

# 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 XV.

1925

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

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

The deepening darkness called “Modernism” is surely fulfilling the prophetic word of II Tim. iii. and iv., *The Berean Expositor* must as surely fulfil II Tim. iv. 2:--

PREACH THE WORD.

We therefore ask the prayerful co-operation of all our readers in our twofold attempt to carry out this duty and privilege. Side by side with the written ministry of *The Berean Expositor* has always been the spoken ministry both in London, the Provinces and in Scotland. For the time, at least, it is possible for the Editor to respond to invitations to conduct Bible meetings, and it is our desire to buy up these opportunities. The written testimony is often accepted after the spoken word has cleared the way.

May we then ask that the prayerful fellowship extended to *The Berean Expositor* may be widened to embrace the equally important endeavour to preach the word in season, out of season, and that both doors of utterance and of opportunity may be granted, to His glory.

Yours in the bond of peace,

CHARLES H. WELCH  
FREDK. P. BRININGER

*December, 1925.*

## INDEX

AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE	5
ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS	6
BODY, THE, IN EPHESIANS	4
DEITY OF CHRIST, THE	8
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
Amalek, type of the flesh.	
Aaron and Hur, types of fellowship (Exod. xvii. and xviii.)	16
HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
Superiority of the Priesthood of Melchisedec (vii. 1-10)	20
A seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary	31
MINISTRY, NOTES ON--	
The end of the charge	41
The contest	43
The life that is now, and to come (I Tim. iv. 8)	45
MINISTRY OF CONSOLATION, THE--	
Mary <i>also</i> sat at His feet (Luke x. 39)	48
A cure for insomnia (Psa. iii., iv.)	49
If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do (Psa. xi. 3)	50
The factors of consolation (II Thess. ii. 16, 17)	51
MYSTERY, STUDIES IN EPISTLES OF--	
Readjustment (Eph. iv. 12)	53
The threefold goal (Eph. iv. 13)	56
The Satanic system (Eph. iv. 14, 15)	60
The Head, the all things (Eph. iv. 15)	63
Things that make for growth (Eph. iv. 16)	66
Alienation, the mind and the new man (Eph. iv. 17-20)	69
The new man and the Truth (Eph. iv. 20-24)	76
Put on . . . Put off . . . Walk accurately (Eph. iv. 25 - v. 21)	81
PRIEST, THE, AND THE MYSTERY	7
REDEMPTION (NEW SERIES)--	
The Anointed Cherub	91, 97, 104
The Cherubim, their pledge	107
REVELATION, STUDIES IN BOOK OF--	
First resurrection and the second death (xx. 5, 6)	117
Satan's last act (xx. 7-10)	120
The great white throne (xx. 11-15)	124
All things new (xxi., xxii.)	131
Measurements of the new Jerusalem	144
SIN, AND ITS RELATION TO GOD	146
TIMOTHY, FIRST EPISTLE TO	150
WORDS IN SEASON--	
Faith says <i>Amen</i> to God	155
Faith is the crediting of a testimony	157
"Historic" and "Saving" Faith	159

## The Body in Ephesians. p. 106

A beloved reader raises the question as to why we have given but one reference to the doctrinal portion of Ephesians in the structure set out on page 52 of the present volume.

In case other readers should be perplexed and conclude that we have acted arbitrarily, we point out that the reference to the body in Eph. ii. 16 refers to the individual body of the Lord Himself and not to the church. Similarly we omitted the reference in v. 28, for there the reference is not to the church, but to the body of the individual believer.

To place the matter clearly before the reader we will set out the complete structure, including all references, but marking the passages that do not enter into the argument of Eph. iv. 16:--

### The Body.

A		i. 23.	The church which is His body.	<i>Ecclesiastical.</i>
<b>B</b>   ii. 16. Reconcile. Reference to the Lord's own body.				
		C	iv. 4. The one body.	<i>Ecclesiastical.</i>
		D	iv. 12. Gifts for building up.	<i>Past.</i>
		E	iv. 16-. Fitly joined together.	<i>Central.</i>
		D	iv. -16. Member for growth.	<i>Present.</i>
		C	v. 23. Christ the Head.	<i>Practical.</i>
<b>B</b>   v. 28. Love. Reference to believer's own body.				
A		v. 30.	The church and members.	<i>Practical.</i>

## **An opportunity to serve.**

**p. 129**

Most of our readers visit from time to time the libraries that are to be found in our towns, and we wonder whether they have ever felt a twinge of conscience as they observed the serried ranks of papers and magazines which are there for the reader. The special feature we have in mind is that so many of the “cults” and “isms” go out of their way to provide these reading rooms with every opportunity to become acquainted with their special teaching.

It is a matter that has often come to us that we too should be as diligent and as unselfish. May we ask you to share with others in your neighbourhood the cost of providing a free copy of *The Berean Expositor* at the Free Library in your locality? We believe that if one reader but mentioned it to others the response would be immediate. Take a spare copy to the Librarian and submit it for approval, assuring him that it will be supplied regularly, and ask the Lord to bless the effort. Others may find enough encouragement to be able to present a copy of *The Apostle of the Reconciliation* for the library also. Let us “redeem the time” for the night is far spent.

“He that doth indeed go forth and weep, bearing seed enough to trail along, doth surely come in with shouting, bringing his sheaves” (Psa. cxxvi. 6)  
(ROTHERHAM).

**Answers to Correspondents.**  
**pp. 158, 159**

G.J.P. (Holland) writes an encouraging letter in which a question is asked. To make it clear, we recast it and hope we have expressed the writer's meaning:--

At the resurrection of Christ (Matt. xxvii.) many others were raised. Christ and these raised ones together formed the sheaf typified in Lev. xxiii. 10, 11. Together they may have ascended to heaven on the morrow after the Sabbath. Christ's first ascension was that indicated in John xx. 17.

What is the relation of these raised ones to the church of the one body? Are they also seated with Christ in the superheavenlies?

While we believe John xx. 17 indicates that the Lord ascended to heaven as the great anti-typical wave sheaf, we do not find warrant for believing that any others ascended to heaven with Him. I Cor. xv. 23 says, "Christ the Firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming", which teaches that the saints do not form part of that "Firstfruits" presented to God on the morrow after the Passover Sabbath.

Further, the church of the one body with its seat in the super-heavenlies is the subject of a distinct revelation, its calling and sphere being part of the mystery that had been hidden by God until Paul's imprisonment. This would disassociate the one body from the type in Leviticus, or from the saints of Matt. xxvii. Your difficulty arises out of the words "they *may* have ascended". As we have no Scriptural warrant for believing this ascension, we may set it aside, and when we do so your difficulty ceases.

**The Priest and the Mystery.**  
**p. 159**

The question sometimes arises in the mind of the reader, *What has the priesthood of Christ to do with the church of the mystery?* A word may therefore be of service here. It is a fact that priesthood is not spoken of Christ in Ephesians or the other prison epistles, but we must beware of the inference that would set aside the priestly work of Christ, the reasons being as follows.

Ephesians speaks of Christ's sacrifice as an offering and a sweet-smelling savour; Ephesians speaks of making us nigh by the blood of Christ; Ephesians speaks of access with boldness. Let us not mistake the shadow for the substance. Whatever blessing there may be for the believer in the work of the high priest, that blessing shorn of all typical and temporary characteristics is as much the privileged possession of the church of the one body as is the efficacy and preciousness of the great sacrifice for sin.

## The Deity of Christ. pp. 1 - 10

### Form and Fashion (continued).

B.—What do you understand by “equality with God”?

A.—I take it to mean *the same essential nature*, and that Christ did not aspire to the supreme Godhead, but was content with His subordinate position as indicated in John i. 1.

B.—Seeing that “form” like “formula” means essential nature, this new statement must indicate something else. The R.V. reads “on an equality with God”. *Isa Theo* indicates not essential nature, but mode of existence. Now one mode of existence may be relinquished for another without touching the nature. The words of II Cor. viii. 9 are an illustration, “Though He was rich, yet He became poor”. “Rich” and “poor” are modes of existence, but “He” who made the exchange remained the same.

A.—What does the statement mean then?

B.—Christ, though essentially God and therefore surrounded with the accompaniments of Deity, voluntarily laid all this glory aside and came to earth and was found in fashion as a man. “The form of God” has as its proper mode the being “on an equality with God”. “The form of a servant” has as its proper mode “the fashion as a man”.

The counting it not a prize that He was on an equality with God is further explained by the words, “He made Himself of no reputation”, or more literally, “He emptied Himself”. Of what did Christ empty Himself? The answer must be, He emptied Himself of that which He did not regard as a prize. He did not lay aside His essential nature, He did lay aside the glory that was His own proper right. Let us now look at the words:--

“He made Himself of no reputation” (A.V.).  
“Emptied Himself” (R.V.).

The two words “Not . . . . but” leave no room for doubt as to what was “emptied”. The being on equality with God, the ministry of thousands of angels, the glory; this He voluntarily laid aside. The two statements:--

Himself He emptied.  
Himself He humbled.

explain one another. Chrysostom in his commentary on Philippians says:--

“What then should we say in answer to Arius, who said that the Son is of other substance (than the Father)? Tell me what is the meaning of this--*He took the form of a servant*? He became man says Arius. Therefore also *subsisting in the form of God*, He was God . . . . *The form of a servant*—man by nature; therefore *the form of God*—God by nature.

Bishop Pearson draws attention to the inexactness of the A.V. In the A.V. we read:--

“He made Himself of no reputation, AND took upon Himself the form of a servant, AND was made in the likeness of men” (Phil. ii. 7).

Here we have two copulative conjunctions “and”, and three distinct propositions. The original is not so. The words together give one expression of the condescension of Christ:--

“But emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.”

The humiliation thus commenced goes down to the death of the cross; then comes the glorious exaltation:--

“Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him the name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil. ii. 9-11).

We now reach the verse to which you drew attention. Your comment was, I believe, that every tongue is not going to confess that Jesus Christ is *God*, but *Lord*, to the glory of *God*, Who is not Christ, but the *Father*.

A.—Yes, that was my statement.

B.—In the first place we have seen that the Saviour laid aside His glory, but not His Godhead. That glory we see given back in the great exaltation. This exaltation answers John xvii. 5:--

“And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own Self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.”

The structure of the passage may be helpful to us:--

- A1 | EQUALITY. The accompaniments of Deity.
  - B1 | a1 | He emptied Himself.
    - b1 | Servant. To obey.
    - c1 | Likeness of men. Kinsman redeemer.
    - d1 | Found in fashion as man.
  - a1 | He humbled Himself.
    - b1 | Obedient. As servant.
    - c1 | Death. Kinsman redeemer.
- A2 | EXALTATION. The accompaniments of Deity restored.
  - B2 | a2 | Name.
    - b2 | Every knee.
      - c2 | In heaven.
      - In earth.
      - Under earth.
    - b2 | Every tongue.
  - a2 | Lord.

Looking at the structure, what do you say is the name which is above every name given to Christ at His exaltation?

A.—I should say “The Lord”, only that title is used of Christ before the day of His glory.

B.—I think upon examination you will see that the title is invested with a great fullness in this passage. *Kurios*, “Lord”, is the constant translation of the Hebrew “Jehovah”. He Who humbled Himself even unto death will be confessed in that day as Jehovah.

### **The Testimony of a Quotation.**

The words of Phil. ii. 10, 11 are a direct quotation from Isa. xlv. I want you to repeat your comment upon this passage in Phil. ii. before I read the quotation from Isaiah so that we may place them together.

A.—I said that every tongue is not going to confess that Jesus Christ is GOD, but *Lord*, to the glory of God, Who is not Christ, but the FATHER.

B.—I will now read Isa. xlv. 18-22:--

“For thus saith *the Lord* that created the heavens, GOD HIMSELF that formed the earth and made it . . . . I am the Lord, AND THERE IS NONE ELSE . . . . There is NO GOD ELSE BESIDE ME . . . . Look unto Me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, FOR I AM GOD, and there is NONE ELSE.”

Are you satisfied that “the Lord” here is GOD HIMSELF and none else?

A.—Most certainly, that is the plain language of the Scripture.

B.—You are sure “the Lord” here does not mean a lesser Deity, “God in a subordinate sense”?

A.—No, the passage will not allow the thought. This is the Creator of heaven and earth Who is speaking.

B.—I will continue the quotation from Isa. xlv.:--

“I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of My mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, THAT UNTO ME every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear”  
(verse 23).

Will you dare repeat your comment upon Phil. ii. with this testimony before you?

A.—No, I dare not. I must come like Philip and kneel before Him Who is both Saviour and Creator, both God and man, and say, “*My Lord and my God*”.

B.—Praise God for that confession. Difficulties you will still have, problems unsolved and beyond your understanding but your heart will be free, and the consciousness of loyalty to the Lord is beyond description.

A.—It would appear that “Jesus” of the N.T. is none other than the “Jehovah” of the O.T. Is this borne out by any other quotations?

B.—Yes. For example Isa. vi. There we have a vision of the Lord. Before His glory the Seraphim veil their faces while they cry:--

“Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory.”

There can be no doubt that this was a vision of God. Let us consider the testimony of two witnesses:--

HEZEKIAH.—“O Lord of hosts, God of Israel, Thou that dwellest between the Cherubim, THOU ARE THE GOD, even THOU ALONE” (Isa. xxxvii. 16).

JOHN (Quoting Isa. vi. 9, 10).—“These things said Isaiah, when he beheld His (Christ’s) glory, and spake of Him” (John xii. 41).

Scripture declares that the Lord of Hosts is THE God, John declares that the Lord of Hosts is Christ. Your teachers, whose doctrine you have renounced, told you that John taught that Christ as A God, but *not* THE God!

A.—They did, and I believed them, denying the very Lord that bought me.

B.—Not only have we definite quotation, but the fact that “Jehovah” and “Jesus” are one and the same is assumed on every hand. Isa. xl. 3 says:--

“The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the *Lord*, make straight in the desert a highway for our *God*.”

The Gospels declare that John the Baptist is “the voice”, and that he was sent to prepare the way for Christ, Who is both Lord and God.

### **Jehovah not limited to Israel.**

The Lord is the God of Israel. He that dwelt between the Cherubim was no God in a subordinate sense. He is confessed as the God of Israel, the God alone of all the kingdoms of earth, the maker of heaven and earth (Isa. xxxvii. 16). Solomon confessed that this same God was not limited to Israel or the temple, saying:--

“But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee” (I Kings viii. 27).

I want you to see clearly that any reservation in the mind as to the full Deity of Christ blights the faith and is unscriptural. Take the title “Saviour” in Titus:--

“According to the commandment of God our Saviour” (i. 3).

“Adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour” (ii. 10).

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (ii. 13).

“The love of God our Saviour toward man” (iii. 4).

“Through Jesus Christ our Saviour” (iii. 6).

The title “Saviour” is used of “God” and “the Lord Jesus Christ” without distinction. Further, here we have definite statement, that Christ is “The Great God and our Saviour”. Not only is Christ here called “The great God”, but Psa. lxxviii. 35 says:--

“God was their rock, and the HIGH GOD their redeemer.”

That redeemer was Christ. In verse 56 the same title comes again:--

“They tempted and provoked the MOST HIGH GOD.”

They tempted Christ.

A.—How do you know that?

B.—I Cor. x. 9 says:--

“Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted.”

In I Cor. x. 4 we also find, “That rock was Christ”, which looks to Psa. lxxviii. 35. There can be no good done by lengthening this study. You have your Bible, and you may add to the passages already brought forward.

The High God.	\	
The Most High God.	\	
THE God.	\	Christ.—God manifest in the flesh.
Jehovah.	/	
Creator.	/	
The Great God.	/	

Which will you believe, this glorious testimony of Scripture:--

JESUS CHRIST IS THE GREAT GOD

or

He is a A God, God in a subordinate sense?

You will remember that we opened this discussion by saying that “the one God” is “the Father”, and that “the man” is “the Son”, and therefore could not be God Himself. I suggested that we were dealing with the question at the wrong end. The Father must be greater than His Son. He Who sends is greater than the one sent. This is all true, but reasoning that holds good with men may not hold good with one Who is both God and man. We have seen that He is God, even the Great God, Jehovah, God Himself. Therefore we must distinguish things that differ. When He took the form of a servant it was to obey. He took flesh and blood that He might obey. In Heb. x. 5-7 is a quotation from Psa. xl. 6-8. Will you compare the two passages and note any important difference?

## **The Willing Servant.**

A.—Apart from minor differences that are the result of translation, there is one that does call for explanation. In Psa. xl. 6 the words “mine ears hast Thou opened” are replaced in Heb. x. 5 by the words, “A body hast Thou prepared me”.

B.—In the margin of the Psalm you have a note to the effect that “opened” is really the word “digged”. The typical principle of interpretation which we have discussed upon previous occasions comes to our aid here. In Exod. xxi. 1-6 we have the law pertaining to a Hebrew servant, which limited his servitude to six years, except under the following exceptional conditions:--

“If the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges, he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul; and he shall serve him for the age.”

The “digged ear” was the symbol of loving willing servitude, entered for the love of those who would otherwise have been left behind in bondage. The Lord of glory, the Creator of things seen and unseen, when He entered out of love His period of willing servitude, took the form of a servant, and entered the body “prepared” for Him, which body was the symbol of lowliness, and pierced for our sakes upon the cross.

Shall we abuse the very condescension of the Lord and make of it an argument against His very Deity?

A.—I never saw the shameful ingratitude of the doctrine I held that used the language of the Saviour’s period of servitude to deny His Godhead.

B.—When people begin arguing that the “Son” must necessarily be less than the “Father” they are wasting time, for Scripture teaches the same thing. The Son and the Father speak of that relationship which commenced when the fullness of time came for Christ to be born of a woman. He can expressly do the will of Him that sent Him, and took the “form” of a servant and the “fashion” as a man in order to accomplish that purpose. This voluntarily assumed subordination cannot be used as an argument when dealing with His essential Deity.

A.—Do you not believe that Christ was “The Son” from eternity?

B.—You are asking a question which the human mind cannot answer unaided, and upon which Scripture never speaks. As I have said, I am no philosopher, all I know is already written in the Word. What I find there is that Christ

“Originally was in the form of God.”  
“In the beginning He was the Word.”

When the fullness of time came the Word became flesh, and then, the Scripture says, “we beheld His glory as the only begotten of the Father”. Luke i. 31-35 makes a very complete statement. Let us read it:--

“And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call His name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest . . . . Then Mary said unto the angel, How shall this thing be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered, and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD.”

The words “therefore also” put the matter beyond question. The great confession of Matt. xvi. 16:--

“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God,”

and the words of I John iv. 2 are complimentary:--

“Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.”

There is no reference to His Deity, but to His Mediatorship. The way in which many who attacks the doctrine of the Lord’s Deity use the title “Son” is but the old abuse of the man of straw.

A.—What do you mean by this “man of straw”?

B.—It means that for the purposes of argument a person first collects together a series of statements which have no real place in the argument, but which appear valid to the ordinary hearer, and then having built up this “man of straw” he proceeds to display his ability in knocking it to pieces. To those who see that the Sonship of Christ is essentially a part of that great voluntary self-emptying, when the servant’s form was taken at Bethlehem, the spectacle is a pitiable exhibition of either ignorance or prejudice.

A.—There does not seem much more to be said. I think however that you ought to face I Cor. viii. 5, 6 before concluding.

B.—By all means. What is the context of these verses?

A.—Idolatry.

B.—So then we have a statement concerning the Christian faith as opposed to idolatry. In contrast with the “gods many and the lords many” of paganism, we have the sublime teaching of Scripture:--

“But to us (here we have the ‘relative’ argument brought in, to which we devoted some time at the opening of our discussion) there is but one God, the Father, out of Whom the all things, and we for Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through Whom the all things, and we through Him.”

The “lords” of paganism were mediators between men and the more remote “gods”, and this statement becomes exactly parallel with that of I Tim. ii. 5:--

“For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ.”

The question of the Deity of Christ is not in view. It is the “Mediator” and the “Man” that is in question. None of these things, nor all that Scripture says concerning Christ as the Servant or the Son, the Sent One or the Sacrifice, the Shepherd or the Sufferer, can have the remotest influence upon the revealed facts of Scripture that this same Christ is also “The Great God”, “The High God”, “The Almighty God”, “The Creator”, and “Jehovah”.

It is essential to our redemption and to the purpose of reconciliation that Christ shall be *man*. It is also the continual teaching of Scripture that He was *God*. Faith believes the complete statement. The mere multiplying of examples cannot make the doctrine more true nor more plain. I am not aware that any passage has been passed over that would cause any alteration of the doctrine I put before you. If you do find such a passage please write to me, and I will gladly consider it in *The Berean Expositor*.

## **Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth.**

### **#53. Amalek, type of the flesh.**

#### **Aaron and Hur, types of fellowship (Exod. xvii. & xviii.). pp. 176 - 180**

“THEN CAME AMALEK.”—In the generations of Esau (Gen. xxxvi.) we find that Esau and his descendants are the Edomites; “Esau is Edom” (verses 1 and 8). In verse 12 we learn that Amalek was the grandson of Esau. Both Israel and Amalek therefore could trace their descent from Abraham, and herein lies the significance of the type. Amalek stand for the flesh. This typical feature is repeated. Going back no further than Abraham we find two sons—Ishmael who stands for the flesh, and Isaac for the spirit. The church of the Galatians provides a commentary upon the typical character of these two sons and their relation to the flesh and spirit.

Coming to Isaac we find that he also had two sons—Esau and Jacob, and once again the type is clear. The epistle to the Hebrews provides explanations of the meaning of the typical character of these two sons.

Two others must be included, viz., Moab and Ammon, both the children of Lot, and preeminently the children of shame. When we speak of Ishmael, Edom, Moab, Ammon and Amalek, we enumerate those foes of Israel who sought to bar the way and prevent their entry into the land of promise.

This is exactly what “the flesh” in a believer endeavours to do, Israel, when bondmen in Egypt, when confronted by the Red Sea, when in need of bread and water, were called upon neither to fight nor to fend for themselves. In all these experiences they typified the passive position of the believer under grace. The believer, however, has a warfare before him, a conflict that lasts until this life finishes, the conflict between flesh and spirit.

The word “fight”, apart from the instance in Exod. i. 10 which voiced the fears of Pharaoh, is used in two settings only:--

- (1). OF THE LORD.—“The Lord shall fight for you” (Exod. xiv. 14).  
“The Lord fighteth for them” (Exod. xiv. 25).
- (2). OF ISRAEL.—“Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel” (Exod. xvii. 8).  
“Go out, and fight with Amalek” (Exod. xvii. 9).  
“So Joshua . . . . fought with Amalek” (Exod. xvii. 10).

The one conflict of the believer after redemption is with the flesh. What was the occasion of the fight? We believe it was twofold. The word “then” in the sentence, “then came Amalek”, appears to be connected with:--

## **(1). The provision of water.**

In a country like Arabia water is precious, and its possession eagerly sought. Parallel cases may be found in Gen. xxi. 25, where we find Abimelech's servants violently taking away the wells of water from Abraham. Deborah's song includes a reference to this perennial cause of conflict:--

“Instead of the shouting of the archers among the wells, There they laud the righteous acts of Jehovah” (Judges v. 11, Companion Bible).

## **(2). The tempting of the Lord.**

“Then” reads immediately after the question, “Is the Lord among us or not?” The flesh takes immediate advantage of the beginnings of unbelief, of murmuring and complaining.

Amalek was overcome by two means:--

- (i.) The intercession of Moses.
- (ii.) The warfare under Joshua.

