii. 23 that it is essentially connected with sin. "For all sinned, and are coming short of the glory of God." Faith that emphasizes the fact of resurrection" gives glory to

God," as may be seen in the case of Abraham (Rom. iv. 20), and of all of like precious faith, who can now" rejoice in hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 2).

The word" glory" runs through this epistle, and forms an integral part of its theme. The reader should examine all the passages (we give them here to facilitate the study: Rom. i. 23; ii. 7, 10; iii. 7, 23; iv. 20; v. 2; vi. 4; viii. 18,21; ix. 4, 23; xi. 36; xv. 7; xvi. 27). If such is the importance of this initial factor, it behooves us all to acquaint ourselves with just what is involved in "glorifying God," lest we in our measure come short, even though saved. Something of what is intended by " glorifying God" may be gathered from such passages as I Chron. xvi. 23-36):

"Declare His glory among the heathen: His marvelous works among all nations."

Here it will be seen that" His glory" is, by the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, expressed by " His marvelous works." This is one item in glorifying God that the Gentiles omitted. Following this comes a statement concerning His eternal power and deity:

" For great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised: He also i. to be feared above all gods. For all the gods of the people are idols: But the Lord made the heavens. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name. And let men say among the nation., The Lord reigneth."

Glorifying God declares His marvelous works, acknowledges that He is above all gods, confesses that He is Creator, and that He reigneth. When we remember the testimony of Psa. xix., we remember that there we have a similar connection.

"The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament showeth His handywork."

The parallelism here is complete:-

The heavens	----	The firmament
Declare	----	Showeth
The glory of God	----	His Handywork

It is very evident that this confession of God as Creator is directly connected with glorifying God. Into the higher and deeper connection of this glorifying of God as, for example, is indicated in the language of Christ in John xvii., we do not enter, as this is beyond the scope of the passage in Romans i. Here is the first step in Gentile departure. They did not glorify God as God. The second step was that of ingratitude, "neither were thankful."

Thanksgiving,

The testimony of creation might have been awe-inspiring, the thunder bolt, the avalanche, the hurricane might have overwhelmed man's spirit with their testimony to tremendous power, might have extracted his tardy glorifying. But God's glory cannot be separated from His goodness. As Moses learned in Exod. xxxiii. 18, 19, "Shew me Thy

glory. . . . I will make all My goodness pass before thee." So when Paul sought to prevent the men of Lystra from worshipping himself and Barnabas as gods, he not only drew

their attention to that which demanded glory, namely, that God "made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein," but that which as surely demanded thanksgiving: "In that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 8-18). Sunshine and shower, the kindly fruits of the earth, the gift of sleep, the reward of labour, the blessings of home, of parent and child, all these were from the good hand of God, yet" they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful."

In the ascription of praise that is recorded in Rev. iv. 9 "thanks" is included, as also in Rev. vii. 12. Again in Rev. xi. 17 we read:-

"We give thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast reigned."

Four times does the Psalmist say, "Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good." His Godhead demands glory, and His goodness thanks. There is more than a mere phonetic connection between God and good, Some consider that the word "Deva," the generic name for "God" in India, comes from the Chaldee *thav* ("good"), with which is allied the Hebrew *tob*. Donaldson, in his *New Cratylus*, shows that *Th* is frequently pronounced *Dh*. From the Sanscrit Deva, without the digamma *Deo*, comes the Latin *Deus*, and the Greek Theos. "There is none good but One, that is God" (Matt. xix. 17). He is good, and He does good. When He manifests His glory He shows His goodness and declares His name.

As we meditate upon these things, the early apostasy of the Gentile world takes upon it a more serious character. It is not so much that they were ignorant, but ingrate. God did not look for learning, but He did look for thanksgiving. Science, as taught, is cold, mechanical, thankless. When the botanist Linneus saw a field of English gorse for the first time, he burst into tears. Herschel, Faraday, and others are, alas, magnificent exceptions. Let us not slip into a Godless nomenclature, and speak of "the laws of nature," but let us boldly, and yet humbly, glorify God as God, and be thankful to the great Giver for His gifts, by speaking rather of "the laws of God." If we would be true Protestants to-day, "God" will be in the language of everyday life, and not banished to the realm of hymns, prayers, and religious exercises. The reader who knows "The Biglow Papers" by James Russell Lowell; may remember that in his vernacular poems the name of God is mentioned rather freely. In his justification for the use he says :

"The charge is of profanity (against himself) brought in by persons who proclaimed African slavery of divine institution. . . . I scorn any such line of defence, and will confess at once that one of the things I am proud of in my countrymen is, that they do not put their Maker away far from them, or interpret the fear of God into being afraid of Him.

The Talmudists had conceived a deep truth when they said that 'all things were in the power of God, save the fear of God,' and when people stand in great dread of an invisible power, I suspect they mistake quite another personage for the Deity."

By this reference we do not intend to take Lowell's characterizations as our standard, but suggest that his point, so skillfully introduced at the time of the slavery question, should help us to pierce that smug and false piety that divorces the glory of God from His goodness and our thanksgiving, and mistranslates ritual as worship. Here again we must pause, reserving for another paper this record of the quick following of the *mind* into the follies of human imagination, when the fool had found it in his heart to say, "There is no God."

The Epistle to the Romans.

NO. 9.

Given up (Rom. i. 21-32).

In our last paper we found that the first step that led to the giving up of the Gentiles was a failure to glorify God as such, and to give Him thanks for the evident good gifts that He bestowed. In considering the next step in this downward course, we must remember that it follows the first as does effect the cause. Man being what he is, it does not seem possible for the throne of the universe to remain empty. If God be not honoured as the great Creator and Benefactor, then man will soon listen to the serpent's voice repeating the subtle temptation of Eden, "Ye shall be as God." As it was at the beginning, so was it at Babel, and ever since. The temptation as presented led apparently to the wisdom of God, "a tree to be desired to make one wise."