Bishop Hall's comment here is:--

“I do not hear Moses say to this Joshua, Amalek is come up against us, it matters not whether thou go up against him or not; or if thou go, whether alone or with company, or if accompanied, whether with many or few, strong or weak; or if strong, whether they fight or no: *I will pray* on the hill; but choose us out men, and *go fight.*”

In the conflict with the flesh the weapons must be those of God's appointment, and neither prayer alone, nor conflict alone can prevail. As Moses' hands were raised, so Israel's fight succeeded. As Moses' hands sank, so Israel's fight failed.

Three noteworthy features close the narrative:--

- (i.) The command to write the record in a book.
- (ii.) The revelation of the name *Jehovah-nissi*.
- (iii.) The reason given for Amalek's extermination.

“And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua, for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven” (Exod. xvii. 14).

Joshua was the instrument in the hand of the Lord to divide the land of promise for an inheritance to Israel. His greatest activities were spent in the subjugation of the Canaanites, and all those who opposed the possession of the land. This possession was not to be considered complete until Amalek had been destroyed, Moses reminds Israel:--

“Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of the Land of Egypt: How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, when thou wast faint and weary, and he feared not God. Therefore it shall be, when the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it” (Deut. xxv. 17-19).

The name *Jehovah-nissi* is the third Jehovah title revealed in Scripture. The first is concerned with the offering of Isaac, the great type of Christ and His redemption, *Jehovah-jireh*, “the Lord will provide”. A friend, whose judgment we hold in high esteem, says that *Jehovah-jireh* means “Jehovah appeared” (Gen. xxii. 14). The second is connected with the overthrow of the Egyptians (type of the world), *Jehovah-ropheka*, “the Lord that healeth thee” (Exod. xv. 26). The third title is connected with the destruction of Amalek (type of the flesh), *Jehovah-nissi*, “the Lord my banner” (Exod. xvii. 15). The third title is the first of three that suggests the believer’s active appropriation:--

“The Lord my banner” (Exod. xvii. 15).  
“The Lord my shepherd” (Psa. xxiii. 1).  
“The Lord our righteousness” (Jer. xxiii. 6).

The word “banner” (Hebrew *nes*) is the word used for the “pole” upon which the brazen serpent was lifted (Num. xxi. 8, 9). If we turn to the occasion we shall find that it is a repetition of Rephidim. The people speak against God and against Moses because of the lack of water. *Jehovah-nissi* is this time set forth in symbol, and this symbol Christ takes to Himself in John iii. 14:--

“As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even son must the Son of man be lifted up.”

The “banner” under which we must fight our “Amalek” is the cross of Christ, the serpent on the pole, suggesting in type the deep doctrine of Rom. vi. 6 and Gal. v. 24. It is the cross of Christ, seen not as the means of our redemption, but of our victory over the flesh. This is the burden of Rom. vi., vii., viii. and Gal. v. In the margin of the A.V. of Exod. xvii. 16 we read:--

“Heb. *the hand upon the throne of the Lord.*”

The translation both of the A.V. and the R.V. shows that those responsible believed “the hand” to be the Lord’s hand, and therefore translated the passage “the Lord hath sworn”.

*The Companion Bible* note reads:--

“Surely the hand (lifted up) upon the banner of *Jah* (is to swear):” &c.

The substitution of “banner” for “throne” is explained by Rotherham in his *Emphasized Version* as:--

“Ginsburg *thinks* it should be as follows: These are readings suggested by context and verse, but not supported by the Ancient Versions” (G. Intro. pp. 162, 170).

Rotherham does not endorse this “suggestion”, but translates:--

“Because of a hand against the throne of *Yah*.”

*The hand that was laid upon the throne of the Lord* was the hand of Amalek. With all their failures Israel were the Lord’s anointed. When Balaam was brought to curse Israel, he had to say:--

“He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob . . . . the shout of a king is among them.”

“His king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted.”

“Edom shall be a possession.”

“And when he looked upon Amalek, he took up his parable and said, Amalek was the first of the nations, but his latter end is even to perish” (Numb. xxiii., xxiv.).

Here Agag is mentioned in connection with Israel’s king and kingdom. This was a title similar to that of Pharaoh or Abimelech, and used by all the kings of Amalek.

*(To be concluded).*

## The Epistle to the Hebrews.

#40. Heb. vii. 1-25.

The Superiority of the Priesthood of Melchisedec (vii. 1-10).

pp. 81 - 94

In our previous study together we reached that stage in the unfolding of truth that necessitated the fuller mention of the Melchisedec priesthood of Christ. To this the apostle now proceeds and by a series of statements sets forth the superiority of the priesthood of Christ to that of Aaron, bringing this established fact to bear once more upon the great theme of the epistle, "perfection" (vii. 11, 19). If we keep this before us, we shall be less likely to be overwhelmed with the mass of detail that meets us in this section. Omitting the parenthetical details, the proposition of Heb. vii. 1-3 reads:--

"For this Melchisedec . . . . abideth a priest continually."

The intervening details supply the necessary information to establish this proposition.

Melchisedec was first of all KING OF SALEM. Jerome maintains, in his epistle to Evagrius, that this Salem is a city near Shechem, mentioned in Gen. xxxiii. 18 and John iii. 23. Salem however is used to indicate Jerusalem in Psa. lxxvi. 2:--

"In Salem is God's tabernacle, and His dwelling place in Sion."

There are some who think that after the Jebusites took possession of the place it was called Jebus-Salem, which became transformed to Jerusalem. We find in Josh. x. 1-4 that the king of Jerusalem was called Adonizedec, which has much the same signification as that of Melchisedec.

Not only was Melchisedec king, but he was "PRIEST OF THE MOST HIGH GOD". This title *El Elyon*, "The Most High God", is used for the first time in Scripture in connection with this incident (Gen. xiv. 18). The various titles of God are used in Scripture with precision and with special regard to the relationship intended in each particular passage. For instance, Gen. i. 1 - ii. 3 treat of creation, and the title used throughout the record is *El*, "God".

Immediately we commence "the generations", in verse 4, the title changes to "the Lord God". Coming to Abraham's time we have not only the title "The Most High God", but in Gen. xvii. 1:--

"I am *El Shaddai*, walk before Me and be thou perfect",

and again in Exod. vi. 3 we read:--

"I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, by the name of *El Shaddai*, but by My name *Jehovah* was I not known to them."

## **The Priest upon His throne.**

Melchisedec was both king and priest. These two offices were kept severely distinct under the economy of the law. We all know the awful thing that fell upon Uzziah when as king he sought the priesthood also. In Christ alone can these two wondrous offices meet. Zech. vi. 12, 13 says:--

“Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH . . . . he shall be a priest upon his throne.”

The epistle of “suffering and the glory that follows” names those who thus overcome “a royal priesthood” (I Pet. ii. 9), and Revelation, that book of the overcomer, speaks of Christ as:--

- (1). Prince of the kings of the earth—KING.
- (2). One who looses from sin by His blood—PRIEST.

and as a result constitutes those thus blessed:--

“Kings and priests unto God and His Father” (Rev. i. 5, 6).

Melchisedec is the priest of the victor and the Lord is seen in that capacity in Rev. i. This is shown by noticing what particular incident of Melchisedec’s history the apostle next mentions.

## **The Priest of the overcomer.**

“Who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings” (Heb. vii. 1).

Gen. xiv. gives the names of these kings and describes the battle which they fought. Lot, type of the worldly believer, type of the one who would not “lose his soul” as Abraham did, become involved in the fate of Sodom and becomes prisoner.

It is suggestive that the one who escaped and came with tidings tells “Abram the *Hebrew*”—“Abram the pilgrim”—a title that suggests the very opposite of Lot’s condition. He it was who overcame these kings, brought back the spoils and rescued Lot. It is here, at this moment of victory, that Melchisedec appears. The effect of this meeting is seen in Abraham’s reply to the king of Sodom:--

“I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord, the Most High God, the possessor of heaven and earth, that I will not take from a thread even to a shoelatchet, and that I will not take anything that is thine, lest thou shouldest say, I have made Abram rich” (Gen. xiv. 22, 23).

Heb. vii. does not mention this effect upon Abraham, but says:--

“And blessed him, to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all.”

Both these items are expanded by the apostle in verses 4-10. We leave them for the moment to learn a little more concerning this great priesthood. The apostle now proceeds to interpret the meaning of the word Melchisedec:--

“First being by interpretation king of righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is, king of peace” (verse 2).

Many of the names of Old Testament characters seem to be prophetic of their place in the Divine scheme. Abel, Noah, and Peleg are examples. Abraham is an example of a man’s name being changed to fit changed circumstances. The apostle finds design in the order of the titles here:--

First, king of righteousness.  
Then, king of peace.

This he repeats in another form in Heb. xii. 11, where he speaks of the peaceable *fruits* of righteousness, the righteousness evidently coming first.

“Without father, without mother, without descent” (verse 3).

These words cannot be taken absolutely of Melchisedec, otherwise he could have had no existence at all, but relatively, in connection with his office as priest. Those who could not prove their genealogies in the time of the return from captivity were refused admittance into the priesthood (Ezra ii. 61-63). The words “without descent” strictly rendered should read “without genealogy”. The words of the apostle by no means teach that Melchisedec absolutely had no “descent”, but that such descent was not “recorded”, which recording is the essence of the word genealogy, of Melchisedec it is further written that he had:--

“Neither beginning of days nor end of life” (verse 3).

The priests of the Levitical order had both the beginning and the end of their term of office fixed by law. A priest’s term of ministration was called his “days” (Luke i. 23), and the priests, the sons of Kohath, began their service at thirty years of age and ended it at fifty. Summing up these points of resemblance the apostle says, “but being like unto the Son of God, abides a priest perpetually”. The construction of the whole sentence seems to be as follows:--

“This Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God . . . . abides a priest perpetually.”

The remaining words are a parenthetic explanation given in order to show a series of comparisons with the Son of God. The greatness of Melchisedec himself, however, is the immediate concern of the apostle, in order that the infinite greatness of Christ may be the better understood. So he continues.

## The testimony of the tenth.

“Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils” (verse 4).

The word used for *spoils* (*akrothinion*) is composed of *thin*, “a heap of corn” and *akros*, “the top”. The top of a heap of corn indicates “the best”, and the suggestion is that Abraham gave a tithe of the best. Not that Abraham tithed the best of the spoil only, for Heb. vii. 2 says, “he gave him tithes of all”, but that what he did give as a tithe was taken from the very best. Here therefore is one item which contributes to the impression of “greatness” which Scripture gives to Melchisedec. But this is not all. Not only is our attention directed to the tithe, and the fact that it was made up of the best of the spoils, but we are called upon to observe who it is that gave these titles.

“Unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.”

Dr. Owen says that the conjunction “even” is emphatic and, though joined with “the tenth”, yet in construction it must be understood with Abraham; not “unto whom Abraham gave *even a tenth*”, but, “unto whom *even Abraham* gave a tenth”.

Abraham is here called “the patriarch”. The Hebrews held that there were three sort of patriarchs. The heads of the twelve tribes (that is the twelve sons of Jacob) and David also were called patriarchs (Acts vii. 8, 9; ii. 29). Of greater dignity than these were held Isaac and Jacob, but chiefest of all was Abraham, “the first father” of the race. If therefore one were greater than Abraham, how great he must be! This is the argument of the apostle.

The sons of Levi in their capacity as priests received tithes from the people according to the law, yet these men, says verse 8, were mortal, but Melchisedec, in type, “liveth”. Levi was in the loins of his father Abraham when the tithe was given, and so, in practice, the whole priesthood of Israel acknowledged the superiority of the order of Melchisedec. Not only is Melchisedec’s greatness manifested in what Abraham gave to him, but also in what he gave to Abraham:--

“But he whose genealogy is not reckoned from them

- (1). received tithes from Abraham, and
- (2). blessed him that had the promises” (verse 6).

The greater Abraham is made to appear, the greater must Melchisedec be, for “without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better” (verse 7). Abraham is specially marked out as “the patriarch” and “he who received the promises”. That this receiving of the promises was no small thing Heb. vi. 13-16 bears witness. Nevertheless it was Melchisedec who blessed Abraham.

We have now passed in review the fourth of a series of comparisons instituted with the object of showing the greatness of Christ. We have in:--

- (1). Chapter i.—His superiority to ANGELS. He the Son. They the ministers.
- (2). Chapter iii.—His superiority to MOSES. He the Son. Moses the servants.
- (3). Chapter iv.—His superiority to JOSHUA. Jesus, the Son of God (verse 14).  
Joshua, the son of Nun (verse 8).
- (4). Chapter v.-vii.—His superiority to AARON.  
The Levitical priesthood is filled by men who die.  
The oath consecrates the Son as priest in the power of endless life.

The way is now clear for the apostle's teaching concerning "perfection", which has never been lost sight of, although to our lesser minds the amount of detail, and involved argument, may seem to indicate a departure from the original purpose. "If therefore perfection . . . ." is the apostle's argument from all that has been under review in this article, and this we must now consider.

### **The changed order (vii. 11-18).**

Having considered together verses 1-10 of chapter vii., and having seen the greatness of the Melchisedec priesthood, we are prepared for the transference of that greatness to Christ, and for its connection with the great theme of perfection. Before attempting any further detail it will be a safeguard for us to have the broad outline of that great section which is devoted to the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ.

#### **Heb. vii. 1 - x. 18.**

- A | vii. 1-10. This man (4). A priest—*Eis to dienekes*.
- B | vii. 11 - x. 4. PERFECTION.
  - c1 | vii. 11. *No perfection* by Levitical priesthood and carnal commandment.
  - d1 | vii. 12-18. But by Melchisedec priesthood.
  - c2 | vii. 19. *No perfection* by Law.
  - d2 | vii. 20-ix. 8. But by oath to the Son.
  - c3 | ix. 9, 10. *No perfection* by carnal ordinances.
  - d3 | ix. 11-28. But by perfect tabernacle and better sacrifice.
  - c4 | x. 1-4. *No perfection* by sacrifices of the law.
- A | x. 5-18. "But this man" (12). As priest sat down—*Eis to dienekes*.

To some minds "structures" make no appeal. The subject before us is so solemn and so vital that we feel that much blessed truth will lose its force if not seen as a whole. Therefore we tarry to draw attention to the lesson of the above structure. It will be noticed that the opening and closing members are to do with the Melchisedec priesthood of Christ in several important particulars.

- (1). "THIS MAN".—Chapter vii. 4 by using this expression draws attention to the greatness of Melchisedec above both Abraham and Levi.
- (2). "BUT THIS MAN".—of chapter x. 12 takes up the theme with reference to the superiority of the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ.
- (3). Both passages focus upon one peculiar expression, viz., *eis to dienekes*. This phrase occurs in Heb. vii. 3; x. 1, 12 & 14, and nowhere else in the N.T. It is

translated twice “continually” and twice “for ever”. “For a continuance” is a good rendering. In the case of the type, Melchisedec, the silence of Scripture as to his “beginning” of days or “end” of life sets him forth typically as a priest after the power of an endless life. In the case of Christ, the antitype, the contrast is between the priest who “standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never take away sins”, and Christ, “Who, after He had offered *one sacrifice* (in contrast with the ‘offering oftentimes’) for sins” (in contrast with those sacrifices which could never take away sins) “sat down for a continuance” (instead of repeatedly going over the same ritual, “standing daily”).

### **Things that make for perfection.**

If we take note of these opening and closing sections therefore, it becomes evident that “perfection” cannot possibly be attained under the ministry of priests who themselves needed an offering for their own sins, who were made after the law of a commandment which respected their mortal condition, and whose service stood in meats and drinks and baptisms—“carnal ordinances”—that really indicated that the way into the Holiest of all had not been opened. Such ordinances and sacrifices failing to touch the conscience failed altogether, and were only “shadows” and “not the very image” of the good things to come.

To believers who were never brought up under the law, who never boasted in “the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service of God”, the turning from the shadow of Aaron, his tabernacle, his priesthood and his sacrifice and the abiding priesthood, seems a simple act of reasonable faith. To the Hebrew, cradled in the thought that of all nations the nation of Israel alone had the oracles of God, such a turning would be a wrench, a rupture, a counting “gain” as “loss” and as so much “refuse” (Phil. iii. 8). Therefore God in His kindness and His condescension reasons with them step by step, until the last ground of boasting in the law is destroyed and Christ is seen as all in all.

We commence therefore our study with an argument:--

“If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec and not be called after the order of Aaron?” (Heb. vii. 11).

In David’s time the service of God’s house was raised to its greatest height. If David himself did not actually build the temple, the complete revelation was made to him of that house exceeding magnificent, with its golden vessels, its courses of priests, its wonderful psalms, yet it is David and no other who gives us Psalm cx. saying:--

“The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec” (verses 1 and 4).

The apostle, therefore, asks a pointed question, what further need for another priest, of another order, if perfection were attainable under the Levitical priesthood? Of all the

reasons that are most trenchant that which the apostle himself gives in parenthesis is the one, viz., “For under it the people received the law” (verse 11).

### **Perfection and Legalism.**

It has been objected that the giving of the law from Mount Sinai preceded and did not follow the setting up of the Levitical priesthood. We do not think the expression “received the law” refers to the giving of the law at Sinai, and that it is hardly a good translation. In chapter iv. 2 we find that the people were “evangelized”, here, in vii. 11, we see that with the institution of the Levitical priesthood the people were “legalized”. They were shut up to carnal ordinances, mortal priests, and the blood of bulls and of goats, until Christ should come Who by His coming should take away the first, that He may establish the second (Heb. x. 9):--

“For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law” (verse 12).

This was a sore point with the Jew. Stephen was stoned to death because they said that he taught that:--

“Jesus of Nazareth shall . . . . . change the customs which Moses delivered us” (Acts vi. 14).

The same charge was brought against Paul:--

“Men of Israel, help: This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place” (the temple) (Acts xxi. 28).

Those who had become believers from among Israel still retained their regard for the law:--

“Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous for the law. And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither walk after the customs” (Acts xxi. 20, 21).

It is evident that in dealing with the change of law and priesthood the apostle had a delicate task before him, and whereas the Gentile could easily grant the whole situation without scruple, the whole constitution of the Jew rebelled against the very idea. So it is that we have so much detail and the consideration of the subject from so many different points of view. In the section vii. 11-18 the argument revolves round the fact that the O.T. recognizes a change in the order of priesthood. In the law priesthood is exclusively connected with one tribe, LEVI. Christ however sprang out of JUDAH, but of this “Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood” (verse 14). “It is evident”, said the apostle, “that our Lord sprang out of Judah”. “It is more abundantly down right evident” that the priesthood and the law with it must be set aside, for the Scripture testifies:--

“Thou art a priest for ever *after the order of MELCHISEDEC*” (verse 17).

The new priesthood differs from that of the Levitical order in one grand particular. The Levitical priest was made:--

“After the law of a carnal commandment” (verse 16),

but the Melchisedec order was made:--

“After the power of an endless life” (verse 16).

One more item is added before this section concludes, and that is that not only does the change of priesthood necessitate the setting aside of the law, but the necessity to have such a change indicates the failure of that law so far as “perfection” is concerned:--

“There is, moreover, a setting aside of preceding law, because it was inefficient and unprofitable” (verse 18).

In verse 16 the law was spoken of as “carnal”. While viewed in itself the law is holy, just and good, that the law is “weak through the flesh”, and though “ordained to life” will be found “unto death” (Rom. vii.). The sentiment of Heb. vii. 11 is repeated in viii. 17:--

- vii. 11-18. | a | *Question.*—“If perfection were by the Levitical order?”
  - b | What need for another priesthood?
  - c | The law abrogated, as weak and profitless.
- viii. 7, 8. | a | *Question.*—“If the first covenant were faultless?”
  - b | No need for seeking a second covenant.
  - c | Finding fault, He said, “I make a new covenant”.

The theme of the first passage (vii. 11-18) is the better priesthood, the theme of the second (viii. 7, 8) is the better covenant.

All this was necessary to clear the way for a faith that would behold with single eye the Lord Jesus Christ a prophet, priest, king and sacrifice, and the “perfecter of faith”.

### **Salvation unto the uttermost, or what the law could not do (vii. 19-25).**

No perfection is possible under the Levitical priesthood, therefore the greater reason for thankfully believing Him Who is a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Such is the argument and conclusion of vii. 11-18. In verse 11 there is a parenthesis, viz., “for under it the people received the law”; this parenthesis is now brought forward and dealt with in the same way as was the Levitical priesthood:--

“For the law perfected nothing (or no one), but the superinduction of a better hope (did), through which we draw nigh to God” (verse 19).



understand it. The better hope is said to have been “superinduced”, *epeisagoge*. In Gal. iii. 19 the law which was “superadded” was “for the sake of transgressions” and was to operate “till the Seed should come”, when it would be abrogated as being “weak and unprofitable” failing as it did to touch the conscience.

When the fullness of time comes and the Son of God entered into His office, there was the “superinduction” of a better hope which set aside the types and shadows, and actually did give access to God. It is called the “superinduction of a better hope”. This better hope does not look for an entrance into the land of promise, but looks for “a better country, an heavenly”. It is connected with a “better covenant”, in contrast with the old covenant that was made after the exodus and before the land of promise was reached. “Better promises” lie behind this hope, a “better resurrection” lies ahead, and “better sacrifices” lie beneath.

This better hope brings us nigh unto God. This is what the law could not do, and therefore this access to God must be intimately connected with “perfection”. That this is literally so will be found in the case of Christ:--

“We have such an high priest, Who is set at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (viii. 1).

As the perfecter of faith He is

“set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (xii. 2).

In the Spirit we, through Him, draw nigh now, but this only pledges actual access when the day arrives for the redemption of the purchased possession. The superiority of this better hope lies in the superiority of its mediator. That superiority has been shown in various ways. The particular thought before us in verses 20-22 lies in the fact that the Lord Jesus was made a priest by oath.

### **The oath that perfects.**

The argument is found in the words:--

“And inasmuch . . . . by so much . . . .” (verses 20-22).

The intervening passages give the fact of the oath, and the result, the better covenant. The hope and the covenant were “better” in the same proportion that the pre-eminence of the Melchisedec priesthood was above that of Aaron. That pre-eminence is discovered in the “oath”.

The force of the oath and its bearing upon the subject is found in the added words “and will not repent”. The priesthood of Christ was immutably secure. Not only was there this attribute of immutability connected with the priesthood of Christ arising out of the nature of the oath sworn by God, but further, it arises out of the fact that He ever liveth:--

“And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because He continues (as a priest) for the age, hath an intransferable priesthood (verses 23 and 24).

See the argument in the word “continue” or “abide” in verse 3 which speaks of the character of priesthood and not of life itself. “Unchangeable”, *aparabatos*, means incapable of transmission. Melchisedec had neither father nor mother—and Christ as the Melchisedec priest has no need to secure a successor. His priesthood is never terminated by death.

“By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better covenant” (verse 22).

The word “surety” is *egguos*, and is allied to *eggizo*, “to draw nigh” of verse 19. The old covenant failed to “bring us to God”, the new covenant gloriously succeeds. The surety of that new covenant is not the blood of bulls or goats, but the blood of Christ. Of such a priest and such a surety the apostle says:--

“Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them” (verse 25).

We need to ponder these words, or else we may miss the sense:--

“He is able to save”. That is a blessed fact.

“He is able *also* to save”, suggests something in addition.

“He is able also to save to the **UTTERMOST**”, reveals what that addition is.

### **Salvation unto all perfection.**

Once more we are not confined to “salvation”, but the “so great salvation” which the Hebrews were in danger of letting slip (Heb. ii.). This is the “aionian salvation” connected with obedience and suffering that makes perfect (Heb. v.). To the uttermost is *eis to panteles*. *Panteles* is from *pan*, all, and *telos*, end, from which we obtain *teleiosis*, perfection. He is able not only to *save* so that condemnation is avoided, but He is able **ALSO** to save unto all perfection those that come unto God by Him. He accomplishes this “uttermost” salvation by “intercession”. This word “intercession” is not limited to the sense of supplication, but to the extension of aid of any sort.