With the infallible sequence of cause and effect comes conscious distance: "I hid myself"; and loss of innocence: "I was naked." Gen. Hi. is echoed by Rom. i. The first sin is repeated in all sin and in all men. There in Rom. i. we have the other side of temptation, "as God," and the worship of an image made like to man, with the dominion placed beneath his feet. "To make one wise" is repeated in the words "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." The hiding of the guilty pair and the sense of distance that came in is repeated in the "giving up" of Rom. i. 24, 26 and 28, while the loss of innocence in their conscious nakedness is but the tiny seed that produces the crop of uncleanness that makes Rom. i. 24-31 hard reading. Let us give our attention to the record of Gentile failure. Starting from the withholding of that due to God both in glorifying Him as God, and in expressing thankfulness for His bounty, we read the next stage in Rom. i. 21-23 :

"But became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things"

As we read these words, Psa. viii. comes before the mind: "O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, Who hast set Thy glory above the heavens" (verse 1). Here the Lord, the Creator, is glorified "as God." "For out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength" (verse 2). This is the true sequence. The recognition of God "as God" leads to humility. What a difference between "babes and sucklings" and "professing themselves to be wise!" The contemplation of "the things that are made," which was neglected and rejected in Rom. i., led the Psalmist to say :

"When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; WHAT IS MAN, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?" (Psa. viii. 3, 4).

Here is no empty pride or vain profession, but true humility. This however does not lead to a grovelling state of mind, nor an unholy denial of the dignity of that creation which alone bears the impress of the image of God: "For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour" (verse 5). In Rom. i. man sank lower than the beasts in his empty wisdom. When he robbed God of the honour and glory due to His name, he at the same time robbed himself. Instead of standing in the consciousness of the glory and honour set upon him by God, we read in Rom. i. of dishonour, degradation and shame.

"Thou madest him to have dominion Over the work of Thy hand. ; Thou hast put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field: the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas" (Psa. viii. 6-8).

Here is man's true dominion. O what a falling off is there in Rom. i.! Placed over the work of God's hand we find man so utterly darkened and besotted that he worships the very creation that had been placed *beneath his feet*. This idolatry, and all that it implies, degraded both God and man. The truth, and all it implies, honours both God and man.

Vanity.

At the fall of man in Eden, vanity entered and ruled. "For the creation was made subject to vanity" (Rom. viii. 20). Ecclesiastes found everything connected with Adam and separated from the risen Christ to be "vanity and vexation of spirit" (For justification of such a statement see the articles on Ecclesiastes in Vols. X.-XIII.). Vanity not only ruled without, but it reigned within. "They became vain in their imagination" (Rom. i. 21). There are two words that are translated "vain," *kenos* and *mataios*. The former refers to contents, the latter to results. It is the latter word that is used here. The word "imagination" is *dialogismos*, which is translated in Rom. xiv. i. "disputations." The fact is, these reasonings were futile, resultless, empty. They led nowhere except to complete alienation from God. "The Gentiles walk in the 'Vanity of their mind. . . . being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them" (Eph. iv. 17, 18). The apostles at Lystra, as we have already seen, refer to the idols of the Gentiles as "vanities." Jer. ii. 5 reveals the reason for Gentile blindness: .. They are gone far from Me, and have walked after *vanity*, and are become "*vain*" (see also 2 Kings xvii. 15).

There are two important lessons to be learned here. First, the more obvious one, that man cannot by mere reasoning or philosophy discover God: "the world through its wisdom knew not God." It is a primary necessity that "He who cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him"; in other words, approach to God necessitates the recognition of the glory due to Him as *God* (Rom. i. 21)- "He is" (Heb. xi. 6), and thankfulness (Rom. i. 21), for He is the "rewarder" (Heb. xi. 6). The moment the fool says in his heart, There is no God, it can be written, "Corrupt they are, they have done abominable works, there is none that doeth good" (Psa. xvi. 1). This Psalm is quoted at some length in Rom. iii., but its presence can be felt already in Rom. i.

The second lesson that we may learn is to avoid a tendency to extremes, and to the condemning of "reasoning" as such. High in the list of those enduements that lift man above the level of the brute is the possession of reason, and it is false to assert that faith is contrary to reason, or that it is unreasonable; that is to degrade faith to credulity, and revealed truth to the level of superstition. Where faith is in the ascendant, the mind is clarified, false grounds of argument are detected, and reason and faith walk hand in hand. "The entrance of Thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple" (Psa. cxix. 130). The necessary outcome of these baseless and empty speculations was the darkening of this very faculty of reason. "Their foolish heart was darkened" (Rom. i. 21). "Foolish" is translated *undiscerning* by Rotherham, and is translated in verse 31 (A.V.) by "without understanding." The darkness that settled down upon the world shut out the only light in which man may walk and please God; his reason and his mind ceased to function correctly, even as the eye loses its power and its discernment if deprived of light. It is "in Thy light we shall see light" (Psa. xxxvi. 9). This assumption of wisdom was in reality sheer imbecility. Rom. i. 22 led the Gentile world by rapid stages into a morass of the most degraded form of idolatry and immorality :

"They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things" (Rom. i. 23).

Not only is there an exact parallel in the Gentile failure with the primal sin of Eden, but there is also an absolute parallel in the downward movement of the Gentiles as recorded in Rom. i. with the downward movement of Israel as given in Psa. cvi.

Gentile (Rom. i.)

"They changed the glory of the corruptible God into an image....man...birds, beasts.... creeping things" (23).

"They did not like to retain God in their knowledge" (28).

"Wherefore God also gave them up" (24).

"Uncleanness...vile affections" (24-27).

"Inventors of evil things" (30)

Israel (Psa. cvi.)

"They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image. Thus they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass" (19, 20)

"They forgot God their Saviour" (21)

"Therefore He said that he would destroy them" (23).

"They joined themselves also unto Baal-peor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead" (28).