If this “salvation” be taken to indicate salvation in an evangelical sense, shall we not find a difficulty in making *that* salvation depend upon the Lord’s *pesent intercession*? This “uttermost” salvation He is attending to in His office as high priest:--

“Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, *He is able to succour* them that are tempted” (Heb. ii. 17, 18).

This is salvation *eis to panteles*; the Lord not only saves all that trust in Him, but He is able also to save to the end, through temptation and trial. It is this that makes the

“better hope” an anchor for the soul. He Who is its sure anchorage has “suffered being tempted”:-

“For we have not an high priest which cannot touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. iv. 15).

**#41. Heb. vii. 26 - ix. 20.**  
**The principal thing.**  
**A seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary**  
**pp. 145 - 156**

The ruling theme of this epistle is that of “perfection”, and chapters v. - x. are occupied with the office of Christ as priest after the Order of Melchisedec, and with His one great offering. Both the priesthood, the sacrifice and the heavenly tabernacle are verbally connected with “perfection”.

**The priest of the perfect.**

The reservation of the apostle manifested in v. 11 indicates that the doctrine associated with this priesthood is by no means elementary, but can only be appreciated by those of “full age”, or as the word is, “the perfect” (v. 14).

This priesthood is also closely associated with another aspect of “perfection”, namely, that of the “overcomer”. This is indicated by the first appearance of Melchisedec in Scripture when he met Abraham, the overcomer, returning from the slaughter of the kings.

**A comparison and a contrast.**

Heb. v. opens with a description of the service of the high priest. He offered both gifts and sacrifices, and also had compassion on the ignorant. His limitations are indicated by the fact that

“He also is compassed with infirmity, and by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins” (v. 2, 3).

The apostle proceeds to develop in some detail a comparison and a contrast.

*First in comparison.*—Chapters v. 7-9 with its reference to Gethsemane reveals in Christ a high priest Who can have compassion because He Himself had suffered being tempted. The glorious superiority of Christ’s Melchisedec priesthood occupies chapters vi. and vii., reaching its zenith in the record of that perfected priest Who is able to save unto all perfection all that come unto God by Him.

*Then the contrast.*—The apostle returns after this climax has been reached to point a contrast, taking up the statement made in v. 3, saying:--

“For such an high priest became us, Who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; WHO NEEDED NOT daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people’s; for this He did once, when He offered up Himself” (vii. 26, 27).

This truth has already found expression in Heb. iv. 14, 15; there we find reference to Christ as priest Who has “passed through the heavens”, Who is touched “by the feeling of our infirmities”, Who was nevertheless separate from sinners, “yet without sin”.

### **Sin and its relation to Christ.**

Scripture is never ambiguous where the personal sinlessness of Christ is involved. If Heb. iv. 14, 15 shows the Lord identifying Himself with His people in their trials, it immediately adds “*sin excepted*”. If II Cor. v. 21 shows the Lord in His sacrifice identified with sin, it immediately adds, “*Who knew no sin*”. If Rom. viii. 3 shows the Lord identified with flesh and blood, the sinlessness of Christ is expressed in the words, “*the likeness of sinful flesh*”. As this subject is one of the first importance, let us pause to examine the words of Heb. vii. 27 concerning the sinlessness of the Lord Jesus.

### **A fourfold testimony.**

HOLY.—There are three Greek words which are translated in the A.V. by the word “holy”, they are *hagios*, *hosios* and *hieros*. *Hosios* is the word used here. Its first occurrence is Acts ii. 27:--

“Neither wilt Thou suffer Thine *Holy One* to see corruption.”

*Hosios* is used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew word *chasid*, which is rendered not only by the word “holy”, but also by the word “merciful”. *Hagios* implies the thought of separation, but *hosios* suggests holiness that can stoop to have mercy upon those who are in themselves defiled, without contracting defilement thereby.

The Syriac version uses a word here that means “pure”. This blessed character was our Saviour’s from birth. It is not an acquired holiness, but inherent. We can appreciate the choice of this particular word in the message of the angel to Mary in Luke i. 35:--

“The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that HOLY THING which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.”

Such was His nature. His acts were in perfect harmony with His inherent holiness.

HARMLESS (*akakos*).—This word occurs in but one other passage, viz., Rom. xvi. 18, where it translated “simple”. In the LXX version of Psa. xxvi. *akakos* occurs in verses 1 and 11, where the A.V. reads “integrity”. The intervening

verses 2-10 are a practical expansion of the meaning of *akakos*. Reins and heart examined and tried (verse 2). No fellowship with vain persons and dissemblers, but rather hatred of all wicked works (4, 5). And so throughout the Psalm. All this and more is true of the Lord Jesus.

As concerning *hosios* (“holy”) Scripture declares, “He knew no sin”; as concerning *akakos* (“harmless”) Scripture declares, “He did no sin, neither was there guile found in His mouth”. The blessed man of Psa. i. and the holy one of Psa. xv. & xvi. is Christ.

UNDEFILED (*amiantos*).—This word occurs in Heb. xiii. 4; James i. 27; I Pet. i. 4. The difference between *akakos* and *amiantos* is that in the former the truth conveyed is that the Lord *did no evil*, while in the latter the truth conveyed is that He could not be *contaminated by evil* in any one else. He *touched* a leper, but He needed no cleansing. A woman with an issue of blood *touched* Him, and while virtue went out of Him to her, no contamination passed from her to Him. In the midst of publicans and harlots, called by the Pharisees, “a gluttonous man and a winebibber, and friend of publicans and sinners”, He ever remained “the lamb without blemish and without spot”. Without *natural* blemish (the thought in *akakos*), without *contracted* spot (*amiantos*).

In all this the Lord Jesus transcended the type. The tabernacle needed an atonement by reason of the uncleanness of Israel (Lev. xvi. 16), but such cleansing was unnecessary to the Lord. The Levitical priesthood sinned and needed a sacrifice. The Lord knew no sin, did no sin, and needed no sacrifice. Earthly priesthood terminates at death. The Lord liveth and His priesthood is intransmissible. In all these respects the Lord was:--

SEPARATE FROM SINNERS.—This we may see from two points of view.

(1). *As to His manhood*.—Born of a woman, yet from birth “that holy thing”, and while being made partaker of flesh and blood, nevertheless coming in the “likeness” only of *sinful* flesh.

(2). *As to His manner of life*.—He was truly man. He ate, He drank, He slept, worked, suffered, died. To the woman of Samaria He was “a Jew” (John iv. 9). To His fellow-townsmen He was “Joseph’s son” (John vi. 42), yet throughout His life He was never “separate from sinners”. Even though a disciple leaned upon the bosom of the Lord at supper, never once do we find a follower of the Saviour addressing Him as “Jesus”. Shall His condescension, His sympathy, His fellowship warrant unholy familiarity? Believers, let us remember that He is our Lord, and let us render the honour due unto His name.

Thus we have four statements, arranged in two pairs, indicating for our comfort the high priest that “became us”.

HOLY.	\	<i>As to</i>	UNDEFILED.	\	<i>As to</i>
HARMLESS.	/	<i>nature.</i>	SEPARATE FROM SINNERS.	/	<i>practice.</i>

## **Heaven itself.**

It is evident that this priest could not be a minister of the earthly and typical tabernacle. His peculiar separateness proclaims Him to be the minister of the true tabernacle, "heaven itself". Therefore the apostle continues, "and made higher than the heavens".

There is as much stress placed upon the "heavenly" character of the Lord's priesthood as upon His sinlessness. It will be of service to note some of the statements of Scripture under this head:--

"Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God" (Heb. iv. 14).

"We have such an high priest, Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (Heb. viii. 1).

The heavenly priesthood of Christ receives its fullest exposition in chapters viii. & ix., and reaches its climax in ix. 24:--

"For Christ is not entered 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."

## **The one offering once for all.**

Before the apostle can proceed to the expansion of the subject of the heavenly ministry of the Lord, it is necessary that one matter shall be dealt with, which if left ambiguous might lead to deadly error. The earthly high priest not only offered up sacrifice for the sins of the people, but he was obliged also to offer a sacrifice:--

"First for his own sins" (Heb. v. 3; vii. 27).

Here we perceive a strong contrast, for the heavenly priest was "holy, harmless, undefiled", and therefore needed no sacrifice for Himself. When He died, He died "the JUST for the unjust", consequently:--

"He needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the people's, for this He did *once*, when He offered up Himself" (Heb. vii. 27).

In seeking out the argument of this epistle the reader is called upon to exercise continual watchfulness. We found that the consideration of the heavenly ministry of the Lord was postponed, in order that the question of His one offering might be dealt with, and now we shall find that the consideration of two features of that offering mentioned in vii. 27 is deferred until the heavenly ministry has been more fully opened up.

The two features that await exposition are:--

1. The fact that the Lord offered one sacrifice once for all.
2. The fact that He offered, not bulls and goats, but that He offered up Himself.

One further item is necessary to complete the list of the distinctive features of the Lord's high priesthood, and that is

### **The law and the oath.**

“For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, Who is PERFECTED unto the age” (Heb. vii. 28).

There are two items here that demonstrate the superiority of the priesthood of the Son. They are:--

1. The oath compared with the law as to immutability. The oath is more solemn, and its immutability is indicated in Heb. vi. 17.
2. The oath and the law as to sequence. The oath was made “since the law”, and what this implies is explained in Heb. vii. 11:--

“If therefore PERFECTION were by the Levitical priesthood . . . . what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec and not be called after the order of Aaron?” (vii. 11).

That question has now received its answer. Perfection could only come through the priest after the order of Melchisedec, whose priesthood is not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. All truth, whether dispensational, doctrinal or experimental, focuses upon the person of the risen Christ. The whole fabric of Mosaic ritual vanishes into the shadows before the face of Him Whom could say, “I am the resurrection and the life”.

With the “perfecting of the Son” by the oath we reach the conclusion of the lengthy comparison commenced in chapter v. Before entering into a detailed examination of the tabernacle and its sacrifices and seeing them as shadows of the true, a short chapter is devoted to bringing the teaching of chapters v. - vii. to a point: “Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum” (viii. 1).

### **The principal thing.**

The teaching of this passage is something more than a summary. The word *kephalaion* (sum) may mean the summing up of a number as in Num. iv. 2, “Take the sum of the sons of Kohath”, or it may be the principal part as in Num. v. 7, “He shall recompense the trespass with the principal thereof”. The following translation seems to convey the sense of the passage.

“The principal thing, however, among those things of which we are speaking is that we have such a high priest Who is seated on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man” (Heb. viii. 1, 2).

## **A seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary.**

It will be well to prepare the reader for the necessity of a certain amount of close attention. The arguments of this central part of Hebrews are involved, and there are, as the apostle has said, some things “hard to be understood” concerning this heavenly priesthood. There is a wealth of detail and a formidable series of sub-divisions to exercise our patience, but at the beginning the apostle would have us look away from these and let our hearts dwell upon “the principal thing”. We have a *seated priest*; that tells of a *finished work*; this seated priest is the minister of no earthly tabernacle, He has entered “heaven itself”. The consideration of this finished work and this heavenly tabernacle occupies the bulk of chapters ix. and x.

Just as all the tabernacle and its services revolve around the ark and the mercy seat, so all that the apostle has said concerning the excellence of Christ is concentrated upon His once offered sacrifice. This is the theme that is immediately introduced in viii. 3:--

“For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man should have somewhat to offer.”

The “somewhat” suggests something different from the offerings of the law, and verse 4 puts forward the argument that the Lord could have no priesthood on earth, as the prescribed offerings were already ministered by an earthly and an exclusive priesthood. Their service however was typical of a higher and a greater.

“Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things” (viii. 5).

The Levitical economy was one of type and shadow:--

“As Moses was admonished (or ‘warned’) of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shown thee in the mount” (viii. 5).

The fact that Moses was “warned” (*see* same word in Matt. ii. 22; and Heb. xi. 7), suggests the importance of this typical representation, whilst the parallel in I Chron. xxviii. 11-19, concerning the pattern of the temple, confirms it. The typical teaching of the tabernacle is enlarged upon in Heb. ix. For the moment we are occupied with the “principal thing”, a seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary.

## **The Mediator of a better covenant.**

The excellency of the ministry of this seated priest is further enforced by the superiority of the covenant which forms the sphere of His activities. The degree of this superiority is gauged “by how much” the new covenant is superior to the old. This forms a fruitful line of teaching in II Cor. iii. We have, with the re-introduction of the subject of the covenant, returned to the argument of Heb. vii. 18, but we have returned with fuller knowledge. There, in vii. 18, we learned that the commandment which appointed the Levitical priesthood was “disannulled” because of its “weakness” and

“unprofitableness”. Here, in viii. 6-13, we learn that the covenant with which the Levitical priesthood was associated was likewise set aside as being “not blameless”, the Lord “finding fault” with it and introducing the new covenant as the better hope founded upon better promises, ministered by a better priest, and ratified by a better sacrifice.

A lengthy quotation from Jer. xxxi. occupies Heb. viii. 8-12, which testifies in no uncertain way to the nature and scope of the new covenant.

### **The new covenant.**

There are still quite a number of God’s children who have hazy ideas concerning the new covenant (or testament as it is translated in Matt. xxvi. 28), therefore it will be helpful if we set out its chief features from the passage before us, before passing on to chapter ix.

1. The new covenant is made with Israel and Judah.
2. It is not engraven upon stone as at Sinai, but written upon the heart.
3. The old covenant was connected with the exodus from Egypt, and its commemorative feast was the Passover, whilst the new covenant is connected with a greater and a spiritual deliverance, and its commemorative feast was instituted at the Passover by the Lord (Matt. xxvi. 26).
4. It is essentially connected with the national restoration of Israel (Jer. xxxi. 35-40).

The apostle sums up the matter for us in Heb. viii. 13:--

“In that He saith, A new covenant, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.”

### **But Thou remainest.**

In chapter i. the present creation is said to wax old and pass away, and in contrast with this is placed the Lord of Whom it says, “but Thou remainest”. At the end of the epistle (chapter xiii.) the same truth emerges, viz., “Jesus Christ, the same, yesterday, to-day, and for the age”. This is the blessed truth of chapters viii. and ix. Here in viii. 13 we have the waxing old and the passing away of the old covenant in contrast with the unchanging priesthood and heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant.

### **A greater and more perfect tabernacle.**

In the structure of Heb. vii. 1 - x. 18 given on page 86 of this Volume, it will be observed that the member governed by the title, “The oath of the Son”, extends from vii. 20 - ix. 8 where we reach another member entitled, “No perfection by carnal ordinances”. Chapter ix. 1-8 therefore concludes the section commenced in vii. 20.

## Heb. ix. 1-8.

- A | 1, 2-. The first covenant.
- B | -2-. The tabernacle prepared (*kataskeuazo*).
- C | -2-5. The contents. In the first; in the second.
- B | 6-. These things prepared (*kataskeuazo*).
- C | -6, 7. The priests. In the first; in the second.
- A | 8. The first tabernacle.

Two features of the first covenant are considered:--

- (1). Ordinances of divine service.
- (2). A worldly sanctuary.

A great controversy has arisen over the meaning of “the worldly sanctuary”. The word “worldly” is a translation of *kosmikon*, which occurs in one other place in the N.T., viz., Titus ii. 12. It does not occur in the LXX. One of the causes of diversity in translation is that *kosmikon* is cognate with *kosmion*, which is translated “modest” in I Tim. ii. 9, and with *kosmeo*, which is translated “adorn” in the same verse. The underlying idea of both words is that of something orderly. Rotherham accordingly translates the passage in Heb. ix. 1:--

“Even the holy ritual well arranged.”

Some, because of certain remarks made by Josephus and Philo, consider that the intention of the apostle was to show that the tabernacle typified the world. Those who desire a detailed examination of the various renderings should consult the note in Bloomfield’s Greek Testament, ninth edition.

### Not made with hands.

The simple explanation of the word *kosmikon* (“worldly”) is discovered in the purpose of the apostle who sets the earthly type over against the heavenly reality, the true, the heavenly tabernacle, “which the Lord pitched and not man”, and which was “not made with hands, that is to say not of this creation”. The holy places made with hands are called “figures of the true”. The true tabernacle being called “heaven itself” (Heb. ix. 24).

As the priest and the offering constitute “the principle thing”, the apostle passes over without comment the various articles of furniture used in the tabernacle, their typical teaching not being contributory to the theme of the epistle. A more or less detailed examination of the typical teaching of the tabernacle will find its place in the more elementary series, “*Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth*”. We just stay to observe here that the articles of furniture fall into two groups, viz., (i.) Those in the holy place, and (ii.) Those in the most holy place.

- (i.) IN THE HOLY PLACE.
  - (1). The candlestick
  - (2). The table.
  - (3). The shewbread.

(ii.) IN THE MOST HOLY PLACE.

- (1). The censer.
- (2). The ark.
- (3). The golden pot of manna.
- (4). Aaron's rod that budded.
- (5). The tables of the covenant.
- (6). The cherubim of glory.
- (7). The mercy seat.

“of which we cannot now speak particularly.”

**A lesson enforced.**

It will be noticed that the golden altar of incense is omitted from the first list, and that a golden censer is added to the second list. If we interpret the golden censer as the golden altar, as some do, then we make the apostle to teach that the golden altar was in “the holiest of all”, which it certainly was not. The LXX uses the word *thumiaterion* (“censer”) in II Chron. xxvi. 19 and Ezek. viii. 11, where both passages read “censer” and can mean nothing else.

It seems to be the intention of the apostle to enforce the lesson of Hebrews by this somewhat unexpected alteration. Both the golden altar and the censer speak of intercession, and our hearts are directed upward to the right hand of God, where the great high priest ever liveth to make intercession, having passed into the heavenly holiest of all. We read in Lev. xvi. 12, 13, that the high priest took a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar and made a cloud of incense to cover the mercy seat, and this type of the interceding priest penetrating beyond the veil is the feature seized upon by the apostle and emphasized in this way.

**The Holy Ghost this signifying.**

At Heb. ix. 6 the apostle resumes his subject, saying, “Now when these things were thus ordained”. We have drawn attention in the structure to the fact that the words “ordained” in verse 6 and “made” in verse 2 are the same in the original and should read in both cases “prepared”. Immediately the apostle resumes his theme he brings forward the great question of the priestly service, and contrasts the typical with the true. Into the first tabernacle the priests had continual access, entering daily in the course of their office, but:--

“Into the second went the high priest *alone once* every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people” (Heb. ix. 7).

The particular period to which this passage refers is that section of Lev. xvi. which speaks of the Day of Atonement. There we read of the censer and its use (verse 13). There we read of the blood:--

“Then shall he killed the goat of the sin offering that is for the people, and bring the blood within the veil” (verse 15).

There too we read:--

“There shall be *no man* in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement” (verse 17).

From these and similar passages the apostle draws a *negative* argument, then pursuing the theme through into Heb. x., he rounds off the examination with a *positive* argument. It will make the line of argument clearer for us if we place the two passages together.

#### **The Negative.**

“The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing” (ix. 8)

#### **The Positive.**

“Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way” (x. 19, 20).

In these two passages lies practically the whole of the apostle’s argument, and if we can keep this well in mind, the details instead of bewildering us will lend point and force to his glorious conclusion.

## Notes on Ministry.

### #5. The End of the Charge.

(Continued from Volume XIV, page 111).

pp. 10 - 13

All lawlessness and wickedness are contrary to sound doctrine. With this negative statement I Tim. i. 10 finishes. Positively it is described as the doctrine that is according to godliness (vi. 3). Sound doctrine convinces the gainsayer (Titus i. 9), but sound doctrine demands accompanying practice.

“But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine . . . . In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works, in doctrine showing incorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech which cannot be condemned; that our adversaries may be shamed, having no evil to bring against us” (Titus ii. 1-8).

The gainsayer will not be convinced by words only. Doctrine and practice must go hand in hand:--

“Now the end of the charge is love” (I Tim. i. 5).

Just as in Romans and Galatians the apostle taught that love was the fulfilling of the law, so here he teaches that love is the end or the goal of grace. *Telos*, “end”, does not mean “end” in the sense of time or termination, but “end” in the sense of goal or object. The “end” of my pen is the extreme tip of the nib, but the *telos* of my pen is the writing that I do. “The end (or goal) of the charge is love.” Beyond all gifts, all knowledge, all power, transcending even the most abiding graces of faith and hope, is love. All right and all wrong may be reduced to the one element love.

“A root of all evils is a love for money” (I Tim. vi. 10).

In the awful description of the perilous times given in II Tim. iii. love is prominent:--

“*Lovers of their own selves, lovers of money*” (verse 2).

so the list opens.

“*Lovers of pleasures, more than lovers of God*” (verse 4).

so the list closes. What was it that brought Demas down?

“Demas has forsaken me, having loved this present age” (I Tim. iv. 8).

For whom is the crown of righteousness?

“All those who have loved His appearing” (I Tim. iv. 8).

Now that love which is the end and goal of the charge to Timothy proceeds from a threefold source, viz., a *pure heart*, a *good conscience*, an *unfeigned faith*. The threefold stress is that of sincerity. In II Tim. i. 3-5 the apostle says:--

“I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers *with pure conscience* . . . . I call to remembrance the *unfeigned faith* that is in thee.”

The “pure heart”, it will be observed, is closely associated with the avoidance of foolish and unlearned questions that gender strife (II Tim. ii. 22, 23). When Paul says he served God from his forefathers, what did he mean? and why should he have felt the necessity to say that he did so with a pure conscience? Practically every Commentary agrees on the point that the apostle worshipped God after the custom of his fathers, or according to the knowledge received from his forefathers, and appears very concerned lest the charge of the Jews against Paul that he had changed the customs and departed from the teaching of the old covenant should have any appearance of truth. In spite of the great weight of learning which is arrayed against us, we feel that we must follow the gleam and seek afresh the meaning of the apostle.

“I thank God whom I serve from my forefathers” (*apo progenon*, II Tim. i. 3).

*Apo* is explained in Appendix 104 of *The Companion Bible* as being used of *motion away from* a place (e.g., Matt. iii. 16; viii. 1); origin or source whence anything comes, such as birth, and then says, “*Apo* may consequently be used of deliverance or passing *away from* any state or condition (e.g., Matt. i. 21; xiv. 2; Mark v. 34; Acts xiii. 8; xiv. 15; Heb. vi. 1). “From their sins” must mean “away from them”; “from the faith” (Acts xiii. 8) must mean “away from the faith”. Paul’s words in II Tim. i. 3 we understand to teach that he did worship God AWAY FROM his forefathers, but nevertheless with a pure conscience.

Much that Paul held most precious was diametrically opposed to the teaching of the law of Moses, and unless he had the conviction that follows revelation his conscience might sometimes have troubled him badly, and have taken the temper out of the sword of the Spirit that he wielded so valiantly in the good fight. In his defence before Felix (Acts xxiv.) he shows that already he had come some way along this journey, although at that time the dispensation of the mystery was not in operation. He was accused as a pestilent fellow, a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout all the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, who also had gone about to profane the temple. Paul refutes the charges of sedition and profanity, but admits the new light by which he walked:--

“But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which *they call* heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers” (Acts xxiv. 14).

This charge on the apostle’s part did not mean that he doubted the truth of Moses and the Prophets or such a fundamental as the resurrection of the dead, but that the new faith he held, though it may be deemed “heresy” by others, was God’s truth to him:--

“And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men.”