"They provoked Him to anger with their inventions" (29).

As we contemplate the twofold departure from the revealed truth of God, the one, the revelation of His Godhead in nature, the other, of Himself and His will in Scripture, our hopes for man in himself must surely die, and all our hope must rest in God.

The Gentiles given Up.

We now approach the solemn fact towards which all which has been written since verse 18 has been leading, viz., the giving-up of the Gentile nations by God; "Wherefore God also gave them up" (verse 24). The word *paradidomai* ("to give up") occurs in verses 24, 26 and 28. At this point it seems advisable to take notice of the structure of the passage that we may see the setting of this threefold giving-up.

Rom. i. 19-ii. 1.

- A (i. 19-22) a. Known of God.
 - b. Inexcusable.
- B. (23-31) c1. Changed the glory.
 - d1. Given up to uncleanness.
 - c2. Changed the truth.
 - d2. Given up to infamous passions.
 - c3. Changed natural use.
 - d3. Given up to reprobate mind.
- A (32-ii.1) a. Knowing the judgment of God.
 - b. Inexcusable.

This threefold giving up indicates the dispensational position of the Gentiles from the dispersion at Babel, and the call of Abraham, until the ministry of the reconciliation committed to Paul, when Israel began to pass off the scene. The Gentiles were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise throughout the dispensation of the law under Moses, throughout the kingdom under David, throughout the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom during the earthly ministry of the Lord Jesus, and throughout a part of the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles. To this period Paul referred when he said to the Athenians; "At the time of this ignorance God winked," but indicated that a change had come by adding, "but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts xvii. 30). That the reconciliation of the world was closely associated with the setting aside of Israel may be seen by reading Rom. xi. 15. Referring to the structure we observe that not only is there a threefold giving up, but also that this giving-up is preceded by a threefold change ;

1. They changed the glory of the incorruptible God, for the likeness of corruptible man, &c.
2. They exchanged the truth of God for the lie.
3. They exchanged the natural use for that which was against nature.

There is a slight alteration in the words translated "change" in these verses in the A.V. We have attempted to indicate the difference by using "change" and "exchange." First they changed the glory of God without actually giving up God altogether, but this soon led to the next step, for they exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and then worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator. It is not possible for God to take second place. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Into the third item we cannot go. The defiling character of idolatry may be gathered from its annals, and we do not feel that any good purpose would be served by elaborating this revolting subject here. At the same time we know only too well that human nature is not a whit better to-day than when it openly practised the sins condemned in Rom. i. We need to faithfully warn the rising generation, speaking very tenderly and lovingly, yet nevertheless plainly, for Babylonianism in all its forms is rising like a flood, and the book of the Revelation reveals Rom. i. in a superlative degree. We need not go so far into the future as the book of the Revelation, however, for 2 Timothy iii. 1-8 uses many of the words of Rom. i. to describe the perilous times at the close of this present dispensation. The sequence of the apostasy and its relation to the development of the mystery of *iniquity*, otherwise called "the lie," and the mystery of *godliness*, otherwise called "the truth," can be traced through Paul's epistles.

Taking the statements of Rom. i. we find them worked out in the other epistles :

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. "As God." The creature more than the Creator." | "The man of sin....as God" (2 Thess. ii 3, 4) |
| 2. "The lie." "The truth." | "The received not the love of the <i>truth</i> ...they believe <i>the lie</i> " (2Thess.ii.10, 11) |
| 3. "Given up to an undiscerning mind" | "God shall send them strong delusion" (2 Thess. ii. 11). |
| 4. "Pleasure in them that do them." | "Had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 12) |

A comparison of the list of sins in Rom. i. with that of 2 Tim. iii. 1-7 will show how completely the para recorded. The reader must supply further parallels by studying the intervening epistles.

The lie.

We must draw attention before closing to the fact that the A.V. is not strong enough in its translation of Rom. i.25. It is "*the lie*." Of this lie Satan is the father (John viii. 44), and the Babylonian delusion at the time of the man of sin is the climax (2 Thess. ii. 10, II; Rev. xiv. 5 (*cp. Companion Bible*)xxi. 27, xxii. 15). This lie could not dominate the mind of man without something having entered into that mind at the same time. We have seen that as man robbed God of His glory, he robbed himself of his highest and best. As he degraded God to the level of a creature, so he degraded himself. The explanation is given in verse 28. In this verse there is a play upon the words *dikimazo* (" to try or prove"), and *adokimos* (" disapproved ") :

"And as they did not approve to be holding God in acknowledgment, God gave them up unto a disapproved mind, to do that which is not becoming."

Vaughan, with a certain amount of liberty with the English, expresses it thus: "As they *refused*. . . . God gave them to a *refuse* mind." The glory of God is the last item of importance in the ethics and culture of material philosophy. It is the sheet anchor of all the teaching of Scripture. God knows why He placed the ten commandments in the order in which we have them in the Word. They are in the true sequence. Idolatry is "the lie" in essence, murder and adultery are but " the lie" in practice. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. "There is no fear of God before their eyes" (Psa. xxxvi. I) is the climax of the dreadful list of Rom. iii. 10-18.

Thus far we have traced the failure of the Gentiles. The apostle's object is to demonstrate the universal need of the righteousness revealed in the gospel. Consequently he has to show the parallel condition of Israel with the Gentiles before he can proceed with the opening up of the truth. This we must study together in another paper. Meanwhile, it would be good for us all to heed Eph. ii. II-13.

The Epistle to the Romans.

NO. 10

An important parenthesis and its point (Rom. i. 18-iii.20).

When we reach Rom. i. 16, 17 we cannot avoid the conviction that we are at the heart-of the gospel as preached by Paul. At verse 18 we seem to take a turn, and any further explanation of faith, righteousness, or justification seems to be suspended. From Rom. i. 18-32 we have a fearful picture of the utter failure of the Gentile world even though they had received the revelation of creation, and the monitorship of conscience. When we get into Rom. ii. the teaching becomes more involved; we seem further than ever from the theme of the epistle, and indeed the conclusions we may have reached at the end of Rom. i. seem rudely challenged by the time we reach the end of Rom. ii. Nevertheless we approach God's word not with a wonder as to whether it is perfect in every part, but with a conviction that it is, and just as it is said of the lover of the works of God: "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein" (Psa. cxi. 2), so to the earnest seeker after truth light will surely be given.

A reading of Rom. ii. leaves one with the feeling that the whole passage is an aside, a great parenthesis, and the opening verses of Romans iii. are but a continuation of the same theme. At Rom. iii. 9 light dawns, for the apostle himself definitely tells us what he has been endeavoring to set forth since Rom. i. 17. To follow the direction given by his own analysis gives certainty in place of conjecture. The object with which Paul wrote Rom. i. 18-iii. 9 is given in the following words: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (Rom. iii.9). ("Proved" is better translated "accused," as may be seen by other parts of the same word in Matt. xxvii. 37, &c.).

It is evident that the charge against the Gentile is opened in Rom. i. 18--32, and that the two-fold accusation against Jew and Gentile occupies Rom. ii. 1--iii. 8, and the concluding evidence against the Jew-"those who are under the law" (iii. 19)--occupies verses 10-18, bringing us to the great conclusion: "all the world guilty before God." As soon as we pass this point, the thread laid down in Rom. i. 17 is seen to be resumed, and we immediately have before us one of the most illuminating passages of Paul's epistles so far as justification by faith is concerned: "even a righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ" (Rom.iii. 22). Although we have not as yet seen more than the drift of Rom. ii., we have at least set the bounds of our inquiry.

A - Rom. i. 17. Justification by faith.

B - Rom. i. 18--32. The accusation against the Gentile. -List of offences.

C - Rom. ii. 1-iii. 9-. Circumcision and uncircumcision.

B - Rom. iii.-9-19. The accusation against the Jew. -List of offences.

A - Rom. iii. 20, &c. Justification by faith.

The members denominated "A" are merely to set bounds; we do not attempt anything further here. The passage that we have before us as the subject for study is "C"-Rom. ii. 1-iii. 9--. Now for the trial of faith. The writings of our fellow-labourers in this epistle yield nothing as to structure or outline. *The Companion Bible* says nothing. Our own attempted sub-divisions were unsatisfactory. Accordingly we took a clean sheet, confessed to the Lord our ignorance, but at the same time the conviction that no one part of this epistle would be found unruly or out of order, and the light came. The fullest section, and that which sets forth the perfectness of the argument, is that under notice, and this will be the better appreciated when its place and purpose is understood. This

understanding will be furthered by devoting our attention to the introductory and concluding members :

- A – ii. 1. – a. – *Krino*. – Inexcusable, whoever judges.
 - b. – *Krino*. – Judging another condemns self.
 - c. – *Krino*. – The one judging practices same things.
- B – ii. 2. *Krima*. – Judgment of God according to truth.
 - C – ii. 3-25 (Details omitted until next paper).
 - C – ii.25- iii. 1 (Details omitted until next paper).
- A – iii. 4-7 a. – *Krino*. – God will overcome when judged.
 - b. – *Krino*. – God is not unrighteous when judging the world.
 - c. – *Krino* – God judges sin, though He overrules it for good.
- B – iii. 8, 9 – *Krima* – Judgment of God is just.

The summary of this outline is as follows:

- A – When man judges he sets a standard whereby he himself shall be judged.
- B – God's judgment is according to truth, and not appearance or privilege.
 - C – No respect of persons with God. Jew and Gentile.
 - C – No advantage or disadvantage. Circumcision or uncircumcision.
- A – When God judges He is found to be above all suspicion.
 - B – God's judgment is just.

We are told that the visitor to the labyrinths of the catacombs retained hold of a silken thread by which he could retrace his steps without fear of becoming lost. In the chapter before us there are almost endless opportunities for getting "lost." The apostle touches upon a sphere that is removed from our responsibility, and while certain passages will prevent us from coming to an adverse conclusion concerning the heathen world which has never known either the law of Moses or the gospel of Christ, the silken thread attached to Rom. iii. 9 and 19 will keep us to the reason for the teaching of Rom. ii. so far as this epistle is concerned, and prevent us from overturning the definite teaching of Rom. iii. 20 for the less definite suggestions of Rom. ii. 12-16. It is evident from Rom. i. 18-32 that nothing more was necessary to bring in the Gentile guilty before God. The apostle's problem, however, was to bring about the same conviction in the breast of the Jew. We are not left to our own conjectures to discover Israel's great impediment, for the apostle has spoken most clearly on the subject.

" I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth" (Rom. x. 1-4).

Israel's boast in Rom. ii. is that they "knew His will"; that they "approved the things that were more excellent."

They esteemed themselves as guides to the blind, and lights to them which are in darkness." They had a "form of knowledge and of the truth in the law," *but they were in fatal ignorance!* When we see this, what is there to choose between the Gentiles who

"Became vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened, who, professing themselves to be WISE, became FOOLS. . . . and did not like to retain God in their KNOWLEDGE" (Rom. i. 21-28),

and the Jews whose vain-glorious boasting ended equally in death? The deadly enemy of Paul's message before Acts xxviii. was Judaism, or the false claims of the law. After Acts xxviii. Judaism passes, and a "vain deceitful philosophy" challenged the high glories of the prison epistles. In both cases the apostle shows its utter vanity, and sets Christ crucified, risen, and ascended over against it as "the end" and "the fullness."