*“But this I do admit.”*—These words are in strong contrast with the repudiation of the other verses. Paul admitted that he worshipped God *away from* his forefathers, and thereby merited the censure of his unregenerate kinsmen, but he protested at the same time that his conscience in the matter was clear. When we turn back to I Tim. i. we read immediately following the reference to the unfeigned faith and good conscience:--

“From which some having missed the mark have turned aside to vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm” (verses 6 and 7).

The word rendered “swerve” in the A.V. and which we have rendered “miss the mark” occurs elsewhere only in vi. 21, a very evident parallel, and in II Tim. ii. 18 where the Gnostic denial of the resurrection is suggested. These opposers had missed the mark. Not understanding the apostle’s standpoint, they turned aside to that which ceased to be argument and became simply confusion. The apostle did not need their instruction as to the true place of the law, as I Tim. i. 8-10 shows.

We continually meet the same thing. So far as orthodox Christianity is concerned we must be willing to be accused of departing from the worship of God as sanctioned by custom and tradition. We must be prepared to be called sectarians and heretics. We must be prepared to read long disquisitions intended for our edification, which as clearly miss the point as did the lectures given to Paul on the law. It must suffice us that “we know Whom we have believed”, and the good deposit entrusted to Paul and passed on since is after all in the hands of the Lord. As stewards let us be faithful. Let us remember the glorious goal of the charge—love, and the threefold channel—a pure heart, a good conscience, an unfeigned faith, and steadily pursuing our ministry let us leave the rest with the Lord. Vain jangling belongs only to those who have “missed the point”.

## **#6. The Contest. pp. 61, 62**

An atmosphere of conflict is palpable in the earlier verses of chapter i., and in the third reference to the charge the apostle speaks definitely of the good warfare:--

“This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare: holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away concerning the faith have made shipwreck: of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme” (I Tim. i. 18-20).

*“This charge.”*—To what do these words refer, and to what part of the preceding verses shall we go back? Verses 17 and 18 are glorious doxology. Before that Paul speaks of his conversion and commission. It is here that the structure comes to our aid and sorts the subject matter out for us.

## I Tim. i. 3-20.

- A | a | i. 3, 4. The charge.
- b | i. 5. Faith and good conscience.
- c | i. 6-10. Some swerved.
- B | i. 11. The blessed God.
- C | i. 12-16. Paul, persecutor and pattern.
- B | i. 17. The only wise God.
- A / a | i. 18. The charge.
- b | i. 19-. Faith and good conscience.
- c | i. -19, 20. Some put away.

It will be seen that verse 18 is a resumption of the charge temporarily set aside at verse 10. The apostle, possibly to give encouragement to Timothy, tells him that he has no hesitation in committing this charge to him, for he had been pointed out beforehand by those that had the gift of prophecy as one who in due time should take a prominent place in the church. Added to this in iv. 14 the apostle says:--

“Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.”

Yet again in a closely parallel context the apostle says:--

“Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands” (II Tim. i. 6).

Timothy’s ordination took place during the period when gifts were in general use in the church, and is therefore not to be taken as an example for the present time. He himself was warned to lay hands suddenly on no man, and in place of any special prophecy going before pointing out who should be given the work of the bishop or deacon, a list of necessary qualifications is provided in chapter iii. Those who do possess a gift may be exhorted to “stir it up”, but we fear that in the present day it is mostly stir and no gift, while the scriptural qualifications of chapter iii. are either ignored or unknown.

The special calling and qualifications of Timothy were mentioned by the apostle to strengthen him in his difficult task. Here we have “The good warfare” (*he kale strateia*). In II Tim. ii. we have “The good soldier” (*kalos strateotes*). This warfare cannot be successfully waged without a clear conscience. To know one’s stewardship is half the battle. To be able to say “nevertheless I am not ashamed”, when ruin and failure seem to be the only visible result for a life’s service, necessitates unflinching, unswerving faith.

“*Holding faith and a good conscience.*”—Some had not held these as they should, and the result was shipwreck. It is not enough to have a knowledge of truth. It must be held in faith and a good conscience. These will steer the vessel clear of rock and reef. To meddle with a good conscience is like interfering with a mariner’s compass. Let all who feel the call to service remember that it is a warfare, a fight, and that they will need to endure hardness if they would be good soldiers of Jesus Christ. Save us from the man

who thinks he would like to do a bit of service as a pleasant occupation! There must be the burden of stewardship and the realization of the seriousness of the call before such can be approved unto God.

**#7. “The life that is now, and to come” (I Tim. iv. 8).  
pp. 107-109**

The instructions given to Timothy, while personal to himself and dealing with matters that were then present, are nevertheless part of “all scripture”. The errors and opposition of the early days foreshadow and emphasize error and opposition for all time, and especially so the apostasy at the close. Accordingly the next item in the charge is set in an atmosphere of apostasy and in the latter time.

The right understanding of the departure from the faith necessitates a careful study of the “mystery of godliness” with which chapter iii. closes. This we must do upon another occasion, our task for the moment being to observe the items in the “charge” that bear upon the question of ministry. The apostasy of this chapter (iv.) is not of necessity to be looked upon as something that will take place at the end of the dispensation, it is progressive. The words “in the latter times” were future to the apostle, but not future to us. They differ from the words of II Tim. iii. 1 in Paul’s own day (I Tim. i. 6), and was destined to spread, as departure from the truth opened the way.

The agents in this apostasy are not merely human:--

“Seducing SPIRITS and doctrine of DEMONS” (I Tim. iv. 1).

It will be remembered that the apostle stated the necessity of a “pure conscience” as a part of the “end of the charge”, together with an unfeigned faith. “Unfeigned” is in the original *anupokritos*, “not hypocritical”. Those who “missed” this “turned aside”. All this is suggestive in the light of the developed apostasy. There the human agents of the doctrine of demons are *hypocrites*, and their *consciences* have been seared. How needful in view of these things to every seeker is that conscience void of offence, that faith that is without hypocrisy, that heart which is clean! Little do those who trifle with these things think that they are adding their quota to the steadily growing apostasy. Many times this propagation of lies is accompanied by external pretensions to a super-holiness. Such were the ascetic teaching of the early Gnostics, and their various modern representatives still teach the same:--

“Forbidding marriage, and commanding to abstain from foods, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be refused, being received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer” (I Tim. iv. 3-5).

It must be remembered that the Gnostic teaching viewed creation and the flesh as evil and to be avoided, and that the dualism of their doctrine spoke of the Creator of this

present world as the evil one. Paul's words here are a definite contradiction to such monstrous teaching, and to Timothy the apostle says:--

“If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine which thou hast closely followed” (I Tim. iv. 16).

One of the modern developments of the apostasy is spiritism, and no minister of “the truth” should omit to expose and to warn his hearers against “the lie”. Likewise all modern movements that appear to rise superior to the Word of God as to marriage and food should be immediately brought to the touchstone of the faith. These things are spoken of as “profane and oldwomanish fables”, and are to be avoided. Instead of being occupied with such things, the apostle says, “Train thyself with a view to godliness”.

“*Pros*, towards, with genitive indicates *the motive*, with the dative it suggests *the act*, with the accusative *the literal or mental direction, as an end, marking the ultimate purpose*” (Dr. E. W. Bullinger's Lexicon and Concordance).

Godliness was the end towards which Timothy should exercise himself. The precise meaning of *eusebia*, “godliness”, we must reserve for a separate study. That it is closely connected with the very centre of the apostle's witness can be seen by its use in chapter iii. the term “The mystery of godliness”.

The word “train” or “exercise” of the A.V. is *gumnazo*, which gives us the word *gymnasium*. This leads the apostle to institute a contrast between “bodily exercise” and the exercise with a view to godliness. The one profits, certainly, but only “for a little”, the other is profitable for all things:--

“Having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come” (verse 8).

This statement must be remembered and carried over to verse 10:--

“We trust in the living God, Who is the Saviour of all men, especially of believers.”

Set out together the two verses mutually explain one another:--

“The life that now is” . . . . .	All men—both believers and unbelievers.
“The life to come” . . . . .	Believers—in a special sense.

If this be noted we shall be spared the controversy that arises out of the universal aspect of the verse, which can only be upheld if the passage be lifted out of its context.

Having thus placed godliness” as the great goal of the true minister of Christ, and shown its absolute antithesis in the fast developing mystery of iniquity, the apostle concludes with the words:--

“These things *charge* and teach. Let no man despise thy youth, but be a pattern of the believers, in word, in conduct, in love, in faith, in purity” (verses 11 and 12).

Let us heed these solemn exhortations. Timothy was “nourished up” in the word he taught. He was to train himself with a view to godliness. He was to be thankful for the mercies of God’s providence granted for the “life that now is”, but was to be far more concerned for that “special salvation” which included the “life to come”. Lastly he was to be a type, a pattern, an example to believers, so that the doctrine that he taught should be expressed and impressed with his own life, and be seen in string contrast with these ministers of darkness, whose teaching was hypocritical, and whose consciences were seared as with a hot iron.

## The Ministry of Consolation.

### #15. “Mary also sat at His Feet” (Luke x. 39). pp. 62, 63

There are some temperaments that more readily sympathize with Martha than with Mary. There is also a false notion entertained by some concerning the part played by Mary. It is assumed that Mary left her sister to see to all the necessary work consequent upon the Lord’s coming to their house, and under a guise of superior spirituality took the easier course. This is manifestly untrue. In the first place we have the Lord’s own commendation:--

“Mary hath chosen that good parts, which shall not be taken away from her” (Luke x. 42).

Secondly, the Scripture says that Martha was “cumbered about much serving” (verse 40). The word “cumber” means “to tear asunder” and so “distract”. Then again it is not “with serving” but “with *much* serving”. It is enjoined upon the saints “to be given to hospitality”, but we are apt to overdo the material side at the expense of the spiritual unless we take heed. The Lord for whose entertainment Martha was distracted with much serving could take two loaves and a few fishes and feed 5,000 people; surely therefore there was no call for this distraction.

Thirdly, we do Mary a great injustice if we omit from our reckoning the little word “also”. The scripture does not say that “Mary sat at the Master’s feet” but

“Martha *received* Him . . . . . Mary’s *also sat* at His feet.”

The word “received” includes the thought of providing necessary hospitality. The word “also” suggests that Mary had not been negligent in her duties. What was necessary on her part had been performed, but nothing superfluous, nothing lavish, nothing to distract, to tear as it were asunder, was undertaken. The blessed opportunity must be seized, and so after having done all that was necessary, “Mary *also sat*”. The Lord said to Martha:--

“Thou art anxious and troubled concerning many things” (verse 41).

and according to the Vatican MSS, He continued:--

“But of few things, or of one, is there need?”

Before concluding, we wonder whether our readers will suffer a personal word here? On some occasions when at Bible Meetings it has been necessary to provide tea, there are some who absent themselves from the actual meeting in order to prepare the meal or to clear away afterwards. It is possible that some do not “also” sit at the Master’s feet. Let all seek to emulate Mary. Those who by temperament are the busy Marthas, let them

remember that “much serving” is cumbering and is not needful. Let those who are too apt to do all the “sitting” remember that of Mary it is written, “Mary *also* sat”, then all will share “that good part” which received the blessing of the Lord.

## **#16. A Cure for Insomnia (Psalms iii. & iv.). pp. 94, 95**

Do you know what it is for the cares and perplexities of this life to intrude into the hours of rest, and drive sleep from tired eyes and aching head? Insomnia may not always take its rise from broken nerves or deranged stomach. There is sometimes a spiritual cause.

Psalms iii. and iv. deals with a period in David’s life that was one of sore distress. Absalom, his son, had risen in rebellion against his own father, and David who in earlier years had been hunted by Saul is now obliged to flee from his own flesh and blood. A cause there for anxiety and lack of sleep! Psalm iii. speaks of the increase of those that trouble him, that many had risen up against him, many sought to break down his faith by saying:--

“There is no help for him in God” (verse 2).

“Selah” seems to stand at the end of a line and say, “You hear that? well now look at this”. What does the Selah introduce? Let us look at it again.

“There is no help for him in God.”

SELAH.

“But Thou, O Lord, art a shield for me . . . . I cried . . . . He heard” (verse 3).

Again another Selah. What follows this time?

“I laid me down and slept. I awaked; for the Lord sustained me” (verse 5).

David slept, and slept safely, for he awaked conscious that the Lord had indeed been his shield.

In Psalm iv. we seem to advance in confidence. Then not only does David sleep, but he sleeps in peace and he falls asleep at once (verse 8). The adverb translated “both” is rendered “at once” in Isa. xlii. 14, and is so rendered here by many expositors. In spite of all the natural causes for anxiety and wakefulness David could say:--

“No sooner do I lie down, than I fall asleep at once, and not into a sleep made hideous by awful thoughts and cares, but sleep in peace, for the Lord alone is the One that maketh me to dwell in safety, in Jerusalem or in the wilderness.”

It would appear that David's friends were not much more helpful than his enemies. The enemies said:--

"There is no help for him in God" (Psalm iii. 2).

while his friends said:--

"Who will show us any good?" (Psalm iv. 6).

and once again David turns to the Lord:--

"Lord, lift up the light of Thy countenance upon us" (Psalm iv. 6).

The secret of David's peaceful sleep is just the fact of the Lord's presence. The light of His countenance was more gladdening than the day of harvest (verse 7). To suffer hunger in a wilderness, to be a fugitive instead of a monarch did not seem "good", but as in the case of Joseph in his prison, "the Lord was with him". So with David. He had the light of God's countenance, all else mattered little:--

"I will lay me down in peace, and sleep at once: for Thou, Lord, alone maketh me dwell in safety" (Psalm iv. 8).

**#17. "If the foundations be destroyed,  
what can the righteous do?" (Psa. xi. 3).  
pp. 109, 110**

*The Companion Bible* points out that the foundations here refer not so much to buildings as to "the settled order of truth or institutions". In Isa. xix. 10 the word is translated "purposes".

It is not our intention here to discuss the evident prophetic character of the Psalms, but there are few who have received the illumination of Scripture who do not realize that the foundations *are* being destroyed at this present time. There is also no scriptural warrant to make us expect that these foundations will ever be restored before the Lord Himself comes.

**"What can the righteous do?"**

It is exceedingly difficult not to attempt to do something. One will feel stirred to great activity in witness, another will seek to form a league or a crusade. All these things may be perfectly right, yet on the other hand they may be wrong. The Psalmist seems to supply the first great answer to his question, "What can the righteous do?" in the very next verse. What does he say?:--

"The Lord is in His holy temple, the Lord's throne is in the heavens" (verse 4).

It is evident that something is implied between verses 3 and 4. It is as though the Psalmist said, What can the righteous do? Well, before he “does” anything let him remember this. First his utmost “doing” is vain, except the Lord deign to own it. Secondly, the crumbling foundations *here* do not by any means indicate that the foundations of the Lord’s throne are crumbling. Heaven is higher than earth. At the very time when this earth will be a seething cauldron, ruled by a man possessed by the devil, the throne of God will be surrounded by a sea as smooth as though made of glass. When therefore you feel that the time has come for you to “do” something in view of the breaking down of the very foundations of truth, of society, of order, just take your place in spirit for a moment *there* where the temple still stands unsullied and the throne unshaken.

In correspondence with the words, “What can the righteous do?” come the words of verse 5, “The Lord trieth the righteous”. The breaking up of the foundations is the work of the wicked (verse 6), but the Lord is overruling the work of the evil one to purge and to try His people.

Think twice and thrice therefore before plunging into anything that may, after all, prove but a snare of the wicked one. Our testimony will not be less decisive because we have weighed our plans in the balance of the sanctuary:--

“If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do? The Lord is in His temple. The Lord’s throne is in heaven.”

## **#18. The factors of consolation.**

**p. 111**

“Now our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, console your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work” (II Thess. ii. 16, 17).

What is a ministry of consolation? Is it the repetition of pious platitudes? Is it sentimental? or does it rest upon the one foundation of all true ministry? and does it keep pace with all true doctrine and practice? Look at the verse quoted above. This consolation has its source in the Lord Jesus Christ and in God the Father. It flows not only from Divine omnipotence, but Divine love. This twofold source makes this consolation different from all other, it is “everlasting” or *aionian*. If its past reaches back through love to God, it looks forward to the future, for together with the *aionian* consolation is given “good hope through grace”.

This is an important factor in the ministry of consolation. The present darkness is illuminated by the hope of glory, the trouble that envelopes and threatens to overwhelm us is but for a time, it cannot reach beyond this present life into the next. The exhortation

of I Thess. iv. 18, “Wherefore console one another with these words”, has the hope of resurrection in view. Those who sorrowed did not sorrow as those who had “no hope”.

Because grace reigns we have good hope, and because we have such a hope we can even “boast in tribulations also”, for that hope maketh not ashamed. If this ministry of consolation points us backward to the love of God in Christ, and forward to the good hope through grace, has it nothing to say for the immediate present? Indeed it has:--

“Comfort (Console) your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work”  
(II Thess. ii. 17).

It *stablishes*. Floods of sorrow cannot shift the feet from the great foundation. The winds of adversity may blow, but that house is built upon the rock. Moreover, this consolation is practical. It leads to “every good word and work”. The Godward side speaks of love and grace, the believer’s side speaks of hope and work. We may therefore speak of this ministry of consolation under three heads:--

THE PAST AND SOURCE.—The Lord, the Father, love and grace.  
THE PRESENT AND RESULT.—Consoled hearts, stablished words and work.  
THE FUTURE AND INCENTIVE.—The good hope.

We may see the same practical result of the doctrine of resurrection set out in I Cor. xv. 20, 58:

“But now is Christ risen from the dead . . . . therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.”

[COLOR type added from BE.LX.53]

## Studies in the Epistles of the Mystery.

### #72. Eph. iv. 12-15. Readjustment (Eph. iv. 12) pp. 17 – 21

The fourfold gift to the church, which we have already considered, was given with a very special object:--

For (*pros*) the perfecting of the saints:--

1. Unto (*eis*) a work of ministry.
2. Unto (*eis*) a building up of the body of Christ.

Before the work of ministry could be entered upon, or the body built up, something had to be done to meet the dispensational crisis of Acts xxviii. The state of affairs at that time is expressed in the word “perfecting”. Had the church of the one body been the “perfect” state of which the church of I Cor. xiii. was the immature, then this development of doctrine and status could have been expressed by the word so often translated “to perfect” (*teleioo*). This however is not the case. The word used here for the “perfecting” of the saints indicates a rupture, a break, a dislocation, such as we might expect when such a drastic setting aside of the channel of blessing took place, as it did, in Acts xxviii.

*Katartismos*.—This word according to *Cremer* is used in classical Greek in medical works only. *Katartizo* occurs in Matt. iv. 21, “mending their nets”, where the primary idea *restore* is seen. In I Cor. i. 10 it comes in a context of division:--

“I beseech you . . . . that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be *perfectly joined together*.”

So also in Gal. vi. 1:--

“Ye which are spiritual *restore* such an one.”

To *mend* as one would a broken net, to *be perfectly joined together* as contrasted with division, to *restore* as one would a dislocated limb (the medical use of the word), this sense seems uppermost in Eph. iv.

The apostles and prophets of the earlier order were not necessarily fitted to mend the rupture that had been caused by Israel’s rejection. A special set of apostles and prophets was given by the Lord, whose primary business it was to bridge the gulf, and to reset the saints into their new position. These laid the foundation (Eph. ii. 20). Their work was accompanied and also followed by the evangelist and the teacher, and all united together in the one great work of readjustment, for the very gospel took on new aspects, such as the “gospel of peace” and the “gospel of glory”. At such times some old things pass away, some old things are brought over into the new setting, and some new things are

revealed. It is only through the writings of the later ministry of Paul that we can learn these differences.

Take an example, well-known to most students of Scripture. In I Cor. ix. are two important items of church practice:--

1. The position of women in relation to men in the ministry.
2. The Lord's supper.

Apart from the teaching given by the specially equipped ministers whose work it was to readjust the saints, we should not know whether both the above were carried over into the new dispensation, whether both were left behind, whether the Lord's supper only was retained, or whether the relationship of the man and woman only was carried over. Who could possibly decide this but the Lord Himself? In Paul's first epistle to Timothy (ii. 8-15) the relation of the sexes in ministry is repeated and readjusted. Here we stand upon positive teaching. The second item, the Lord's supper, is not repeated, either in this chapter, this epistle, or in any epistle written by Paul for the instruction of the church and its ministry after Acts xxviii.

Let those who feel that they must continue this remembrance of the Lord's death do so as unto the Lord, we have no right to judge them, but let them also acknowledge that we too, who no longer partake of a *typical* feast which is vitally connected with the *new covenant* and so with the Israel's *restoration* and *kingdom*, and closely linked with the *parousia* phase of the Lord's coming, let them acknowledge that we too when we eat not, to the Lord "eat not" and are "fully persuaded in our own mind" (Rom. xiv. 3-6).

We have already seen, in the sevenfold unity of the Spirit, that the apostle has likewise decided for us whether we observe the baptism of John, of Peter and Paul during the Acts, of the Spirit in His manifest gifts, or of that silent, unseen, yet vital union with the risen Christ, which after all is *the* meaning underlying all the varied baptisms of other dispensations, and which alone gives the typical ordinance its value and power.

This ministry moreover was directed to "the saints" and was a work of "edifying the body of Christ" rather than world-wide evangelization. The gospel for the unsaved is still the gospel as revealed in Romans. The epistle to the Ephesians assumes that the reader has reached the inner teaching of Rom. v.-viii., "Dead to sins". The readjusting of the saints had a twofold goal:--

1. Unto a work of ministry.
2. Unto a building up of the body of Christ.

Work is valueless apart from dispensational truth. Labour expended upon the body of Christ with undispenational Scriptures does not build up but destroys. The scattered and divided state of the church to-day is largely the result of the attempt to combine dispensations that differ. The reader may be engaged in "a work of ministry", but it is worth while to stop and consider its relation to the various phases of God's purpose. Some of God's children are engaged in phases of kingdom truth. They sometimes

condemn us because we see something different. We do not condemn them however, but readily admit that there are other circles of ministry still open to-day than that of the One Body. The failure is most manifest when one, who professedly belongs to the One Body and seeks to minister in that sphere, for reasons of “usefulness” and through the claims of others descends to an unwholesome blend of body, bride, and kingdom, which cannot but produce a hybrid following. What is true of the particular case of ministry is true in a wider sense, as the parallel of Col. i. 10 shows:--

“That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful unto every good work.”

Instead of looking upon dispensational truth as a phase of things that can be taken up as a kind of hobby or left as the case may be, we should look upon it as laying at the base and root of all our actions, doctrine and ministry.

The goal of this readjustment and ministry is the building up of the body of Christ. Do we appreciate the emphatic place that Scripture gives to that ministry which “builds up”? In Eph. iv. 16 we find it as the great goal of joint service:--

“Unto the building up of itself in love.”

And again in verse 29:--

“Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying (or building up).”

Look at I Cor. viii. 1:--

“Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth.”

This truth is expanded after the chapter of love (xiii.), and in its two forms comes seven times in chapter xiv. (verses 3-5, 12, 17 and 26):--

“He that prophesieth speaketh unto man to edification . . . . He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church.”

“Forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church . . . . Let all things be done unto edifying.”

By comparing Eph. iv. with Eph. ii. we may learn something of the sacred fellowship such ministry has with the Spirit of God:--

“In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God in Spirit” (ii. 21, 22).

In the doctrinal section the temple “grows”, and the sphere of that growth is “in Him” and “in Spirit”. In the practical section the body is “built up” by the human instrument given and equipped by the ascended Lord. All ministry is therefore but fellowship in the great work of God Himself. It is His pleasure that upon the defection of His people Israel

an elect company should be called and gathered together as a holy temple, a habitation of God. That indicates and limits the sphere and activity of the ministry appointed under those terms. We do not write these words in criticism of the ministry of others, called under other economies, but we do recognize in them our own all-sufficient authority for the work we seek to do and the ministry we seek to fulfil.