It will be seen by the words quoted from Rom. ii. 17-20, that the Jew not only made great claims for himself, but spoke with emphatic judgment against the Gentile. This, which the Jew thought his strong point, proved his overthrow, for the apostle brings to light a solemnizing truth, namely, that the clearer our judgment is against the shortcomings of others, the higher, necessarily, the standard must be by which we ourselves shall be judged. This, moreover, is aggravated by the fact that the Jew, while condemning the Gentile for breaches of the law, himself was responsible for similar breaches, and, like David before Nathan, uttered his own doom. The apostle here is stripping the false covering of privilege, both by his argument in Rom. ii. 1-3, and by the definite statement which is axiomatic the world over: "there is no respect of person with God" (Rom ii. II).

At the beginning and ending of this section we have a three-fold reference to judging (the verb *krino*), followed by a statement concerning the judgment (*krima*) of God: "Whoever judges another is inexcusable." The apostle had been "an Israelite," and having been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel he was swift to anticipate the cavils of his Jewish antagonist, which might be presented somewhat as follows:

You say Paul, that whosoever judges another is inexcusable and condemns himself. You stress the *whosoever* to the breaking down of distinction and privilege, but do you not see that by so doing you must therefore include God Himself? He too must stand before the bar and be judged.

Instead of meeting this specious argument with a swift and passionate denial, the apostle quietly assents to the main contention. In Rom. iii. he says, in effect:

Within certain limits I agree that your words contain a deeper truth than you are aware. God Almighty could withhold any account of any of His matters. In some things He does, but not in the matter of judgment. David acknowledged that God would ever become victorious when His judgments were questioned. Not because of His MIGHT, but because His judgments are RIGHT.

So concerned is God that no suspicion should lurk anywhere concerning His righteousness, that He is at pains to justify Himself in connection with passing over the sins of the past. He will not have His forbearance misinterpreted (Rom. iii. 25). The God of Israel challenges them, saying: "Are not My ways equal?" (Ezek. xviii. 29). The point of the case is that although God's judgments will be subjected to the most patient scrutiny, yet will He always triumph, and Israel will immediately collapse, "For thou that judgest doest the same things" (Rom. ii. I). In God's case He is not unrighteous Who taketh vengeance, for how then could He judge the world?

In case any reader should object to this rather free use of the Name and Person of God in this argument, we would direct his attention to the end of Rom. iii. 5 ("I speak as a man").

"The judgment of God is according to TRUTH" (Rom. ii. 2).

This stands in contrast with *prosopolepsian* of verse II, the respect of persons which is denied. God has further manifested the utter impartiality of His judgment in the fact that

"He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance (*margin, offered faith, i.e., good faith*) to all, raising Him from among the dead" (Acts xvii. 31).

"The judgment of God is RIGHT" (Rom. iii. 8).

The A.V. reads, "whose damnation is just." It is an entire repudiation of the casuistry of the Jew contained in the false charge: "Let us do evil that good may come" (Rom. iii.

8). If it was a slander to say that Christ's apostle taught such a doctrine, the fact that the context is occupied with the vindication of God's judgment from the least suspicion of advantage, or of the engineering of human faithlessness, should cause us equally to abominate the mere approach to such a thing. That God does overrule evil is abundantly testified throughout Scripture and experience, but that is an entirely different matter. Before we conclude this examination it is necessary to become acquainted with the central section (Rom. ii. 3-iii. I). This we must take up in our next article.

What a solid basis for our redemption! True it flows from the love of God; true it is all of grace and not of merit, yet marvelous to remember He has so wrought that "He might be *just*, and the *justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26). Then what of that spirit of judgment? that keenness to see error? that "nose for heresy?" What kind of standard are we setting for ourselves? Should any interpose with a plea of privilege, parallel to that of the Jew, we would remind such that in addition to Rom. ii., Col. iii. 25 tells us that: "There is no respect of persons," and that "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done."

Sign of the Times.

p. 15

Read in the light of Isa. viii. 19, 20, and I Tim. iv. 1-3, we can see that forerunners of Rev. xvi. 14 are preparing the way. Therefore "lift up your heads" (Luke xxi. 28).

"The Daily Chronicle, 15th November, 1926.

SIR A. CONAN DOYLE'S CHALLENGE.

3,000 of Albert Hall Audience Who Have 'Been in Touch with Dead'.

'I ask all those who are sure that they have been in touch with their dead to rise and to testify.'

This challenge by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle to spiritualists assembled yesterday morning at the Service of Remembrance in the Albert Hall was responded to by about 3,000 people, men and women of all types.

'I thank God there are so many', said Arthur. 'I will make a prophecy that within five years' time, to such an appeal made from this platform, there will not be one man or woman in the hall who will not rise.'

For the first time the Albert Hall had been engaged by the spiritualists for their annual Armistice service, and about 8,000 were present."

p. 31

Christian people who have entertained the unscriptural hope of peace on earth apart from the personal presence of the Prince of Peace, would do well to heed the uncompromising testimony, not of a popular preacher, but of a soldier, quoted below from the article on *War*, by Sir Ian Hamilton, in the New Encyclopedia Britannica:--

"Is War Inevitable?"

"Because good Europeans hate war in 1926 it does not follow that they hated war in 1914 or that they will hate it in 1964. Because Sir Bedivere has flung Excalibur far out into the mere let no one imagine that the glamour of the sword is for ever quenched. Against that spiritual symbol the shield of Locarno, welded by the spectre of the falling franc, will form a poor protection. To-day pacifists speak to the converted, but their young sons have been born with the old instincts.

Those who have seen with their own eyes and suffered in their own bodies know the ugly truths of war, but they cannot convey their knowledge to the young generation.

Nothing will stop war save the Second Advent of Christ."

The following extract from a report published in *The Daily Chronicle*, of the sixth Hailey Stewart Lecture, 1926, indicates the necessity for the believer to stand fast to the teaching of Scripture concerning the keystone doctrine of the resurrection:--

Sir O. Lodge's confession.

Never visits his son's grave in France.

Death an adventure.

"I have never been to see my boy Raymond's grave in France. He has asked me not to. He says, 'I take no interest in that grave. I never was in a grave in my life'."

Sir Oliver Lodge, the famous scientist, made the above dramatic statement delivering the sixth Hailey Stewart lecture at the Memorial Hall, London, last night, his subject being "Death and the Hereafter".

"Think about the grave as little as possible", proceeded Sir Oliver.

"If people would get over that trouble about interment, and about lying there for centuries waiting for a general resurrection—all that kind of medieval superstition—they could begin to regard death as more like what it is, an adventure, an episode that is bound to be welcome when it comes, and as something not to be afraid of."

Say ye not a confederacy” (Isa. viii. 12).
“Keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. iv. 3).

Never before in Europe. London’s First.

FELLOWSHIP OF FAITHS
Thursday, JULY 21ST. Exactly 5.15 to 6.45 p.m.

CITY TEMPLE

(HOLBRON VIADUCT, E.C.4),

PEACE & BROTHERHOOD

As taught by

SEVEN LIVING WORLD RELIGIONS.

Ten Minute Addresses by

Buddhist	Hon. Dr. W. A. de Silva, of Ceylon.
Christian	Dr. Sherwood Eddy, of America.
Confucian	(A message from Dr. Wei-Chang Che’ n, of China).
Hindu	Maharajadhiraja Bahadur of Burdwan, of India.
Jew	Dr. Moses Gaster.
Mohammedan	Abdul Majid and Maulvi A. R. Dard.
Theosophist	Dr. Annie Besant.

The Rev. Dr. F. W. Norwood, Presiding.

Devotional Music: Moslem Call to Prayer by the Muezin of London Mosque.

Hindu Song by Dilip Kumar Roy.

Christian Hymn.

Words in Season.

#9. Onions and garlick, or this manna! (Num. xi. 5, 6). pp. 92 - 94

There is a word that by its use conveys a most important lesson for all who would go on to the full goal of our redemption, and stand “perfect and complete in all the will of God”. That word is variously translated “desire”, “covet”, and “lust”. While it is true that in some aspects that which is sensual and unclean is intended, the believer is apt to miss much vital teaching by avoiding the word altogether as having no immediate application to himself. A few examples will help us in this matter, and so before proceeding further we will notice them:--

“The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other” (Gal. v. 17).

It is very evident here that the word “lust” does not imply anything sensual or unclean, but simply “desire”, for it is used of both the flesh and the spirit:--

“The lusts of other things entering in, choke the word” (Mark iv. 19).

Here again “lust” means desire or coveting:--

“We should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted” (I Cor. x. 6).

The passage refers to the wilderness journey of Israel, and their desire for the things left behind in Egypt.

These examples will suffice to show that in avoiding this word “lust”, we are closing our ear to very salutary warnings from the Word of truth. We cannot do better for the moment than look more closely at these three passages, and seek to discover their meaning. Take Mark iv. 19 first. It occurs in the parable of the *Sower*, and therefore has a primary interpretation respecting the mysteries of the kingdom. As this parable occurs in three of the Gospels, it will help us further to note any variation in the wording:--

“The care of this age, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful” (Matt. xiii. 22).

“The cares of the age, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts concerning things that are left, entering in, choke the word, and it becomes unfruitful” (Mark iv. 19).

“And are choked with the cares and riches and pleasures of life, and bring no fruit to perfection” (Luke viii. 14).

It will be observed that while cares and riches are mentioned in all three passages, there are several variations that are illuminating. For example, the cares of the age of Matthew and Mark become the cares of life, and as the word is *bios*, the cares also of livelihood. Luke adds the word “pleasures”, and Mark adds the word “desires” or

“lusts”. Now Mark’s full expression is very suggestive: “desires concerning things that are left.”

A somewhat parallel passage is Luke xii. 26, “If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why are you careful (anxious) concerning the things that are left?” Eph. ii. 3 makes a distinction between the saved and “the rest”, as does also I Thess. iv. 13. the desires and cares for the things that are “left” choke the word, and prevent fruit to perfection. Paul says in Phil. iii. and iv.:--

“Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before I press Mark them which walk who mind earthly things Be careful for nothing.”

This feature leads us on to the quotation from I Cor. x. 6, where Israel lusted after evil things. We find the record in Numb. xi. 4, 5:--

“The mixt multitude fell a lusting We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick.”

They remembered! Paul sought to forget. They, in type, minded “earthly things”, the tasty produce of Egypt, the things that are left “entered in”, and brought ruin with them. Their very remembrance spoilt their taste for the bread of heaven:--

“There is nothing at all beside THIS MANNA!” (Numb. xi. 6).

The Psalmist gives one tragic comment upon this “lusting” or “desiring”:--

“They lusted exceedingly in the wilderness And He gave them their request, *but sent leanness into their soul*” (Psa. cvi. 14, 15).

The fullest light is let in when we turn to the third reference cited above, viz., Gal. v. 16, 17:--

“Now I say, walk in spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the desire of the flesh. For the flesh desires the contrary of the spirit, and the spirit the contrary of the flesh, for these are opposed to each other.”

Here then are two sets and two sources of “lust” or “desire”, flesh and spirit. They are contrary the one to the other. The spirit desires the things of God; therefore to “desire the things that are left”, the things of the flesh, the things that were left behind beyond the Red Sea in Egypt, is to fail both in fruitfulness and in perfection.

We must return to this subject again, meanwhile may we receive with meekness the Word of God that reveals the hidden spring of so many perplexing things in this life, viz., *desire*.

Specially for Young People.

#1. Talks on the way. pp. 113 - 117

At the London meetings conducted by the Editor, six meetings in the year are devoted to the instruction and help of the Young People who attend. These are held on the second Sunday of the months of January, March, May, July, September, and November, in which, of course, all ages are welcome. It has been felt that a wider circle of Young People, or those who have such under their care, would appreciate notes of these meetings. We accordingly commend them to the earnest prayerful use of all readers.