To any reader who may be conscious of any indirectness of aim, or who is easily turned aside by the criticism of others, or who is easily plunged into despair because of opposition or non-success, we would suggest a quiet prayerful weighing over of the dispensational grounds of his ministry and stewardship, feeling sure that conviction as to that will carry strength for all that follows. Paul knew Whom he had believed, he was certain of the nature of his call, and the fact that all forsook him, and many misjudged him, then became a light matter. Let us give a resume of these important features:--

1. PERFECTING.—The first thing to decide as before the Lord is the dispensation in which one is called to serve.
2. MINISTRY.—Then, and only then, can ministry be worthy of the name; all other labour is in vain.
3. EDIFYING.—Never lose sight of this great feature. While others may feel called upon to pull down, and to expose error, let us see to it that we steadily and surely, as in the troublous times of Nehemiah, “build up the body of Christ”, thereby having blessed fellowship with the great Worker Who is silently building up a habitation of God in Spirit.

### **The Threefold Goal (Eph. iv. 13)** **pp. 21 – 25**

The first great unity in this chapter is that of the Spirit; the second is that of the faith. The first measure is that of the gift of Christ; the second is the stature of the fullness of Christ. We found that upon mentioning the unity of the Spirit, the apostle immediately proceeded to detail its sevenfold structure (Eph. iv. 3-6). May we expect to find the same help in connection with the unity of the faith? We believe we may:--

“Until we all should arrive unto the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ”  
(Eph. iv. 13).

The word *kai*, translated “and”, is explained by *Dr. Bullinger* in his Analytical Texicon thus:--

“*Kai* (the conjunction of annexation, uniting things strictly co-ordinate), *and*; sometimes not merely annexing, but implying increase, addition, something more, *also*, or only emphasis, *even*.”

If we take the meaning of *kai* to be “even” in this passage, it emphasizes the great centre of the faith toward which the new ministry directed the saints:--

“EVEN the knowledge of the Son of God” (Eph. iv. 13).

No creed was ever so simple. None ever so exhaustive and complete. We might have expected that the apostle often spoke of Christ as the Son of God, but this is not the case. The passage before us is the only occurrence of the title in the four prison epistles, nay, in any epistle of Paul written after Acts xxviii. It stands therefore the one unique utterance in the dispensation of the mystery. In his earlier epistles Paul uses the title three times, namely in Gal. ii. 20, which speaks of his identification with the death and the life of the Son of God; in II Cor. i. 19, where he declares that all the promises of God find their yea and their amen in Him; and in Rom. i. 1-4 He is seen as the sum and substance of the gospel of God, marked off as “the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead”.

There are however other references besides these, for the passages wherein occur the words “His Son” must be included. If the unity of the faith is comprehended in the knowledge of the Son of God, then all that is revealed concerning that Son must go to constitute the oneness of the faith. It is not possible to enter into a careful study of each occurrence, but we can set the passages before the reader who will not fail to appreciate the contribution to a fuller knowledge.

*Gal. i. 16.	The Son revealed in Paul, that He might be preached among the Gentiles.
Gal. ii. 20.	The Son of God. His faith, His life, the life lived by Paul
Gal. iv. 4.	The Son sent in the fullness of time.
Gal. iv. 6.	The Spirit of the Son in the hearts of all God’s sons.
I Thess. i. 10.	The believers wait for His Son from heaven.
I Cor. i. 9.	The fellowship of His Son.
I Co. xv. 28.	The final act of His Son.
II Cor. i. 19, 20.	All the promises of God. Yea and Amen in the Son.
Rom. i. 3.	The gospel of God concerning His Son.
Rom. i. 4.	Declared the Son of God with power, by resurrection.
Rom. i. 9.	The gospel of His Son.
Rom. v. 10.	Reconciliation by the death of His Son.
Rom. viii. 3.	Sent in the likeness of sinful flesh.
Rom. viii. 29.	Conformed to the image of His Son.
Rom. viii. 32.	God spared not His own Son.

*\*The reasons for placing Galatians first are given in our Book,  
“THE APOSTLE OF THE RECONCILIATION”.*

Evangelical truth, church fellowship, individual experience, dispensational truth, Age purpose and promises, all find their goal, their assurance, their centre in the Son of God. These are the facets of truth illuminated by the apostle Paul. There is however a vast field in the Gospels and the Acts, where messianic prophecies, the kingship of Israel, *aionian* life, the raising of the dead, and other themes are found associated with the same title. It will be seen that the unity of the faith is a mighty comprehension. The four passages of Paul’s writing which definitely use the title Son of God speak of:--

Life now being by faith of	\	
Promises being Yea and Amen in	\	THE SON OF GOD.
Resurrection declaring with power	/	
Unity of the faith being the knowledge of	/	

and these may well be taken as heads, dividing the revelation concerning Him into their various departments.

The knowledge of the Son of God is really “full knowledge” (*epignosis*). Delitzsch says (*Hebraerbr.* 493, *Cremer*), “We may speak of a false *gnosis*, but not of a false *epignosis*, for *epignosis* seems to suggest that the knowledge gained acts powerfully upon the person”. In Col. iii. 10 it appears that this *epignosis* is not so much the gradual and mental attainment; it is associated with “renewal”, and is according to the “image” of the Creator. In Col. ii. 2 the *epignosis* of the mystery of God is approached by close fellowship in love and in all the riches of the full assurance of understanding, and here the mystery of God is Christ, the Vatican MS reading being “the secret of God, Christ, in Whom are hid”. The full knowledge of the will of God is necessary if we would walk worthy of the Lord, pleasing Him in all things (Col. i. 9, 10).

Finally, this full knowledge must be sought by prayer. Eph. i. 17 shows that it is the outcome of the gift of the spirit of wisdom and revelation. It is this full knowledge of the Son of God that constitutes the unity of the faith. While the faith rests upon historic fact, it will be realized that in this word we have something deeper than acquaintance with prophecy of fulfillment. The Chief Priests and Scribes, who so readily referred Herod to the prophet’s utterance that the Messiah should be born in Bethlehem of Judaea, had *gnosis*, but they had not *epignosis*, for if they had they would have anticipated the wise men with their gifts and their homage. Old Simeon and Anna show the heart-knowledge which seems to be contained in *epignosis*. Looking at the passage once more we observe that it suggests a threefold goal:--

“Until we all should arrive—  
 Unto (*eis*) the unity of the faith, even the full knowledge of the Son of God.  
 Unto (*eis*) a perfect man.  
 Unto (*eis*) the measure of the stature of the fullness of the Christ” (Eph. iv. 13).

Consequent upon that *epignosis* of the Son of God is the perfect man. Man, here, is not the usual *anthropos*, but *aner*. Five times in chapter v. this word is translated “husband”. This is a man, full grown, in his prime, fit and complete. The apostle knew that every believer will be presented “holy, and unblameable, and unreprouable” in the sight of God through the death of Christ, yet he longs for another “presentation”, he longs to be able to “present” every man “perfect” in Christ (Col. i. 22, 28). What can be more perfect than the position of Col. i. 22? Nothing. The highest conception of the idea “perfect” is not that of the Greek *teleios*. This word, derived from *telos*, the end or goal, suggests the idea of having gone on to the end, having laid hold of that for which one has been laid hold upon, as Phil. iii. 12 puts it.

The *teleios* is often contrasted with the child, as in Heb. v. 12-14 & I Cor. xiii. 10, 11, where the knowledge is elementary, the sight weak, the discernment small, the food milk.

The church of the One Body is the *pleroma*, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all, and that, and nothing short of that, is its measure:--

“Unto the measure of the stature of the *pleroma* of Christ.”

The great purpose of the ages, expressed in the word “fullness” and the part that the One Body has in that great restoring work, is the measure of its growth. It is the answer to the prayer of Eph. iii. 19:--

“To know that which surpasses knowledge—the love of Christ, so that you may be filled up to (that is the ‘measure’) all the fullness of God.”

Such is the threefold object of the ministry of the apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. The readjustment of the saints had “the fullness” in view. The work of ministry had the “perfect man” in mind. The building up of the body of Christ had the fullness before it, for the church is the fullness of Christ. This may be better grasped if set out thus:--

Apostles, etc., given:--

- (1). For the readjustment.
- (2). For ministry.
- (3). For building up the body of Christ.

Till we all arrive:--

- (1). Unto the unity of the faith.
- (2). Unto a perfect man.
- (3). Unto the stature of the *pleroma*.

How definite such a ministry is. Here is no beating the air, no uncertain sound. Happy are they who having thus clearly seen the Lord’s will know no other service, hear no other call, see no other open door, but gladly and whole-heartedly pursue this holy if somewhat narrow way, realizing that to have the lowliest place in that great fabric, the *pleroma*, outweighs all that man can give or say.

## **The Satanic System (Eph. iv. 14, 15)** **pp. 26 – 30**

### **The Contrast to the Unity of Faith.**

What a measure is set before us in attaining unto the unity of the faith! Nothing less than the fullness, the *pleroma* of Christ. Nothing but the “perfect man” can reach this standard.

In strong contrast to the “perfect” or the full grown adult is the “babe”, as we have observed in Heb. v. and I Cor. xiii. So we find the apostle immediately turning to the negative:--

“That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive” (Eph. iv. 14).

Perhaps we should be more accurate if we translated *nepios* by “infant”, for the Greek word is derived from *ne* = “not” and *epo* = “to speak”, which thought is retained in the word infant, which is from the Latin *infans*, *in* = “not” and *fans* = “speaking”. This meaning gives point to the Lord’s words in Matt. xxi. 16 “out of the mouth of infants (*nepios*) and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise”. So in I Cor. xiii. 11 the apostle says “When I was a child (*nepios*), I spake as a child”.

The Corinthians were called infants (babes) by reason of their carnality and divisions. They had not grown in grace. As a result the apostle was obliged to withhold from them the deeper things of God, “the wisdom of God in a mystery”, which however he said he did speak to those who were “perfect” full grown adults. The fitness of the word “infant” then will be seen in Eph. iv. There the great feature is the “Unity of the Spirit”, those like the Corinthians were more associated with the “divisions of the flesh”. Eph. iv. contemplates the believer as having reached “the perfect man”, the extreme opposite of the “infant”. Ephesians throughout is the revelation of a “mystery”, and such must be withheld from “infants”.

#### **“Tossed and whirled about with every wind of doctrine.”**

The word “tossed” (*kludonizomai*) is used in the LXX of Isa. lvii. 20: “The wicked are like the troubled sea.” *Kludon* is used by James, “He that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed” (James i. 6). *Katakluzo* is to overwhelm with water (II Pet. iii. 6), and *kataklysmos* is a flood (Matt. xxiv. 38), our English word cataclysm. “Carried about” is *periphero*. We find the word in Heb. xiii. 9, “Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines” (though here some MSS read *paraphero*); and again in Jude 12, “Clouds are they without water, carried about of winds” (though here again the truer reading is *paraphero*). Both instances however serve to illustrate the meaning of the word. These two words convey the acme of instability and perplexity. Such a condition is far removed from the serene atmosphere of the unity

of the faith, and the perfect man. “Examine yourselves”, said the apostle. Are we carried about by every wind of doctrine? Do we not know many who seem to have a new doctrine every time we meet them? Such are infants, for such the mystery remains a “mystery”.

This “wind of doctrine” blows not by chance. Just as surely as the purpose of God moves towards the goal, the *pleroma*, so Satan is ever seeking his own travesty of truth. The winds of doctrine that bring such confusion are part of a tremendous system of wickedness. Men may throw the loaded dice, but the wiles are the wiles of the Devil. “The sleight of men” is *kubeia*, “to play at dice”, and so “to cheat”. “Cunning craftiness” is *en panourgia*:--

“He perceived their *craftiness*, and said unto them, Why tempt ye Me?” (Luke xx. 23).

Here is the first occurrence of the word, and the context should be studied as a warning and a lesson. Notice how the craftiness is veiled:--

“And they sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of His words, that so they might deliver Him unto the power and authority of the Governor . . . . Master, we know that Thou sayest and teachest rightly, neither acceptest Thou the person of any man, but teachest the way of God truly. Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesar, or no?” (Luke xx. 20-22).

It was a deeply-laid plot. The way in which they had been caught on the horns of a dilemma in the matter of John the Baptist rankled, and at last the Chief Priests and Scribes thought to use His own weapon against the Lord Himself. They would make Him impale Himself upon the horns of a dilemma, for see, if He said “Yes”, His reputation as a leader and deliverer, to say nothing of His claim to be the Messiah, would be shattered, for how could the Deliverer of Israel teach them to pay tribute to the Pagan? If He should say “No”, they would immediately charge Him before the Roman Governor as a stirrer up of sedition. They evidently expected “No” for an answer, for they sent the spies “that so they might deliver Him unto the power and authority of the governor”. They reckoned however without the Lord. He takes the wise in their own craftiness. What was His reply?

“Shew Me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s. And they could not take hold of His words before the people, and they marveled at His answer, and held their peace” (Luke xx. 24-26).

We must be on our guard against those who feign themselves “just men”, who profess to agree with the Word of truth, who flatter us that *we* are not partial or hold men’s persons in respect. The parallels and the contrast to “craftiness” are given in II Cor. iv. 2:--

“We have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

A | Hidden things renounced.  
 B | Walk in craftiness,  
 C | Handle Word of God deceitfully.  
 C | Truth manifested.  
 B | Commended to conscience.  
 A | In the sight of God.

The two sets are sufficiently obvious, and we commend them to our readers as a commentary upon our subject. II Cor. xi. 3 gives the basic example, origin and energizer of this craftiness:--

“The serpent beguiled Eve through his *subtilty*.”

Behind the “sleight of men” is the “cunning craftiness” of the Devil:--

“Whereby they lie in wait to deceive” (Eph. iv. 14).

Aquila translates Exod. xxi. 13 by *methodeuse*, but the word seems to mean more generally a systematic artifice. *Methodeia* comes again in Eph. vi. 11, “the *wiles* of the Devil”. “Systematic deception”, “snares of the cunning”, “deliberate system of error”, “the systematizing of the deception”, “a subtle method of deceit” are some of the many translations offered. They impressed us with the thought that there is deliberate systematic method pursued in this craftiness. Speaking of Satan, II Cor. ii. 11 says, “We are not ignorant of his devices”. He ever continues the same corruption of the Word of truth, the flattery, the temptation, as in the Garden of Eden, and the instance recorded in Luke xx., till cast into the lake of fire. Shakespeare well puts it:--

“The equivocation of the fiend, that lies like truth.”

So then we have the unity of the Spirit set over against the systems of deception, in other words, the mystery of godliness and the mystery of iniquity, the truth and the lie.

The apostle has been saying what we are *not* to be; he now concludes by stating the positive. One word suffices to give complete contrast to all the craft and deceit of the wicked one.

*Aletheuontes*.—The word means more than “speaking the truth”, it means “being true”. This has a fuller and deeper meaning than we may at first suppose, but as this is dealt with by the apostle in the same chapter we will follow his own order and wait until we reach the passage. We can see however the supreme place of truth in the witness for God. It may not be amiss to exhibit the usage of “truth” in Ephesians:--

## Truth.

- A | i. 13. Word of truth. Salvation.
- B | a | iv. 21, 22. Put off.
  - b | iv. 24. Righteousness and holiness.
- B | a | iv. 25. Put away.
  - b | v. 9. Righteousness and goodness.
- A | vi. 14. Girdle of truth. Warfare.

The whole world is ranged under two heads, the *Truth*, and the *Lie*. Christ stands at the head of one, Satan at the other. Truth makes the weakest invincible. Truth will prevent the ship from being carried by the winds and waves. Truth will deliver from the sleight of men and reveal the systematic deceit of the wicked one.

We shall see presently the close connection between the “old man” and “the lie”, and the “new man” and “the truth”; let us here, while the passage is before us, remember the close association that must ever be between “the perfect man” and “the truth”.

### #73. Eph. iv. 15, 16. The Head, the All Things (Eph. iv. 15) pp. 49 – 52

The admonition to “speak the truth in love” taken from the A.V. of Eph. iv. 15 is one that should ever be before the mind of the believer. It is not, however, the meaning of this particular verse. There is no word here for “speaking”, it is rather “being the truth”, i.e., so living that every act and motion and motive shall be in line with “truth”. It is possible that the words “in love” complete the statement, “being the truth in love”, but we believe the true rendering of the passage links the words “in love” with what follows, namely, growth.

We have been warned of the dangers that beset the believer who remains a “babe”. To attain the unity of the faith necessitates the “perfect man” and the “stature or full age” of the fullness of Christ. This therefore demands growth. Over against the sleight of men, the cunning craftiness and the systematic deception of wickedness, the apostle places one simple word, *altheuontes*. I wish our language permitted such a word as “truthing”, it does not, but even “being true” seems weak in comparison with the fullness of the original. Over against the perfect man and the stature, the apostle places “growth”. It can be easily seen if set out thus:--

- A | Faith, knowledge, perfect man, stature of Christ.
- B | Systematic deception.
- B | Being true.
- A | Growth in love into Christ.

The words “in love” we believe should be read with the words “we should be growing”. It will be observed that the section of verses 15 and 16 is bounded by the words “in love”:

“IN LOVE we should be growing unto Him, the all things, Who is the Head—Christ  
. . . . unto the building up of itself IN LOVE.”

We have pointed out in other articles of this series that the “body” of Eph. iv. is the reflection in the practical section of the “temple” in the doctrinal (Eph. ii.).

The temple is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.  
The body is built up as a result of the ministry of the apostles and prophets.  
The temple is fitly framed together.  
The body is fitly joined together.  
The temple has Christ as its chief corner stone.  
The body has Christ as its head.  
The temple grows unto an holy temple in the Lord.  
The body grows unto Christ.  
The temple — “In whom ye are builded.”  
The body — “Out of whom . . . . makes for growth.”

Growing and building, figures of body and temple, are to be found together in such passages as “rooted and founded” (Eph. iii. 17), and “rooted and built up” (Col. ii. 7). It is important that we remember the fact that the Scripture speaks of the “growth” of the body. No amount of energy, of meetings, of advertising, can make for growth. Growth is the result of life, health, suitable environment and sound food. Growth can be retarded by the absence of light, air or water. The student of Scripture does not need an exposition of these three types, they are so obvious. Nevertheless, growth is stayed in many a child of God simply because he is not walking in the light.

The passage in the A.V. reads, “May grow up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ” (Eph. iv. 15). We find it difficult to accept the translation “in all things”. First.—There is no word for “in”. Secondly.—The words *ta panta* are either the nominative or the accusative plural. In other passages “in all” is *en pasi* (Eph. i. 23; Col. iii. 11), and even though the *en* should be omitted, the dative case *pasi*, would still remain unchanged. Further, we believe that the words *ta panta* express from another point of view that which constitutes the *pleroma*, and indicate that creation which was the work of God, not as revealed in Gen. i. 1, but as revealed in Eph. iii. 9:--

“The dispensation of the mystery, which hath been hidden from the ages that God,  
Who (*en to Theo to*) the all things (*ta panta*) created.”

Some MSS add “through Jesus Christ”. These words are probably an interpolation, but they nevertheless express the meaning of the passage. As we have said before, the full discussion of *ta panta* cannot be undertaken as a part of an article, it must be given a separate study. Without therefore coming to any conclusion here as to the relation of *ta panta* to the purpose of the ages, we feel that so much was necessary in the reconsideration of this expression in Eph. iv. 15. We set aside the rendering “in all things”.

Another phrase needs considering. What do we understand by “growing into Him”? Are we considered as separated from Him, and by slow degrees growing nearer and nearer to Him? This may be possible if we are speaking of the believer’s experimental fellowship with the Lord, but how can a “body” grow into the “head”, for that is the figure before us? Moreover, the very next verse says, “out of whom all the body . . . . makes growth”, so that growth is viewed as only possible while Head and members are united.

A somewhat parallel expression occurs in iii. 19, “That ye may be filled (*eis*) unto all the fullness of God”, which means that the believer shall be filled for, or with a view to, that fullness. That he may be able to take his place in that fullness, that as a member of that body which is itself a “fullness” he may be filled up to the measure of Him that filleth (*ta panta*) with all. So in Eph. iv. The growth is “for” or “with a view to” Him in His capacity as the Head, which is but another way of indicating our “measure”, “the stature of the fullness of Christ”. The fullness is the measure of our stature. “The Head” and “the all things”, is but another way of saying the same thing. Conybeare and Howson in a footnote say, “*Auxanein eis auton* is grow to the standard of His growth”. Christ, the Head, is placed together with “the all things” that are “through Him” (I Cor. viii. 6); the Lord and His great age purpose are placed before us as our standard and our goal. Should it appear strange thus to link together Christ and *ta panta*, we should remember Col. iii. 11 which says, “*ta panta kai en pasin Christos*”, “the all things and in all things (*is*) Christ”. When the scriptural term is understood the sense of strangeness will vanish as we realize how truly the Lord Jesus Christ takes the all things of this mighty purpose into Himself.

To complete the thought of this verse we need to remember one further truth. Running together down the ages are two mysteries. The mystery of godliness, culminating in the exaltation of Jesus Christ as Lord, and the mystery of iniquity, culminating in the man of sin setting himself up as God. In Eph. iv. 4 is the mystery of iniquity, “the systematized deception”. In Eph. iv. 15 is the mystery of godliness, with Christ as Head over all things to His church, as He will yet be in heaven and earth to the glory of God the Father.

What an incentive to “grow in grace”! may it not be lost upon us.

## **Things that make for Growth (Eph. iv. 16).**

**pp. 52 - 56**

We now come to the central reference to the “body” in Ephesians. In Volume VIII we gave the structure of the seven references. We repeat it here for the sake of new readers:--

- A | a | i. 23. The Body. Christ the Head.
- b | iv. 4. The Unity. Christ the one Lord.
- B | iv. 12. Gifts for the building.
- C | iv. 16. Unity. “Fitly joined together.”
- B | iv. 16. Each member for the increase.
- A | a | v. 23. The Body. Christ the Head and Saviour.
- b | v. 30. The Unity. The church the members.

Central place is given to the unity of the body “fitly joined together”. The subject is evidently of great importance, judging from its place in the epistle.

We have drawn attention before to the fact that the “body” in the practical section echoes the “temple” in the doctrinal section. A glance at the structure above will show that there is only one reference in the doctrinal portion to the body, the remaining six being found in chapters iv. and v. The body aspect of the church is essentially practical, and unity is its very life.

“Out of Whom all the body being fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in measure of each several part, the growth of the body is making unto the building up of itself in love” (Eph. iv. 16).

When the purpose of God in His church is viewed from the Godward standpoint the “temple” is said to grow “in the Lord”. Further, it does not say that the temple builds up itself in love, but that it is built up together in spirit. In chapter iv. the theme is practical. The unity of the spirit is there for us “to keep”. The work of the spirit is through human channels, apostles, prophets, etc. The building up of the body of Christ, first wrought by these gifts of the ascended Lord, is followed, after the unity of the faith is reached, by the harmonious working of every member of the body building itself up in love. A parallel passage is Col. ii. 19:--

“Out of Whom all the body, being supplied and knit together through the joints and ligaments, groweth with the growth of God.”

The first point to notice is that all grows “out of” Christ, the Head. The next thing is that “growth” depends upon “supply”, and “supply” upon “unity among the members”. We might place the reference to the compactness of the body and its several members into parenthesis and read:--

“Out of Whom, *origin*, (all the body being fitly framed and knit together) through that which every joint supplieth, *channel*, (according to the working in measure of every part) the growth of the body, is making unto the building up of itself in love, *goal*.”