The way that seemeth right

Life is a journey. The Scriptures are full of references to this journey. Figures of the pathway, the guide, the provision, the dangers meet one everywhere. Psalm xxiii. has much to say about the way, so has Moses in the Pentateuch, the Lord in the Gospels, and Paul in the Epistles. Let us learn something for our help and blessing concerning “the way”.

The way.

The whole scheme of Christian doctrine and practice is called “the way”, especially in the Acts of the Apostles.

“If he found any of THE WAY (*see margin*) bring them bound unto Jerusalem” (Acts ix. 2).

“Divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of THE WAY before the multitude” (Acts xix. 9).

“At the same time there arose no small stir about THE WAY” (Acts xix. 23).

“I persecuted THIS WAY unto the death” (Acts xxii. 4).

“After THE WAY which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my father” (Acts xxix. 14).

“Felix having more perfect knowledge of THE WAY, deferred” (Acts xxiv. 22).

Added to the simple expression “the way” we find in the Acts several explanatory terms, such as:--

“The right ways of the Lord” (xiii. 10).

“The way of salvation” (xvi. 17).

“The way of the Lord” (xviii. 25).

“The way of God” (xviii. 26).

These titles are expanded and expounded in the epistles, but before we turn to their teaching we must realize the character and end of “man’s way” so that we may the better appreciate “the right ways of the Lord”.

Man's way.

The book of Proverbs provides a comprehensive commentary upon the way of man. Conceit is taken from man by the impossibility he finds even of understanding his own way, to say nothing of clear sighted analysis or unbiased judgment.

“Man's goings are of the Lord: how can a man then understand his own way?”
(Prov. xx. 24).

The sense of this passage is obscured by the failure of the translation to differentiate between the two words used for “man”. The LXX more truly gives the extremes—“a full-grown man” and a “mortal”. The sense is better expressed thus:--

“The steps of a powerful man are from the Lord;
Then a common man, how shall he discern his way?” (John Miller's Translation).

That man is unable correctly to discern his way, Proverbs teaches most clearly:--

“There is a way that seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death” (xiv. 12 and xvi. 25).

This proverb is repeated and therefore its truth is doubly impressed. The word “seemeth right” is literally, is right to his face or before him. This is in direct contrast with the “end” which is literally “its after part”. To be taken up with “things seen” blinds the mind to that “afterward” that is the inevitable wage of sin. Prov. xvi. 26 which follows (according to the A.V) speaks of man labouring for himself, the following translation being terribly suggestive:--

“The labouring soul labours for it” (*i.e.* death). (John Miller's Translation).

It is a solemn thought that the whole way of man and all his labour is for nothing else than death. Nevertheless this is most certainly true. There are but two ways. Call then the way of man, and the way of God, the way of lying, and the way of truth, the way of death, and the way of life. Prov. xv. 19 has one of these contrasting pairs:--

“The way of a slothful man is as an hedge of thorns; but the way of the righteous is raised up as a causeway” (*see* margin).

There are fourteen references to the “slothful” or the “sluggard” in Proverbs, and the child of God could spend the time taken in their consideration on many other things with less profit. Faith, though it be not “works” is not slothful. For a connection between sloth and thorns as applied to the believer see Heb. vi. 7-12. Those who think their own ways to be right, Proverbs says are “fools”:--

“The way of a fool is right in his own eyes” (xii. 15).

Study the context of such passages that speak of being “wise”, or “right”, or “clean”, or “pure”, in our “own eyes”, as Prov. iii. 7; xvi. 2; and xxx. 12. While the fool thinks his own way right, Scripture says:--

“The foolishness of man perverteth his way: and his heart fretteth against the Lord” (Prov. xix. 3).

This perversion may be seen in Prov. xxi. 8:--

“The way of a man is forward and strange: but as for the pure, his walk is right.”
“The man who has been *twisting about* as to his way, has also been *getting further off*: but the pure man is *straightforward* in his work.” (John Miller’s Translation).

Here is wandering that ends in utter loss, a twisting that never proves to be “a short cut”. The way of truth is a “right” way, it leads to life; all others whatever their outward seeming end in death. Not only does man pervert his own way, and sow his path with thorns, but

“The way of the wicked seduceth them” (Prov. xii. 26).

There is a fascination about evil; a will-o’-the-wisp lures men on to ruin, and nothing but grace can enlighten the eyes to see it in its true colours, or to confess it. This word “seduce” in the *preterite* is used in Isa. liii. 6:--

“All we like sheep have *gone astray*; we have turned every one to his own way.”

Here is a complete endorsement of Prov. xii. 26. Their “own way” was parallel to “going astray”, and in the blessed sequel we find it is expressed as “iniquity”, which the Lord Jesus bore as the great sacrifice for sin. This “straying”, this seduction of self by the way of wickedness, though apparently right, ends in death:--

“The man that *wandereth* (same word as ‘seduce’) out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead” (Prov. xxi. 16).

Contrast this with the words of Prov. xv. 24:--

“The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from hell (*sheol*) beneath.”

It is ever the same. God’s way is a way of light and life; and man’s a way of darkness and death. We have not yet seen the verse that tells of darkness. Here it is:--

“The way of the wicked is as darkness: they know not at what they stumble” (Prov. iv. 19).

This passage must be read with verse 18, which says:--

“The path of the just is as dawning light, advancing and brightening toward perfect day.” (John Miller’s Translation).

What we have learned.

From these passages of heavenly wisdom we learned at least the following facts about the way of man:--

1. Man's own powers of observation and reasoning, and even conscience unguided by inspired truth, are not sufficient to convince him that his own way is utterly wrong.
2. Man's own way, though self-approved, is nevertheless a way of self-deception, a way of darkness, and a way of death.
3. Man really has become through sin an utter fool; he sows his own path with thorns, and renders upward progress impossible.