The two parenthetical clauses, as it were, are assumed as facts:--

“Taking it for granted that there is no dislocation either of limb, nerve, organ or circulation”, and “taking it for granted that each one part is working proportionately”, then “the growth of the body will take place”.

What a deal is “taken for granted”! Let us note these features carefully.

“ALL THE BODY . . . . MAKES FOR GROWTH.”—This is equivalent to saying, “According to the measure of each one part makes for growth.” All the body is concerned with the growth of all the body. It is impossible for one member to merely feed itself and further its own growth without wrecking the health if not risking the reason and the life of the body.

“FITLY FRAMED AND KNIT TOGETHER.”—The word translated “fitly framed together” in ii. 21 and “fitly joined together” in iv. 16 is *sunarmologeō*. This word is composed of “together”, “adapt”, and “collect” and *Dr. Bullinger* in his *Lexicon* well expresses this by saying that it “joins together parts fitted to each other”.

A very slight acquaintance with anatomy or physiology will impress the mind with the perfect adaptation of the various parts of the body. There are no “square pegs in round holes” when the unity is the unity of the *spirit*; there are, alas! too many such when the unity is of the *flesh*. Unity is fullest when it is unobtrusive. We are not conscious of the many perfectly-fitted and lubricated joints of our bodies until rheumatism spoils their perfect fitness and brings the fact of joints to mind. The healthy man is not conscious of the organs of his body. This is the unity that we desire, but the man-made thing is a source of irritation and trouble all the time. “Leagues”, “unions”, “societies” are well in their place, but they do not and must not be looked upon in the same light as the unity of the spirit.

Not only is the body “fitly framed”, but it is “knit together”. Col. ii. 19 speaks not only of “joints” but “ligaments”. What is the “bond” that shall unite the whole body together as one? Let Col. ii. 2 answer, “being knit together in love”. This is the “bond of perfectness”. The unity of the spirit is held together by “the bond of peace”, the unity of the body by the “bond of perfectness—love”. “In love” commences and closes this section of Eph. iv. (*see* verses 15, 16). A loveless unity is not of God. If we are members one of another we shall care for one another. When we think of what love is, we can understand what a bond it can be:--

“Love--its longsuffering, its kindness; its freedom from envy, vaunted self-assertion, inflated arrogance, vulgar indecorum; its superiority to self-seeking; its calm control of temper; its oblivion of wrong; its absence of joy at the wrongs of others; its sympathy with the truth; its gracious tolerance; its trustfulness; its hope; its endurance” (I Cor. xiii. Farrar).

Here is the character of the “perfect man” as I Cor. xiii. 10, 11 indicates. Is it my character and yours, fellow-member? Wherever we fail in this, we fail to maintain unity

and check growth. Think how much harm is done among members of the one body through lack of “longsuffering”. Meditate upon the other attributes of this greatest of gifts. Love forms the ligaments of the body, without which all is out of joint.

“EVERY JOINT SUPPLIETH.”—Strictly speaking, the words read “through every joint of the supply”. The joints supply nothing of themselves. The supply comes from the Lord, and through the members as a channel. This figure is well illustrated in Phil. i. 19 where the word occurs:--

**“And I know that this will result in my deliverance**  
**1. through your prayer**  
**2. and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ,**  
**3. according to my earnest expectation and hope.”**

Here are fellow-members joined together in love, the one praying, the other expecting, and the Lord supplying. What a beautiful picture of “the joint of supply”. Oh to be honoured as a means and a channel of blessing from our living Head to His beloved members.

“ACCORDING TO THE WORKING.”—Joints and ligaments perfectly adapted, perfectly united, need something else than fitness, they need life. “The body without the spirit is dead, being alone.” What constitutes the life-giving energy of this body? It is the power of God not as manifested in creation, but in *resurrection*. It is “to usward who believe” (Eph. i. 19, 20). More than that, it is the power of *ascension*, “And set Him . . . . far above all” (Eph. i. 21). Still further, it is the power of *victory*, “And hath put all things under His feet” (Eph. i. 22). It is the power that will finally accomplish the purpose of the ages, “The fullness of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23; i. 11). It is this power that equips for service:--

“Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me according to the energy of His power” (Eph. iii. 7). “Now unto Him Who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask of think, according to that power energizing us” (Eph. iii. 20).

This mighty power, “the power of His resurrection”, is the life of the one body:--

“According to the energy in measure of each one part” (Eph. iv. 16).

The distribution of *energeia* and *energeo* in Ephesians is suggestive:--

- A | i. 11. The purpose. Energizing all things with a view to.
- B | i. 19. Exceeding power. “To usward.”
- C | i. 20. Christ the Head. The energy.
- D | ii. 2. The energizing of the children of disobedience.
- A | iii. 7-11. The purpose. Energizing the minister with a view to.
- B | i. 19. Exceeding power. “In us.”
- C | i. 20. The members. The energy.

It will be seen that the energy that actuates every member of the one body is that same energy that pulsates through *ta panta*, “the all things”, and which raised Christ, the Head, the Fullness, and with Him “the all things” also far above all. The reader may remember that in between the reference to the ascension of Christ and the gifts for men in Eph. iv. 8, and the details of their bestowal and ministry, comes that reference to the fact that the Lord ascended up far above all heavens that He might fill “the all things”. The reader may now better realize the close relation that there is between the church of the one body, and that great purpose of the ages. Every time we are actuated by the flesh, or the world, we by so much militate against the purpose of God.

This constant association with the purpose of God and its resurrection power is but another way of saying verse 15, “Truthing, in love we all should grow”. There is another energy at work, the *lie*, with Satan at its head. He rules in the lower regions of “the air”, and not “far above all heavens”. His associates are the “rulers of the darkness of this world”, and the “children of disobedience” (Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12).

“THE MEASURE OF EVERY PART.”—It is not sufficient to remember the gifts of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. Every member of the body has a part to play, and it is according to the measure of each one part that the body builds up itself in love.

Here then is a place and a power for each. Let us heartily and gratefully respond.

#### **#74. Alienation, the mind and the new man (Eph. iv. 17-20) pp. 99 – 106**

In our previous studies we have seen that the opening of the practical section of this epistle (chapter iv.) sums up all true practice in the exhortation, “walk worthy of your calling”. Practice is the fruit of doctrine and cannot be disassociated from it. It would be useless, for example, to exhort wives and husbands to comply with the practical exhortations of chapter v. if they did not heartily accept the doctrinal basis upon which those exhortations rest. Consequently while it is true that we are now studying the practical section of this epistle, there is no arbitrary exclusion of doctrine, and we shall find much doctrine interwoven with the practical teaching of this section.

The disposition of subject matter must be observed. The positive exhortation of Eph. iv. 1 is followed by a negative testimony as to how not to walk. Between these two phases of truth there is a glorious parenthesis dealing with the *one body* (verses 3-16), and following the negative testimony (and placed in correspondence) is the teaching concerning the *new man*.

## **Eph. iv. 1-32.**

- A | 1, 2. The walk. Positive. Humility of mind.
- B | 3-16. The one body.
- A | 17-19. The walk. Negative. Vanity of mind.
- B | 20-32. The new man.

### **Aliens – from Israel and from the life of God.**

The epistle to the Ephesians reveals a twofold Gentile alienation:--

“Aliens from the commonwealth of Israel” (Eph. ii. 12).

“Aliens from the life of God” (Eph. iv. 18).

The alienation of chapter ii. is expressed in the terms of *distance*, the alienation of chapter iv. is expressed in the terms of *death*. The blood of Christ cancels the former alienation by “making nigh”; the gift and operation of resurrection life reverses the other. In both cases however this twofold truth merges into one expression, *the new man*.

### **The relation of the walk and the mind.**

Before we consider the teaching of the new man we must give attention to the negative aspect of the believer’s walk. In verse 17 we read, “That ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk”. The word “other” should be omitted. We are exhorted to walk not as the Gentiles walk. A very definite change is suggested by the words “not henceforth”. The same negative comes in Eph. iv. 28, “Let him that stole steal *no more*”. While the chief feature of the epistle to the Ephesians is the revelation of the mystery and its dispensational peculiarities, we must not forget that it finds its doctrinal basis in Romans. When dealing with Eph. ii. 1 and the words “dead to trespasses and sins”, we were compelled to refer back to Rom. vi. So also we find the true import even of the words “not henceforth” in Rom. vi. 6:--

“Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with Him that the body of sin might be rendered inoperative, that HENCEFORTH we should NOT serve sin as slaves.”

The service of Rom. vi. 6 and the walk of Eph. iv. 17 are both associated with the old man. In one case it is seen as “crucified”, in the other it has to be “put off”, but both meet in a new “life unto God”. Rom. vi. lays great stress upon “the body of sin”, “the mortal body” and the “members”; Eph. iv. emphasizes “the mind”, and that both positively and negatively:--

“Walk worthy . . . .	with all humility of mind” (iv. 1, 2).
“Walk no longer . . . .	in the vanity of mind” (iv. 17).

There are two words here for “mind”. In iv. 2 the word is a compound of *phreen*, and has particular reference to the heart and understanding. In iv. 17 mind is *nous*. The word *nous* has passed into the English language, and is placed in Roget’s *Thesaurus* together with intelligence, comprehension, understanding and sagacity. The word is used

by Paul more than any other writer of the New Testament, for it occurs 21 times in his epistles out of a total of 24. It is manifest therefore that an intelligent appreciation of the truth revealed through Paul demands an acquaintance with the usage of this word in his epistles. We find the *nous* connected with both the old and the new man.

*The nous of the old man.*—Rom. i. 28; vii. 23, 25; Eph. iv. 17; Col. ii. 18;

I Tim. vi. 5; II Tim. iii. 8; Titus i. 15.

*The nous of the new man.*—Rom. xii. 2; I Cor. ii. 16; Eph. iv. 23; Phil. iv. 7.

### **The mind and alienation.**

Rom. i. 18-32 speaks of the setting aside of the Gentiles consequent upon their idolatrous abandonment of the truth which had been made known to them. Three times in this momentous passage do we read that these Gentiles were “given up” by God (Rom. i. 24, 26 28). In verse 28, by a play upon the sound of the words used (figure of speech called *paranomasia*), the judicial nature of this “giving up” is made prominent. *Conybeare* expresses the figure by translating the verse thus:--

“As they thought fit to *cast out* the acknowledgment of God, God gave them over to a *cast out* mind.”

*Alford* renders the passage:--

“Because they *reprobated* the knowledge of God, God gave them over to a *reprobate* mind.”

The resulting state of morals, given in the verses that follow, is terrible to the last degree. It is summed up in Eph. iv. 19 by the words, “All uncleanness with greediness”. Such was the condition of the Gentile world; such the outcome of a mind alienated from God and His truth.

In our appreciation of the vital distinction that exists between law and grace, we are apt to slur the equally decided difference that there is between the *light* of the law of God given to Israel and the *darkness* of reprobation that settled down upon the Gentiles. While the law could give neither life nor righteousness, we do read:--

“The law of the Lord is perfect, *converting the soul* . . . . The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes” (Psa. xix. 7, 8).

If we keep this fact before us we shall be able to understand the setting of the next reference to the *nous*:--

“I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my *mind* . . . . so then with the *mind* I myself serve the law of God” (Rom. vii. 23-25).

This illumination of the law, however, only intensified the bondage of sin and death, for while to will was present, to perform was impossible. So far as justification is concerned, the enlightened Jew stood upon the same platform as the darkened Gentile,

but so far as the doctrine of the mind is concerned we perceive that it can be influenced by outside factors, even though the bondage of sin and death may remain. Passing to Col. ii. 18 we learn that there is a fleshly *mind* which “puffs up” and leads away from Christ. The three passages that remain speak of:--

“Men, whose *mind* is corrupted and destitute of the truth” (I Tim. vi. 5).

“Men who resist the truth, being corrupt in *mind* and reprobate (cf. Rom. i. 28) as concerning the faith” (II Tim. iii. 8).

“All things indeed are pure to those who are pure, but to those who are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but both their *mind* and conscience are defiled . . . . and unto every good work reprobate” (Titus i. 15, 16).

Such is the testimony of the apostle to the *nous* of the old man. His teaching concerning the *mind* of the new man is contained in four passages:--

“Present your bodies a living sacrifice . . . . be ye transformed by the renewing of your *mind*, that you may *approve* (*dokimazein*, cf. Rom. i. 28) what is the will of God” (Rom. xii. 1, 2).

Here is the great contrast with Rom. i. 18-32; there both mind and body are “given over” to evil, here they are “yielded” to God. This distinction between the natural and the spiritual is brought out markedly in I Cor. ii. 14-16. The natural man cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God, they appear to him foolishness. God reveals His truth “by His Spirit”. The Spirit of God and His relation to God is likened to the intimate relation of “the spirit of man which is in him” (verses 10, 11). In other words, they who are taught by the Spirit can say, “We have the *mind* of Christ” (verse 16).

This connection of spirit and mind is found in Eph. iv. 23, “And be renewed in the spirit of your *mind*”, which may be rendered, “The spirit, that is to say, your *mind*”. The last reference speaks of peace. The mind of the flesh is enmity against God, but Phil. iv. 7 speaks of both heart and *mind* kept in perfect peace by Christ. If we ponder these passages we shall the better understand “the truth” which is taught in Eph. iv. 17 onwards.

### **Accessories and issues of alienation.**

*Vanity of mind* (Eph. iv. 17).—The first item of alienation given is *vanity of mind*. The *mind* of the old man is like the old creation “subject to vanity” (Rom. viii. 20), and like Babel (Rom. i. 21). The essential connection between this vanity and the idolatrous perversion of Babel is seen not only in Rom. i. 21-23, but in Acts xix. 15, 16, where “vanities” and “the living God” are placed in opposition, and moreover these vanities are connected with the period of Gentile alienation when they were “suffered to walk in their own ways”.

*A darkened understanding* (Eph. iv. 18).—The sequence “vanity . . . . darkness” is observed in Rom. i. 21. “They became *vain* in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was *darkened*”. We are reminded of the past, the change and the consequent walk, in Eph. v. 8:--

“For ye were sometimes *darkness*, but now are ye *light* in the Lord, *walk* as children of light.”

The complete reversal of alienation and its darkness is found in Eph. i. 18:--

“The eyes of your heart (A.V. understanding) having been enlightened.”

A comparison of Rom. i. 21 with Eph. iv. 17, 18 will show that “heart” and “understanding” are practically synonymous.

*The ignorance that is in them because of the hardness of their hearts* (Eph. iv. 18).— We may gather something concerning this ignorance by reading Paul’s speech at Athens (Acts xvii. 30). There, dealing with the wise of the earth, he speaks of their *ignorant worship*, and of the *unknown god*. To turn from One in Whom we move, live and have our being, from One Who gave fruitful seasons and every reason for gratitude, to turn away from Him and to worship the works of their own hands was the practical expression of their “alienation from the *life* of God”.

In verse 30 we meet the word “ignorance” and find that it characterizes the whole Gentile period, “And at the times of this ignorance God winked at”. This ignorance and alienation are beyond human remedy. No philosopher or orator who ever stood upon Mar’s Hill could dispel its gloom or illuminate its darkness. The darkness, alienation and ignorance of Eph. iv. 18 are the expansion of the words “vanity of mind” of the previous verse (iv. 17). The walk as the Gentiles which was forbidden is expanded in iv. 19:--

“Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.”

In this record of the Gentile walk we find the word *paredoken*:--

“God gave them up to uncleanness” (Rom. i. 24).

“They gave themselves up to uncleanness” (Eph. iv. 19).

The Scripture adds “with greediness”. Here we have the two sides of the solemn truth. The act of God was not without cause:--

“For this cause God gave them up” (Rom. i. 26).

“Even as they did not approve to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind” (Rom. i. 28).

“The fool hath said in his heart, ‘There is no God’.” (Psa. xiv. 1); the immediate comment is, “They are corrupt; they have done abominable works”.

### **Life and Truth.**

The passages of Scripture brought together here impress us with the important position of the mind in connection with the activities of life. The word “life” (*zoe*) occurs

but once in this epistle, namely, in Eph. iv. 18, “the life of God”. It does not appear to be used in any form in any other part of the epistle, except in Eph. ii. 5 where it is a compound and translated “quicken together”. In case any reader should think that we have overlooked Eph. vi. 3 we would point out that the word there is not *zoe*.

How are we to understand this alienation from the life of God? The parallel passage in Col. i. 21 connects this alienation with “wicked works”. We cannot “live *unto* God” without the “life of God”, and that life can only be ours as we are “made alive together with Christ”.

The sphere of resurrection life is “the truth”, even as sin and death are part of the province of “the lie”. The Gentiles, we are told in Rom. i. 25, “changed the truth of God for *the lie*”, and this led to their alienation. Here in Eph. iv. we are to read of putting away *the lie* and of putting on the truth:--

“Ye however have not thus learned the Christ—if at least it is Him ye have heard, and by Him ye have been taught, even as truth is in Jesus” (Eph. iv. 20, 21).

The presence here of the name “Jesus” instead of the more usual “The Lord Jesus Christ” demands an explanation. While the personal name of the Lord is constantly used in the Gospels, its use without some added title in the Epistles is the exception rather than the rule. Writing to the Hebrews the apostle uses the name “Jesus” eight times (this includes Heb. iv. 8 which does not refer to our Lord but to Joshua). The references are Heb. ii. 9; iv. 14; vi. 20; vii. 22; x. 19; xii. 2, 24; xiii. 12.

In the church epistles the apostle uses the name eleven times in all, three of these references however deal either with unbelievers or the testing of spirits, leaving another series of eight with direct teaching for the church. The references are Rom. iii. 26; viii. 11; II Cor. iv. 5, 10, 11, 14; Eph. iv. 21; and Phil. ii. 10. If these facts stood alone we might feel that there was no spiritual significance in the number of the occurrences, but when we know that the numerical value (*gematria*) of the Greek letters of the word “Jesus” is 888 (a pointed contrast to the number of the name of the beast which is 666), and that the number 8 has the significance of resurrection (a fresh start, as for example Noah and those with him in the ark--*see* II Pet. ii. 5 and I Pet. iii. 20; “the eighth person” and “eight souls”), then the introduction of the name “Jesus” here in Eph. iv. assumes definite meaning.

Most if not all of the references given above are found in contexts of resurrection, and it is because the truth which the apostle is about to teach is vitally related to the Lord as the Head of the new creation, the last man and the second Adam, that he uses this name.

All is now ready for the expansion of “the truth in Jesus”. The old man in its total alienation from God necessitates the *new man* and the *new creation*. This therefore is the subject that must occupy our attention in our next paper.

## The Body in Ephesians. p. 106

A beloved reader raises the question as to why we have given but one reference to the doctrinal portion of Ephesians in the structure set out on *page 52* of the present volume.

In case other readers should be perplexed and conclude that we have acted arbitrarily, we point out that the reference to the body in Eph. ii. 16 refers to the individual body of the Lord Himself and not to the church. Similarly we omitted the reference in v. 28, for there the reference is not to the church, but to the body of the individual believer.

To place the matter clearly before the reader we will set out the complete structure, including all references, but marking the passages that do not enter into the argument of Eph. iv. 16:--

### The Body.

A		i. 23.	The church which is His body.	<i>Ecclesiastical.</i>
B   ii. 16. Reconcile. Reference to the Lord's own body.				
C		iv. 4.	The one body.	<i>Ecclesiastical.</i>
D		iv. 12.	Gifts for building up.	<i>Past.</i>
E		iv. 16-.	Fitly joined together.	<i>Central.</i>
D		iv. -16.	Member for growth.	<i>Present.</i>
C		v. 23.	Christ the Head.	<i>Practical.</i>
B   v. 28. Love. Reference to believer's own body.				
A		v. 30.	The church and members.	<i>Practical.</i>

**#75. The new man and the Truth (Eph. iv. 20-24)**  
**pp. 136 – 142**

In our last paper we were led, both by the contemplation of the utter alienation of the Gentiles from the life of God, and the significance of the name “Jesus”, to expect the introduction of a new creation. Such is indeed the fact, and without it we should be left without the least hope of ever throwing off the dreadful dominion of the old man. Let us observe the disposition of the subject matter before we go into details.

**The new man (Eph. iv. 20-24).**

- A | 20, 21. Truth in Jesus. Head of new creation.
- B | 22. Put off the old man. Corrupt.
- B | 23, 24-. Put on the new man. Renewed.
- A | -24. Truth (righteousness and holiness of). Sphere of new creation.

“The truth in Jesus” is the truth of the new creation. The old man belongs to “the lie”, the new man to “the truth”. The old man is corrupt, the new man is renewed and holy. The words “put off” are to be referred to the word “taught”, and the passage reads:--

“And by Him ye have been taught (. . . .) to put off . . . . the old man.”

We are in the practical section of the epistle, and so are not instructed as to how the old man was put off by Christ, but our attention is directed rather to the outworkings of that doctrine. We are to put off “as regards *the former conversation*” the old man, or as Colossians put it:--

“Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man *with his deeds*”  
(Col. iii. 9).

“With his deeds” is equivalent to “the former conversation”, remembering that the A.V. word “conversation” is much more than merely speaking with another, but means the whole manner of life.

The foundation of this teaching is Rom. vi. 6:--

“Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be rendered inoperative, that henceforth we should not serve sin.”

The lusts or desires that dominate the unregenerate mind have one characteristic, they are “deceitful”. This is not to be limited to the coarser lusts of the flesh, the higher and finer activities of the mind are marked with the same Satanic brand, for Col. ii. 8 speaks of “philosophy” as being “vain and deceitful”, and essentially so inasmuch as it is “not after Christ”. The new man therefore arises out of the “*truth in Jesus*”, and repudiates as the *lie* whatever is not “after Christ”. Christ must be foundation and top stone of this erection, even as He is the Alpha, Omega and Amen of the purpose of the ages.

## The new creation.

The glorious truth given to the apostle to make known with such fervour is no mere negation. It does not find its full expression in “putting off” merely, but is only fully expressed when “put off” is succeeded by “put on”. But, just as the old man which has become corrupt implies the creation of Adam at the beginning, so the new man which is to be put on necessitates a new creation. There are two ways whereby this new creation could be attained. Either by an instantaneous act, without previous preparation, or by a process beginning here and now in this present life and reaching its consummation in that instantaneous change “in the twinkling of an eye” when this mortal shall put on immortality.\*

This latter method appears to be the one that describes the work of God. Having said so much, it is necessary to draw attention to just exactly what phase of the new creative work belongs to this present life, and what belongs to the life to come. It will be found upon examination that the Lord begins the work here in connection with the *mind*, reserving until the day of redemption and resurrection His work in connection with the *body*. The body of the saintliest believer is just as mortal as it was before his conversion. Paul had to acknowledge that while the inward man was renewed day by day, the outward man was perishing. This perishing and mortal body is indeed allowed to feel the earnest of the risen life, and many times the earthen vessel is “cast down but not destroyed”, thereby bearing about in the body the “dying of the Lord Jesus” that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in “our mortal flesh”. That is a precious truth, but the flesh is “mortal flesh” just the same. Therefore, seeing these two phases of the new creation and their appointed times, we observe the order in Eph. iv. where the first step is indicated by the words, “And to be renewed in the spirit of your mind” (Eph. iv. 23). The new creation begins *within*. Its present sphere is the *mind*. The body is not changed until the resurrection. The due observance of this sequence is an important factor in the interpretation of the epistle to the Philippians.

“The *mind* of Christ” (Phil. ii.).

“The *body* of His glory” (Phil. iii.).

*Ananeo* (“to be renewed”) does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. Two words are employed to express the idea of newness--*kainos* and *neos*. *Kainos* looks backward, it excludes the old and the past. *Neos* looks forward, and suggests youth. The two words come together in Col. iii. 10:--

“And having put on the new man (*neos*) being renewed (*anakainoo*).”

In other words, we have put on the new, young, rejuvenate man, fresh, vigorous, prime, with all the glorious future stretching out in its limitless possibilities by the grace of God, and have been renewed with a life that standing beside the empty tomb looks back at a past, dead, buried, excluded, finished. *Neos* turns our faces toward Christ, the last Adam, *kainos* looks back to the first Adam. The one says “life has begun”, the other “that life has finished”. Thus we have the reverse and the obverse of this blessed truth.

[NOTE: \* - This reference to I Cor. xv. must not be misconstrued. We do not believe that the hope of the one body awaits “the last trump”, we use the passage here in a general way.]

The *spirit* of your mind, the subject of this renewal, looks to the doctrine of Rom. vi. There we learn that the seat of sin is in the members of our mortal body (Rom. vi. 6, 12, 13, 19). The mind being held in subjection to the flesh (Rom. vii. 14, 15, 18, 22), even though illuminated by the law of the Lord, finds itself utterly enthralled and under the dominion of sin which is in the members. Hence the battle of the unsaved yet enlightened Jew (Rom. vii. 23).

As we have already said, we have no warrant to believe that the bodies of believers undergo any process of renewal, but rather that these bodies of ours shall returned to dust, to be raised incorruptible, or changed in the case of the living at the time, when the Lord comes.

When the sinner passes from death unto life, from Adam to Christ, from the power of Satan to God, the dominion of sin is broken, the mind is set free, and it becomes possible for the first time to “yield ourselves servants to obey” either sin or God (Rom. vi. 16). Before this we had no option.

### **The new creation manifested.**

The renewal of the mind is an inward operation. It is completed and rounded off by a corresponding outward response:--

“And to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and holiness of the truth” (Eph. iv. 24).

With this passage we should read the parallel in Col. iii. 10:--

“And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created Him.”

These passages taken together are mutually helpful. Let us notice a few special features.

#### **(1). Creation.**

Both emphasize the fact of creation:--

“Created in righteousness and holiness” (Eph. iv. 24).

“Created after the image of Him” (Col. iii. 10).

With these passages we should compare those of Eph. ii.:--

“We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus” (ii. 10).

“For to create in Himself of the twain one new man” (ii. 15).

It is impossible to believe the gospel as preached by Paul and to tolerate any kind of mere reformation. The basic fact and the most decisive in Paul’s witness is that all men,

all doctrine, all works, are ranged under one of two heads, *Adam or Christ*. Quite one half of our problems, whether doctrinal or practical, are to be solved by the recognition of this one great fact. Redemption therefore must eventuate in

## (2). The new man.

The goal of the six days' creation was man. The great sun in the heavens is man's servant. To his physical necessities the day of twenty-four hours is exactly adjusted. The earth is proportioned with marvellous accuracy to man's strength. The list could be continued into detailed tabulation of all the sciences. Man created in the image of God, placed upon the earth to have dominion, explains every known phenomenon of nature.

As it is with the old creation, so it is with the new. Its centre is the new man created anew in the image of God. The ecclesiastical unity that results from the reversal of the dispensational alienation of Eph. ii. is called "the new man", and is created so (Eph. ii. 12-15). The practical unity with Christ, as the reverse of alienation from the life of God, is also called "the new man" (iv. 18-24).

## A needed corrective.

The dispensation of the mystery is called "the dispensation of the *grace* of God". The gospel of that same period is called "the gospel of the *grace* of God". Salvation is by grace, and that salvation is at the other extreme to salvation by works. The transcendent character of grace is so overwhelming that we are apt to forget that if this salvation by grace is not *out* of works, it is nevertheless *unto* works. Another feature that is likely to lead to onesidedness is to emphasize the dispensational standpoint of the new man (Eph. ii. 15) to the exclusion of the practical teaching concerning the same (Eph. iv. 24). Let us not forget that the church which was chosen in Christ before the overthrow of the world, and blessed in the super-heavenlies, was chosen *that it might be holy* (Eph. i. 1-4).

Let us compare Eph. iv. 24 with Col. iii. 10. It is quite manifest that the "new man" of Col. iii. 10 is the same as that of Eph. iv. It is the "practical" view rather than the "dispensational" of Eph. ii. Yet so inseparable are these two concepts of the one truth, that Col. iii. 11 immediately continues, using terms that are comparable to the teaching of Eph. ii., rather than that of Eph. iv.:--

"Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free; but Christ is all and in all."

The ecclesiastical unity is not absent from Eph. iv., however, for verse 25 says:--

"Wherefore putting away the lie, speak every man truth with his neighbour, for we are MEMBERS one of another" (Eph. iv. 25).

The truth is that the church of the one body should be reflected in each individual member that makes up that unity. If Christ be the Head of the church, He must be the Head of each individual also. If that church be a new creation, so also must each

individual member be. If that church be a new man, each member should put on the new man. If Christ dwells in the temple built by the Spirit (Eph. ii. 20-22), then “Because of this” (Eph. iii. 1 and 14) each individual member should desire to manifest that truth in miniature, and is taught to pray “that Christ may dwell in the heart by faith”. Thus doctrine, dispensation and practice meet together in “the truth in Jesus”.

### (3). The Image.

Eph. iv. 24 says that the new man is “according to God”. Col. ii. 10 says it is “according to His image”. It is evident that Gen. i. 26, 27 is in view. The introduction of *the lie* into the garden of Eden rendered the purpose of the image in Adam abortive, but only temporarily, for in Christ, the last Adam, the goal is reached. It is the purpose of God that every one of the true seed shall be conformed to the image of His Son (Rom. viii. 29). The church of the one body, a new creation in that image, is a firstfruits, the greatest and richest earnest of the glorious future.

The goal of Col. iii. 11 that “Christ is all and in all”, foreshadows the goal of the ages “that God may be all in all”. Christ has been given as Head over all things *now* to the church, another anticipation of the day when all things shall be placed under His feet.

### (4). Knowledge.

Eph. iv. 24 speaks of righteousness and holiness of truth. Col. iii. 10 speaks of renewal unto a full knowledge of God, the Creator. Is there a difference here? What connection is there between righteousness, holiness and knowledge of the Creator? Have we so soon forgotten the context of Eph. iv. 24? Have we not seen the utter UNrighteousness and UNcleanness of *ignorance*? Have we not seen the degradation that comes from vanity of mind, darkened understanding and ignorance? If there is to be a change, ignorance must give place to knowledge, darkness to light, uncleanness to holiness, wicked works to righteousness. In other words, the complete truth is expressed by the two passage; either Eph. iv. or Col. iii. taken separately implies and necessitates the other. Having touched upon this teaching concerning knowledge we shall realize the condition of things expressed in Rom. i. the more vividly:--

“Because that when they KNEW God . . . . they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was DARKENED . . . . they did not like to retain God in their KNOWLEDGE, they were given over to a reprobate mind” (Rom. i. 21-23).

We shall also understand the meaning of II Cor. iv. 3-6 the better:--

“But if our gospel be veiled (*see* iii. 14, 15) by those things which are destroyed (*see* iii. 7, 11, 13, 14) it is veiled by which the god of this age hath *blinded the minds* of them that believe not, lest the light of the glory of the gospel of Christ, Who is the *Image* of God (*see* Col. iii. 10), should shine upon them . . . . the light of the *knowledge* of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (II Cor. iv. 3-6).

Here we see the gospel and knowledge used practically as synonymous. The outcome of this teaching is expressed in Eph. iv. 25:--

“Wherefore putting away the lie, speak you truth, each one with his neighbour, because we are members one of another” (Eph. iv. 25).

The reference here to Zech. viii. 16 shows that mere *speaking* will not satisfy the demands of love to our neighbour, for the passage continues thus: “execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates”. “The lie” has brought in its train misery, oppression, death. “The truth” reverses all this and manifests itself in *deed* as well as in word.

The verses that follow expand and apply this exhortation to the whole range of earth’s relationships. As this occupies the whole of chapter v. and part of chapter vi., we must perforce conclude this present paper here.

Let us seek a tender conscience regarding these things, keeping steadily before us the intimate and vital association that has been revealed to exist between the high calling of the one body and the walk that is worthy.

**#76. Put on . . . . . Put off . . . . . Walk accurately**  
**(Eph. iv. 25 – v. 21)**  
**pp. 161 – 172**

The conflict of the ages is reflected in the epistle to the Ephesians. It is summed up in the antagonism that is seen between the truth and the lie.

The church of the mystery has been delivered from the authority of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God’s dear Son. That is the repudiation of the lie. The church has been lifted up from earth and earthly things, quickened, raised and seated in the heavenlies. That is the repudiation of the lie. The members of that church, once energized by the prince of the power of the air, is now energized by the self-same power that raised Christ from the dead. That is the repudiation of the lie.

But what of ourselves? Do we remain passive after grace, as perforce we were compelled to be before? Have we no walk that is worthy? Have we no old man to put off? No new man to put on? We have, and doctrinal truth alone can no more save, sanctify and bless than that kind of faith exercised by demons whose hair stand on end in horror (*pritto*, see Job iv. 15).

**The putting away of the lie.**

“Wherefore putting away lying” should read “Wherefore putting away *the lie*”. “To put away” (*apotithemi*) is used of putting aside clothing (Acts vii. 58), weight (Heb. xii. 1), and occurs in Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. iv. 22, 25; Col. iii. 8; James i. 21; and I Pet. ii. 1. Eph. iv. 25 is the only place where we read of putting away the lie. All other

passages deal with some of the smaller sub-divisions into which the lie falls, such as “the works of darkness”, “the old man and his manner of life” and such individual manifestations as “anger”, “malice”, “blasphemy”, &c.

In Eph. iv. 25-32 this putting away of the lie is dealt with, and the Spirit of God condescends to details in order that we may be made sensible that in the words of our mouth, the works of our hands, the very tone of our voices, we may manifest the truth and repudiate the lie. Two expressions seems to stand out in this passage as index figures on a dial:--

THE LIE.—“Gives place to the devil” and “Grieves the Holy Spirit of God.”

THE TRUTH.—“Even as God for Christ’s sake hath acted graciously to you.”

Let us see the passage as a whole.

### **Eph. iv. 25-32.**

- A | 25. | a | Putting away the lie.  
          b | Speak truth.  
          c | Reason.—“Members.”
- B | 26. Question concerning anger.
- C | 27. Give not place to the devil.
- D | 28. | d | Steal not.  
          e | Labour for that which is good.
- WORKS.       f | Working with hands.  
                  g | To supply need.
- D | 29. | d | No corrupt speech.  
          e | But that which is good.
- WORDS.       f | Out of your mouth.  
                  g | To build up the need.
- C | 30. Grieve not the Holy Spirit.
- B | 31-. Answer as to anger.
- A | -31, 32. | a | Put away all bitterness, &c.  
          b | Be kind.  
          c | Reason.—“God for Christ’s sake.”

### **The practical side of the truth.**

If we have put away the lie, we shall speak truth with fellow-members. To speak truth may at first sight appear to mean only the bearing of a true witness, but a man who would scorn to tell a lie may fail to speak truth if “corrupt communications” proceed out of his mouth. His remedy is found in the “seasoning” which only the “grace” of God can give (Col. iv. 6).

Or again, the man who eschews corrupt speech may tarnish the fair name of truth by “bitterness”. Even husbands who love their wives in some faint resemblance of the love of Christ are warned to beware of this evil thing (Col. iii. 19). Anger too must be carefully watched. We know that it is possible for anger to exist without sin, for such is

the testimony of Mark iii. 5, and all the passages where *orge* is translated “wrath” when used of God. Nevertheless it is true wisdom to shun anger, to class it with bitterness and wrath and clamour and blasphemy and malice (Eph. iv. 31), for it requires a perfect and sinless being to be angry and sin not. If anger is ever entertained let us hasten to finish with it; let not the sun go down before the difference is settled. Plutarch tells us it was a maxim among the Pythagoreans, that whenever one had given way to anger, the difference was made up before sunset. Would that this same spirit were more common among the Lord’s people.

Not only may truth be expressed in words, it must come out in deeds. Stealing is the lie in practice. This in all its shapes and forms must be put away. In its place let there be labour, working with the hands that which is good. This labour is with the object:--

“That he may HAVE, TO GIVE” (Eph. iv. 28).

Labour merely that one may *have* may be selfishness, and industry of itself may not express “the truth”, but labour that one may have something to *give* is an entire reversal of the lie, that steals from another, and is a manifestation of the truth.

### **The devil, and the Spirit of God.**

Closely associated with the lie is the devil, and with the truth the Holy Spirit of God. It must be kept well in memory that to fail to put off the lie and to put on the new man may “give place to the devil”, and when this takes place we may be sure that there is also another equally sad result, viz., the grieving of the Holy Spirit of God whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption.

Among the many ways whereby truth may be hindered and a place given to the devil is revealed in such a strange word as “clamour”. That man who when he gives a command must “shout”, who when he argues a point of truth must “raise his voice” does not give an *outward* expression of that lowliness and meekness which commends the truth.

“Evil speaking” is in the original “blasphemy”, and is probably derived from *blaptein ten phemen* = “Blasting the reputation or credit” of any one. We may sincerely believe that to take a “text” from Shakespeare or the Poets is to belittle the Scriptures, but we sometimes wonder whether Tennyson’s Knights of King Arthur, who vowed “to speak no slander, nor listen to it” do not put many a believer to shame. “Love thinketh no evil.”

### **Be ye imitators of God.**

The remedy for this and all kindred manifestations of the flesh is found in the next three verses:--

“Be ye kind . . . . Be ye imitators of God” (Eph. iv. 32, v. 1).

This after all is but a homely way of expressing the more doctrinal passage:--

“Put on the new man which AFTER GOD is created” (Eph. iv. 24).

“The lie” finds its pattern in the devil:--

“I speak that which I have seen with My Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father . . . . Ye do the deeds of your father . . . . If God were your Father, ye would love Me, . . . . Ye are of your father the devil . . . . he is a liar and the father of it” (i.e. “the lie”) (John viii. 38-44).

It will be seen therefore that to fail to “put away the lie” gives “place to the devil”, while “putting on the new man” is *doctrinally* expressed by the words “after God” and is *practically* shown by becoming “imitators of God”.

The word “follower” in v. 1 is *mimetes*. This word occurs seven times in the N.T. and is therefore marked with the seal of spiritual perfection. The word will be recognized as the source of our English word “mimic”. This element of imitation is expressed in verse 32, where we are exhorted to kindness and forgiveness, “*Even as God* for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you”, and is carried forward into v. 2 in the words, “*As Christ also* hath loved us”.

The love of Christ, the object of our imitation, is not an abstraction. The reader will call to mind many passages speaking of both the Father and the Son, where the words “loved and gave” come together. So here. Christ *loved*, and that love we are to imitate, Christ loved and *gave*, and *that* kind of love we are to imitate. Christ loved and gave *Himself*. This is the essence both of loving and of giving:--

“Praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift . . . . not as we expected, but *first* gave their own selves to the Lord, and to us . . . .” (II Cor. viii. 4, 5).

The love we are to imitate, moreover, has further qualities. He gave Himself *for us* . . . . *to God*. All our loving and giving must be of this character. It is not merely philanthropy or what is now called “charity”, that might (though we doubt it) fulfil the first clause “for us”. It is, on the other hand, not that cold and lofty disdain of all things human and kindly that may in self-deception be called an exclusive offering “to God”. We are sure God has no pleasure in monasteries or nunneries, neither in the hypocrite’s claim “It is Corban” (Mark vii. 11); the *twofold* offering “for us . . . . to God” alone satisfies the case.

Lastly, this love manifests itself in the giving of an offering and a sacrifice. It will be seen that there is no contradiction of the Psalmist who said, “None of us can by any means redeemed his brother”, for redemption is by blood (Eph. i. 7). Into that part of the Saviour’s work no man enters, but Paul knew what it was to fill up what was behind of the afflictions of Christ in his flesh for the sake of the church, he knew what it was to be offered upon the sacrifice and service of faith (Col. i. 24 and Phil. ii. 17). Moreover, he uses the same words, “a sweet smelling savour”, to describe the kindly gifts of the Philippians:--

“The things that were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice, well pleasing to God” (Phil. iv. 18).

Christian giving should always have the atmosphere of the altar and the sanctuary. The children of God contribute to this and that, their gifts may be liberal, they may be helpful, they may encourage, but, do not let them miss the highest and the best. Let them be “even as God *for Christ’s sake*”, let them partake of the character of the offering of the sweet savour, then such offerings will be “well pleasing unto God”.

### **The three-fold walk.**

The apostle now brings the exhortation to walk worthy of the calling and to repudiate the old man, to bear upon things of every-day life. He exhorts us to:--

- (1). “Walk in love as children of love” (Eph. v. 1, 2).
- (2). “Walk as children of light” (Eph. v. 8).
- (3). “Walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise” (Eph. v. 15).

Each walk is expressed both positively and negatively.

*Walk in love.*—The positive is expressed in the one great example, “as Christ also hath loved us”. Negatively, the apostle has to run over the six-fold work of the flesh to ensure that the child of God shall not be left without warning.

*Three-fold uncleanness in act.*—Fornication, all uncleanness, unbridled lust.

*Three-fold uncleanness in word.*—Filthiness, foolish talking, jesting (suggestive talking).

Concerning the first three, the apostle says:--

“Let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints” (Eph. v. 3).

Concerning the second three, he says:--

“Things not consistent, but rather giving of thanks” (Eph. v. 4).

A further three-fold description bringing together those already named follows, and this time with a warning of great import:--

“For this you know, for you have learned that no fornicator, or impure or lustful man, who is nothing better than an idolator, has any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God” (Eph. v. 5).

We do not feel called upon here to rake over this awful heap of corruption and bring to light that which we fain would hide, or which should “not once be named among us” (Eph. v. 3), “for it is a shame even to speak of these things” (Eph. v. 12), nevertheless this epistle is written *to us* and a very slight knowledge of modern life will teach us that these

warnings are absolutely up to date. We have translated *pleonexia*, unbridled lust, rather than covetousness, and in this we are but following such as Conybeare and Howson, Jowett, and Trench. The latter shows the meaning of the word in the following passage:--

“Take the sublime commentary on the word which Plato supplies, where he likens the desire of man to the sieve or pierced vessel of the Danaids, which they were ever filling, but might never fill: and it is not too much to say, that the whole longing of the creature, as it has itself abandoned God and by a just retribution is abandoned by Him, to stay its hunger with the swine’s husks, instead of the children’s bread, is contained in this word.”

It is evident that the same comparison had occurred to Shakespeare:--

“The cloyed will. That satiate, yet unsatisfied desire. *That both filled and running*”.  
(Cymbeline i. 7).

To these words we would but add that the whole truth is expressed in the first and the tenth commandments:--

“Thou shalt have no other gods before Me.”  
“Thou shalt not covet, or desire.”

To imitate God and to walk in love makes such things as detailed by the apostle impossible.

“Jesting” = *eutrapeleia*, refers to that loose talk which by skilful turning of words brings up to the mind far more than the actual wording may appear to intend and is to be shunned by all who put off “the lie”.

### **The Inheritance.**

The words of the apostle that should cause every child of God to stop and consider are that those that do such things:--

“Have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God” (Eph. v. 5).

There is no question but that one phase at least of the inheritance is in the nature of a reward, and consequently may be forfeited. This is clearly expressed in Col. iii. 24 in a passage that exactly corresponds with Eph. v. 5:--

“Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.”

Rom. viii. 17 seems to observe the distinction between “heirs of God” because children of God, and “joint heirs with Christ” if so be that these children walk as Christ walked, which must of necessity involve suffering and rejection.

The inheritance which is a matter of predestination and redemption (Eph. i. 11, 14) is one thing, the inheritance that is in the kingdom of Christ and of God is another, and it

may be forfeited. Men may emphasize “grace”, they may call such teaching “legal”, they may seek to throw out the idea of reward from the epistles of the mystery, but the apostle concludes his words of warning by saying:--

“Let no man deceive you with vain words” (Eph. v. 6).

The parallel in Colossians but endorses or enforces this:--

“Beware lest any man spoil you through . . . . vain deceit . . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward” (Col. ii. 8-18).

Because of these things the wrath of God is coming on the children of disobedience, and the members of the church are not to be partakers with such. There must be an outward expression of the inward change. Once they too were darkness and walked in darkness, producing the unfruitful works of darkness. Now, however, they are light in the Lord and so the exhortation comes, “*Walk as children of light*”. Love leads to sacrifice, and repudiates lust which is but the expression of selfishness. Light leads to fruitfulness and reproves the unfruitful works of darkness. Where the A.V. reads:--

“For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth” (Eph. v. 9).

the revised text read, “the fruit *of the light*”.

This reading contains a truth which is everywhere confirmed in the works of God around us. The student of Horticulture is early impressed with the essential place that light has in plant growth. The bulk of the food upon our tables daily are carbo-hydrates or starchy foods, such as bread and all cereals, potatoes, sugar, &c. Now this carbon is obtained by plants, not from the soil but from the air. Carbon assimilation, called also Photo-synthesis (“placing together by light”), is the work of the green chlorophyll in the leaves, and is entirely dependent upon the action of sunlight. If a patch of black be put upon a leaf in the morning and the leaf be examined under a microscope at night, it will be found that the exposed cells of the leaf are full of starch grains, whereas the cells beneath the black patch are empty.

It is scientific to the last degree to teach that on the first day of creation God should say, “Light be, and light was”. It is the fuller truth to see in this statement of Genesis a type of the gospel:--

“For God, Who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light . . . . the light of the glorious gospel” (II Cor. iv. 4, 6).

Not only does light produce fruit, but darkness has its unfruitful works. We all have seen the varied coloured toadstool that, like the mushroom, do not depend upon the light. No one, however, has seen a green toadstool or mushroom. Such have no power of using sunlight, they are vegetable parasites living upon others, or saprophytes living upon the decaying tissue of dead plants. Such are nature’s pictures of the unfruitful works of darkness. Darkness and death and unfruitfulness are all in the passage before us:--

“Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light”  
(Eph. v. 14).

The third walk is called “circumspect”. *Akribos* is possibly derived from *eis akron benai* = “going up to the summit” of a hill, and generally carries with it the thought of accuracy and exactness, e.g.:--

*Akribeia* = “Taught according to the *perfect manner*” (Acts xxii. 3).  
*Akribestatos* = “The *straitest* sect” (Acts xxvi. 5).  
*Akribesteros* = “The way of God *more accurately*” (Acts xviii. 26).

Josephus speaks of the Pharisees as:--

“The sect . . . . who are thought to excel others in their *exactness* about their national institutions” (Life 38).

There can be no doubt from the above usage of the word what the apostle intends to teach in Eph. v. 15. Grace does not mean laxity or lack of diligence. The same word that describes the zeal for accuracy of the formalist under the law, describes that consecrated zeal which moved Aquila and Priscilla in their endeavours to lead Apollos into the fuller light, and should characterize those of us who have received such a calling as is revealed in Ephesians. The pathway for the saint leads through dark and slippery places. Uncleanness and defilement lie all around, and while there is the blessed provision in Christ for uncleanness contracted in the pilgrim way, we are solemnly warned of the danger of voluntarily entering into any of these things from which redemption has set us free. We have been delivered from the authority of darkness and have been translated into the kingdom of His dear Son. We are therefore enjoined to walk accurately, remembering the pit from which we have been delivered.

This is the last of the seven occurrences of the word “walk” in Ephesians. The first in the practical section says “walk worthy”; the last says “walk accurately”. The first says “with all lowliness”; the last “with wisdom”. Once again the parallel epistle to the Colossians will provide confirmation. Ephesians says:--

“Walk worthy . . . . walk accurately as wise . . . . be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is . . . . be filled with the Spirit.”