The apostle, in Rom. iii., puts the same truth in the following words:--

“There is none righteous, no, not one they are all gone out of the WAY destruction and misery are in their WAYS, and the WAY of peace have they not know.”

This is the testimony of all Scripture. It is found as early as Gen. vi. There in verse 12 we read:--

“And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his WAY upon the earth.”

This corruption of the way proceeded from within:--

“And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen. vi. 5).

A consideration of the way of man leads us to the inevitable conclusion that man of himself is hopeless and undone. Walking in darkness, going down, down to death, yet under the false conceit that his ways are right. It is bad enough to be on a wrong road *and to know it*, but man is on a wrong road and is deceived into thinking it is right!

“This their way is their folly: yet their posterity approve their sayings”! (Psa. xlix. 13).

Yet if you read on in the Psalm it will be found that such folly is fatal, for “death shall feed on them”. Shall we not, in view of this solemn testimony, put up the prayer of the Psalmist?

“Remove from me the WAY of lying: and grant me Thy law graciously. I have chosen the WAY of truth O Lord, put me not to shame” (Psa. cxix. 29-31).

Over and over again we read concerning Israel that they had “turned out of the way”. This was their initial national sin after the great covenant of Sinai.

“Thy people which Thou hast brought forth out of Egypt have corrupted themselves: they are quickly turned aside out of the WAY which I commanded them” (Deut. ix. 12).

So in Deut. xi. 27, 28. A “blessing” if they obey, a “curse” if they do not obey, but “turn aside out of the way”. As we have seen when looking at the initial meaning of sin, sin is a negation: “all UNrighteousness is sin”, “Whatsoever is NOT of faith is sin.” So the false way, the way of death is really the negation of the way of truth, and the way of life. Man’s way is the negation of God’s way.

“Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, It is a people that do err in their heart, and HAVE NOT KNOWN MY WAYS” (Psa. xcvi. 10).

Here for the moment we conclude. Our next subject must be blessed contrast, the way of God. May the awful revelation of the path that man is treading, until grace translates him, be used of God to the eternal blessing of many who are out of the way.

#2. Christ the way. pp. 154 - 156

In the former talk we found that in Scripture the gospel is called *the way*, and that man’s way and God’s way are totally different in their character and goal. We now consider particularly Christ as the Way, and for this we turn at once to John xiv. 5, 6:--

“Thomas saith unto Him, Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way? Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me.”

We have already learned that man is out of the way, has gone astray, and Thomas but expresses the plaint of us all, “How can we know the way?” The answer is *Christ: He* is the way. There is an exclusiveness about this way that we do well to recognize: “No man but by Me” shuts us up to one way only. This feature is by no means confined to the passage under notice:--

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before Me are thieves and robbers I am the door; BY ME if any man enter in, he shall be saved” (John x. 7-9).

Christ is the only door. Again, in John vi. we read that Christ is the true bread of life: “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead *I am the living bread*” (John vi. 49-51). Peter likewise declares, “There is *none other name* under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts iv. 12).

An important point.

The expression, “The way, the truth, and the life” needs a little attention if we would not miss its fulness. As it stands we have three separate facts, each and all true. Christ *is* the way; Christ *is* the truth; Christ *is* the life; and chapter and verse can easily be found

in proof. At the same time, the passage contains something more. This may be a good opportunity for introducing to young people that important auxiliary, a knowledge of *Figures of Speech*. There is a figure which is called *Hendiadys*—a cumbersome name until understood. *Hen* is Greek for “one”; *dia* is Greek for “through”; *dys* is from *duo* (“two”), and so it is “The one-by-means-of-two” figure, two words being used, while one thing is intended. The familiar expression “bread and butter” in everyday English is an example of this figure. We do not mean a separate piece of butter in the same way that we do when we say “bread and cheese”; what we really mean is “buttered bread”, with an emphasis upon the “butter”. This adjective therefore is put forward and made into a noun. John xiv. 6 is an example of *Hendiadys*, or “one-by-means-of-three”, and means, “I am the way, yes, the true and living way”.

We must find space later on to give a few words of explanation concerning the most important Figures of Speech, but will not digress here. The figure emphasizes the two important facts that Christ, the way, is both *true* and *living*.

True.

The ordinary English usage of the word true limits it to that which is the opposite of “false”, and this of course is a frequent meaning in the N.T. There is, however, another very important usage arising out of the fact that in the Old Testament there are so many types and shadows. When we read in Heb. viii. 2 of “the *true* tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man”, the passage does *not* imply that the tabernacle pitched by Moses was *false*, but that it was but a type of shadow. This is actually said to be the case in Heb. ix. 24: “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the *true*, but into heaven itself.” So, when we read in John that Christ is the “true light” (i. 9), the “true bread” (vi. 32), the “true vine” (xv. 1) and the “true way” (xiv. 6), they are viewed as the real in contrast with the type and shadow.

Living.

Not only is Christ the true or the antitypical way, He is also the “*living way*”. The question of the angel at the sepulchre: “Why seek ye the living among the dead?” is applicable here. This way is “living” because it has essentially to do with resurrection, “Thou wilt show me the path of life” (Psa. xvi. 11). John not only speaks of Christ as the living way, but tells of “living water” (iv. 10); “living bread” (vi. 51); and the Son of the “living God” (vi. 69). A dead way or a merely typical way can never lead us back to the “living God”.

A new and living way.

In Hebrews the “living God” is mentioned four times, and we read in x. 19, 20 of “A new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us”. The utter failure of the typical way is the theme of Hebrews:--

“The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a FIGURE for the time then present” (Heb. ix. 8, 9).

“For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God” (Heb. vii. 19).

“For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins every priest standeth 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” (Heb. x. 4, 11, 12).

The once offered sacrifice and the ever living High Priest is the one true, new, and living way whereby we may draw near unto God. All other ways are either false or shadows. All other ways must fail, for they are not “living”; Christ alone is the One who can say, “I am He that *liveth* and *was dead*”.