Colossians says:--

“That ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding: that ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful” (Col. i. 9, 10).

“*Redeeming the time.*”—*Exagorazo* means “to buy out of the market” with the meaning of our English “forestall” implied. Forestall means to buy a thing before it is placed upon the stall in the market and so to exhibit a keen business sense. As stewards and as redeemed ones this keen business sense should be ours in the exercise of our

calling and stewardship. “Time” here is not *chronos*—mere duration, but *kairos*, a fitting time, hence an opportunity. It has been said:--

‘Opportunities are *for* eternity, but not *to* eternity.’

Alas that many only recognize opportunity by its back. Think of the opportunities for service, for study, for communion, for helping, that have been allowed to slip this day, this week. Have you always been prepared to speak that word in season? to give that helping hand? The past is beyond us, and we can but seek the forgiveness that is ours in Christ. The present is here, let us then:--

“Forestall the opportunity, because the days are evil” (Eph. v. 16).

To do this we need wisdom, we need to:--

“Understand what the will of the Lord is” (Eph. v. 17).

How can this understanding be attained? The answer comes in the next verse:--

“And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit (when speaking to one another)” (Eph. v. 18, 19).

### **What is it to be filled with the Spirit?**

This passage is important enough to warrant a pause and a careful examination. First we can see an intended contrast, a contrast introduced in verse 3 of this same chapter. The Gentiles who knew not God found their enjoyment and inspiration in the intoxication of wine, their speech was corrupt, filthy and unfit for saints. Their drinking songs, accompanied by instruments, resounded with the praise of Bacchus, Venus and the like. The saint is to be a contrast. Instead of wine he is to be filled with the Spirit, instead of unclean mirth and idolatrous songs he is to sing spiritual songs and make melody in his heart. Instead of praising the gods of darkness his melody and praise should be directed to the Lord. What are we to understand by the injunction, “Be filled with the Spirit”.

To understand this statement it is necessary to understand the use of the Greek verb to fill. *Pleroo*, “to fill” takes three cases after it. As an active verb, followed by the Accusative, of the *vessel* or whatever is filled. As an active verb, followed by the Genitive, of what it is *filled with*. As a passive verb, followed by the Dative, of the *filler*, and as a passive verb, followed by the Genitive, of what the vessel is *filled with*.

In the passage before us the verb is *passive*, and “with Spirit”, *en pneumati*, is *dative*. This means that the “Spirit” is the One that “fills”, and not that the believer is filled with the Spirit. To make sure that the meaning is clear, let us put it this way. A cup may be filled *with water*, it may be filled *with a pump*. Now, the incongruity of the statement would prevent anyone from imagining that the pump was found afterwards in the cup, but as there are passages which speak of the filling or baptism of the Spirit, the unguarded reader does not discern the meaning so clearly. Now if the Spirit fills us with something

that takes the place of “wine wherein is excess”, we should seek to know what it is. Once again the parallel epistle Colossians supplies the needed information:--

“Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly. Teach and admonish one another in all wisdom, singing in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs with grace in your hearts to the Lord” (Col. iii. 16).

This parallel is so complete that we cannot avoid the inference that “to be filled with the Spirit” will be to be filled by the Spirit with the word of Christ. The Spirit everywhere takes of the things of Christ and applies them to the heart of the believer. That constitutes the inspiration of his renewed conversation, “speaking to yourselves”, and will prevent any corrupt communication from proceeding out of his mouth, for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, and a heart filled by the Spirit with the word of Christ will speak accordingly. The melody of hearts finds its *Amen* in:--

“Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Eph. v. 20).

The lowliness and meekness that adorns this doctrine is expressed by:--

“Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God” (Eph. v. 21).

“Fear”, *phobos*, and “reverence”, *phobeomai* (*see* Eph. v. 33) explain one another. Our reverence for Christ places us all in our true relationship one with another. This relationship is threefold and practically covers the whole of human society.

Our next paper must be devoted to the application of truth to the domestic and social side of life, a side as important if not more so than that of the ecclesiastical and public. Truth like charity begins at home. The Bishop must be able to manage his own house before he can think of ruling the house of God. The Spirit of God has sealed us. The Spirit of God may fill us. Let us walk accurately, for His Word is still a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

## **Redemption. New Series.**

### **#4. The Anointed Cherub. pp. 113 - 128**

Ezek. xxviii. is devoted to the sin and the judgment of the Prince of Tyre, the type (verses 1-10), and the sin and judgment of the King of Tyre, the antitype (verses 11-19). We learn from Josephus that the Prince of Tyre was Ithobalus II, which in Hebrew becomes Ethbaal. Ethbaal means *Baal's Man*! The name of this Prince is suggestive of his character, while it is equally suggestive to remember that an earlier Ethbaal was the father of "that woman Jezebel" (I Kings xvi. 31).

#### **"Ye shall be as God."**

The serpent's words to Eve in Gen. iii. find an echo in Ezek. xxviii. The mystery of iniquity presses on to its goal, which is expressed in the same words—"as Gods" (II Thess. ii. 4; Rev. xiii.). Ezekiel is commissioned to say unto the Prince of Tyre:--

"Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God . . . . . Wilt thou say before Him that slayeth thee, I am God?" (Ezek. xxviii. 2-9).

This Prince had prided himself in his wisdom:--

"Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee" (Ezek. xxviii. 3).

By this wisdom the Prince had gotten riches, and by his traffic he had increased them. This led to pride, and pride of a blasphemous character. His end is to be slain:--

"Thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of Him that slayeth thee" (Ezek. xxviii. 9).

Not only should death be the end of his blasphemous claim, but his very glory should be brought to ignominy:--

"They shall profane thy brightness" (Ezek. xxviii. 7).

#### **The false and the true.**

The word "brightness" as a feminine noun occurs nowhere else but in verse 17. It is one of a series of parallels which show that the Prince of Tyre, a man who aspired to Divine honours, is in his turn a type of the King of Tyre, who was more than man, who aspired to Divine honours. The verbal form of the word translated "brightness" is used of the glory of God's presence in several passages, a striking one being Psa. 1. 2:--

“Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath *shined*.”

The reader will perceive that here we have a further parallel, for Zion, *the perfection of beauty*, is a similar expression to:--

“O Tyrus, thou hast said, I am of *perfect beauty* . . . . thy builders have *perfected* thy *beauty*” (Ezek. xxvii. 3, 4).

also of the King of Tyre it is written:--

“Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and *perfect in beauty*” (Ezek. xxviii. 12).

Zion or Jerusalem is the geographical centre for the outworking of the mystery of godliness, while Babylon, Tyre, Pergamos and other cities have been, and will again be, the place of Satan’s seat and the outworking of the mystery of iniquity.

Ezekiel gives a fuller description of the cherubim than any O.T. writer, and it is to him that we owe the description of the fallen cherub, which is given in chapter xxviii. under the title of the King of Tyre. Passing to the lamentation of verses 12-19, we pass from the history of one who was “a man (*adam*, Heb.) and no god” to one who was much more than man.

Three items make up the description of the King of Tyre, viz., (i.) His wisdom and beauty, (ii.) His title and office, (iii.) His iniquity and sin.

#### **Ezek. xxviii. 12-17-**

- A | 12, 13. Wisdom and beauty.
- B | 14, 15-. The covering cherub.
- C | -15. Iniquity.
- C | 16-. Sin.
- B | -16. The covering cherub.
- A | 17-. Wisdom and beauty.

#### **The finished pattern.**

The opening description of this mighty being is truly wonderful:--

“Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty” (Ezek. xxviii. 12).

“Thou art the finished pattern” is the rendering of *The Companion Bible*. The Hebrew word translated “sum” is the feminine form of the word meaning “measure” or “standard”. In Ezek. xliii. 10 we have the same word as is used in xxviii. 12; there it is translated “pattern”. The masculine form comes in Ezek. xlv. 11, “the bath shall be of one *measure*”. The context suggests a standard. “A just ephah and a just bath. The ephah and the bath shall be of one measure.” In Ezek. xviii. 25 and 29 the word is rendered “equal”; other passages give “to mete” (Isa. xl. 12), “to weigh” (Job xxviii. 25).

There can be no doubt but that we are here facing a revelation of tremendous import. This mighty being, now cast out as profane and doomed to become “ashes on the earth”, was once the “standard”. We anticipate a future article by pointing out that all the glories which were for a time vested in this anointed cherub are to be found in their perfectness and indefectibility in Christ. Christ is set before the church as “the perfect man”, and the measure is “the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ”. The LXX in this place translates “sum” by *homoiosis*, which means “similitude” (cf. James iii. 9). This is the word which the LXX uses in Gen. i. 26, “Let us make man . . . . after our *likeness*”. When we read that Christ was “the *image* of the invisible God”, or “the *brightness* of His glory, and the express *image* of His Person”, we realize that Ezek. xxviii. 12 contains something of an echo of these statements.

### **Wisdom and beauty.**

Following the statement already considered, the prophet continues:--

“Full of wisdom and perfect in beauty” (Ezek. xxviii. 12).

There is evidently emphasis here, for although Ezekiel contains forty-eight chapters, the words “wise” and “wisdom” occur only in chapter xxvii. and xxviii. There must therefore be something peculiar in this attitude. Of the Prince of Tyre the prophet says:--

“Behold, thou art *wiser* than Daniel . . . . with thy *wisdom* . . . . thou hast gotten thee riches . . . . by the greatness of thy *wisdom* . . . . hast thou multiplied thy riches . . . . they shall unsheath their swords over the beauty of thy *wisdom* and profane thy brightness” (Ezek. xxviii. 3-7).

So runs the record of the *Prince*. Speaking of the *King* the prophet says:--

“Full of *wisdom* and perfect in beauty . . . . . thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy *wisdom* by reason of thy brightness” (Ezek. xxviii. 12-17).

This resplendent being, as to wisdom *full*, as to beauty *perfect*, was God’s sealed standard at the time. The meaning of the words, “Thou sealest up the sum”, may be illuminated by reference to the government standard of weights and measures. Encased in materials that maintain an even temperature, and buried deep in a cool cellar, safely resting under lock and key, lies the Imperial Yard Measure. This “seals up the sum”, and to it as to a “finished pattern” all yard measures throughout the realm must conform.

### **Eden lost and restored.**

We are now taken back to Eden the garden of God. The first mention of Eden in Scripture tells of the garden which the Lord planted “eastward in Eden”. After that Genesis speaks of it as “the garden of Eden”. After Gen. iv. no mention is made of Eden until we come to Isa. li. 3, which uses Eden as a contrast with the wilderness, and the garden of the Lord in contrast with the desert. Similarly Joel uses the garden of Eden also as a symbol:--

“The land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness” (Joel ii. 3).

Ezek. xxxvi. 35 is closely parallel with Isa. li. 3. In Ezek. xxxi. and xxxii. much that is said of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, resembles the greatness, the pride and the fall of the Prince and the King of Tyre. The King of Egypt is likened to a cedar tree whose height was exalted above all the trees of the field:--

“The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him . . . . nor any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in his beauty . . . . all the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God envied him” (Ezek. xxxi. 8, 9).

These trees of Eden are further represented as being in “the nether parts of the earth”:-

“Yet shalt thou be brought down with the trees of Eden unto the nether parts of the earth” (Ezek. xxxi. 18).

This must strike the reader as a somewhat curious use of figures. If we think of Eden as described in Genesis, there is no individual that can fulfil the type set forth by these “trees”. The LXX translates the garden of Eden by the word “paradise”, which adds Rev. ii. 7 and, by analogy, Rev. xxii. to our list.

It will be seen that this paradise comes down from heaven as a part of the holy city. It appears that a paradise, a special garden of God, has a place in the first, the present and the future heavens and earth. The garden of Gen. ii. belongs to the present creation, but the Eden of Ezekiel belongs to the earlier creation. The somewhat strange references to the trees of Eden which had descended into the nether parts of the earth, and which are linked together with the proud yet punished King of Egypt, show this at least, that Eden has been the scene of rebellion and of judgment anterior to the sin of Adam. The pride and fall of the King of Tyre is connected with the garden of God.

### **The Serpent and the Cherubim.**

“Thou wast in Eden the garden of God” (Ezek. xxviii. 13).

Scripture speaks of two human beings only who were in Eden, the garden of God, namely, Adam and Eve. Apart from the Lord Himself but one other person entered that garden. Gen. iii. calls him the Serpent (Hebrew, the *nachash*, the “shining one”). A reference to Gen. iii. reveals a close connection between the Serpent and the Cherubim.

### Gen. iii.

- A | iii. 1. The Serpent. Supernatural and animal form.
- B | iii. 2-24-. The temptation, sentence and expulsion.
- A | iii. -24. The Cherubim. Supernatural and animal forms.

We have purposely left the central member without subdivision as our interest at the moment is in the Serpent and the Cherubim. There is no shadow of doubt as to the personality of the Serpent, for Rev. xx. 2 refers to him as:--

“That old Serpent, which is the Devil (N.T. Greek) and Satan” (O.T. Hebrew).

Satan a spirit, using the serpent as a medium, involved mankind in death. The cherubim, composite animal forms, yet belonging to the spirit world, pledge man’s restoration and are associated with the flaming sword that keeps the way of the tree of life. When we see, as we hope to presently, that Satan, as we can now call this King of Tyre, was originally “the anointed cherub”, the relation between the nachash and the cherubim in Gen. iii. will be more clearly seen. Before going further into the description of Satan before he sinned, it will help us to set out just what is said of him in this passage.

#### A survey of the subject.

We find statements revealing Satan’s nature, attributes and actions, interspersed with statements revealing God’s actions. The personal pronoun *thou* is emphatic:--

THOU sealest up the sum.  
THOU hast been in Eden.  
THOU wast created.  
THOU art the anointed Cherub.  
I have set thee so.  
THOU wast upon the holy mountain.  
THOU hast walked . . . . stones of fire.  
THOU was perfect in thy ways from the day that  
THOU wast created.  
THOU hast sinned.  
I will cast thee out.  
I will destroy.  
THINE heart was lifted up because of thy beauty.  
THOU hast corrupted thy wisdom.  
I will cast thee to the earth  
I will lay thee before kings.  
THOU hast defiled thy sanctuaries.  
I will bring forth a fire.  
I will bring thee to ashes.  
THOU shalt be a terror.  
Never shalt THOU be any more.

The three emphatic pronouns tell of Satan’s original condition as created by God. He was the finished pattern, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. His office was that of the

anointed cherub that covereth, till iniquity was found in him. This iniquity is explained as a trafficking and a defiling. It rendered this glorious one profane. Its origin was pride. His heart was lifted up because of his *beauty*, and his *wisdom* he corrupted by reason of his brightness. Thirteen times do we read the word “thou” in reference to Satan. Seven times we have the pronoun “I” in reference to God. Once “I have” in reference to God’s appointment of Satan as the anointed cherub. Six “I wills” in reference to God’s pronouncement in reference to Satan’s destruction. We can now return to some of the more detailed statements with less liability of missing the essential features:--

“Every precious stone was thy covering:  
The sardius, topaz and the diamond,  
The beryl, the onyx and the jasper,  
The sapphire, the emerald and the carbuncle,  
And gold” (Ezek. xxviii. 13).

Spurrell’s translation reads: “Thy covering veil was adorned with every precious stones.”

Nine precious stones, in groups of threes, are the covering of this “shining one”. It is impossible to avoid the implied connection with Aaron’s breastplate, or with the foundations of the new Jerusalem. Further, precious stones figure in the descriptions of the appearances of the Lord Himself. Ezekiel speaks of beryl, amber, crystal and sapphire stone in describing the vision of chapter i., and John says in Rev. iv. 3-6:--

“And He that sat was to look upon like a *jasper* and a *sardine stone*, and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an *emerald* . . . . and before the throne was a sea of glass like unto *crystal*.”

The nine precious stones detailed above are said to be for a “covering”. The Hebrew word *mesukah* does not occur elsewhere. The masculine form, *masak*, however, occurs twenty-five times, and twenty-two of these occurrences are found in Exodus and Numbers variously translated “hanging” (Ex. xxvi. 36), “covering” (Ex. xxxv. 12), and “curtain” (Num. iii. 26).

In the tabernacle were three “coverings” or “hangings”. There was the “hanging” of the *gate* of the court, the “hanging” of the *door* of the tabernacle, and the vail of the “covering” that divided off the Most Holy Place from the rest of the tabernacle. In each case, whether at gate, or door, or Holiest of All, there is the underlying thought of *access* or *approach*, and this illuminates Satan’s office.

In addition to this “covering” of marvelous beauty, we find reference to tabrets or timbrels and pipes made of gold:--

“In the day thou wast created were they prepared” (Ezek. xxviii. 13).

This reveals further that Satan not only held something like a priestly position before the Lord in the sense of access, but had also a close relation to the praises of heaven too, for when the Psalmist would call upon his people to praise the God of Jacob, he said:--

“Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel (tabret)” (Psa. lxxxii. 2).

In Psa. cxlix. Israel joins in the new song, and sings praises with the timbrel and harp, and Psa. cl., that magnificent call upon all creation to praise the Lord, does not omit to say, “Praise Him with the timbrel”. Something of the magnificence of heaven’s hallelujah can be felt when the whole psalm is read through, and something of the splendour and exalted position once held by Satan can be inferred.

The full title and office for which all this has been preparatory is now to be revealed.

### **The Anointed Cherub.**

“Thou wast the anointed cherub that covereth” (Ezek. xxviii. 14).

*The anointed.*—The word used here gives us the word Messiah. The priest was anointed, so also was the king. Here before his fall we behold one of the Lord’s anointed. In Christ, the Priest King after the order of Melchisedec, we see the glorious antitype. He is further called—

*The anointed cherub.*—The first time that we meet with the cherubim in Scripture they are in direct contrast with Satan as the *nachash*, the shining one, the Serpent (Gen. iii.). When the Lord chose Israel out from among the nations, that they in their history and in their worship set forth in type His great purpose with man, the cherubim were closely associated with the mercy seat, the covenant and the dwelling place of God on earth. when at length the wilderness was left behind and the promised land entered, the kingdom set up and established, then under Solomon as the prince of peace the temple was built, and there once again the cherubim were seen. This time their wings not only shadowed the mercy seat, but covered the entire width of the Most Holy Place.

Following upon the kingdom came the failure of Israel and their captivity, and Ezekiel is the prophet of the captivity. The great theme of this prophecy is the departing and the returning glory of the Lord, and vitally connected with this departing and returning glory are the cherubim. The prophet who alone reveals the fact that Satan was once the anointed cherub, is the one Old Testament writer to whom we turn for a description of those wonderful beings.

Chapter i. is occupied with the description of four living creatures, and in chapter x. is a description of the cherubim. In verse 20 Ezekiel says:--

“This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar; and I knew that they were the cherubim.”

With this assurance therefore we can turn back to the first chapter and seek to gather something from Ezekiel's description that shall help us to appreciate the high dignity and office of that one who was once called "The anointed cherub".

### **Like the Greatness.**

There is considerable difference of opinion as to the meaning of the Hebrew word *cherub*. The word never occurs as a verb. The word *rab* indicates whatever is great. "It is the formal name of magnificence or majesty and dominion", says *Marius de Calasio*. The particle *ki* indicates likeness, and suggests the emblematic character of the Cherubim, and would mean "like the greatness", or "like the majesty". If this be the meaning of the name we can understand more fully how the cherubim are connected both with Satan's sin and with God's glory.

### **Lucifer, son of the morning.**

Just as Satan is addressed under the title "King of Tyre" by Ezekiel, so he is spoken of as the "King of Babylon" by Isaiah, and just as the King of Tyre is called "The anointed cherub", so another superhuman title is used in Isa. xiv., "Lucifer (margin Day Star), son of morning". His downfall is clearly indicated in the following accusation:--

"For thou hast said in thine heart.  
I WILL ascend into heaven,  
I WILL exalt my throne above the stars of God,  
I WILL sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north,  
I WILL ascend above the heights of the clouds,  
I WILL BE LIKE THE MOST HIGH" (Isa. xiv. 12-14).

The great leader of heaven's host in the "war in heaven" is Michael. Michael in Hebrew means "Who is *like* God?" and is as it were a challenge. A blasphemous echo of this is found in Rev. xiii. 4, when the world pays homage to Satan and the beast saying, "Who is like unto the beast?" In blessed contrast with the anointed cherub of Ezek. xxviii. is the Son of God Who, as Phil. ii. 6 & 7 reveals:--

"Being originally in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a slave."

Much that is said of the Lord Jesus Christ will stand out with twofold vividness when we give full scope to the fact that He came to "*undo* the works of the Devil", and that every title He bears, every word He uttered, every manifestation of meekness or of power in death or in life had in view the undoing of the effect of Satan's sin and fall.

When Satan came to the man and woman in the garden, what was the bait of his temptation? The very self-same thing that had brought about his own wretched state—"Ye shall be as God!" When the same tempter came to Christ in the wilderness, once again he revealed his own heart and undoing. As we must devote a separate study to this phase of the subject we leave these hints for the time being.

Following the title, “the anointed cherub that covereth”, we read that God said, “and I have set thee so”. *The Companion Bible* and *Rotherham* read, “when I appointed thee, in the holy mount of God thou wast”. In either case, this honour was not appropriated by Satan, but was of Divine appointment. The usage of the word translated “set” suggests the importance of this high appointment. The following are a few instances:--

- “I do *set* my bow in the cloud” (Gen. ix. 13).
- “A father of many nations have I *made* thee” (Gen. xvii. 5).
- “And thou shalt *hang up* the vail” (Exod. xxvi. 33).
- “And I will *set* My tabernacle among you “ (Lev. xxvi. 11).

A feature in the judgment upon this fallen cherub is discovered by the use of the word in Ezek. xxviii.:--

- “Though thou SET thine heart” (verse 2).
- “Thou hast SET thine heart as the heart of God” (verse 6).
- “And I have SET thee so” (verse 14).
- “I will LAY thee before Kings” (verse 17).
- “And I will BRING thee to ashes” (verse 18).

Stones of fire could have no effect upon the anointed cherub while he remained faithful to his trust (verse 14), but when he is cast out as profane, a fire will be brought forth from his own midst which shall reduce him to ashes. Like the Prince of Tyre, all his boasting will be of no avail “in the hand of Him that slayeth him” (verse 9).

### **The holy mount of God.**

The nearness of this cherub to the Lord is seen in the words:--

- “Thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire” (Ezek. xxviii. 14).

The expression “The mountain of God” occurs seven times. So also does the expression “The mountain of the Lord”. Exod. iii. 1; iv. 27; xviii. 5; xxiv. 13; I King xix. 8; and Psa. lxxviii. 15 speak of Horeb or Sinai as the mountain of God. It will be observed that in the first and last mention in the books of Moses we have the presence of fire:--

- “The bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed” (Exod. iii. 2).
- “The sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire” (Exod. xxiv. 17).
- “Let not the priests and the people break through to come up unto the Lord, lest He break forth upon them” (Exod. xix. 24).

As smoke is driven away, so drive them away: as wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked perish at the presence of God. But let the righteous be glad . . . . The earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God, even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God . . . . the mount of God is as the mount of Bashan . . . . Thou hast ascended on high” (Psa. lxxviii. 2, 3, 8, 15, 18).

It will be seen that the mountain of God is Sinai, and that it becomes a devouring fire to all who have not Divine protection and appointment. The mountain of the Lord

however is not Sinai with its law, but Moriah and Calvary with its grace (Gen. xxii. 13, 14; Numb. x. 33; Psa. xxiv. 3; Isa. ii. 3; xxx. 29; Mic. iv. 2; Zech. viii. 3):--

“A burnt offering instead of his son . . . . in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen” (Gen. xxii. 13, 14).

“And they departed from the mount of the Lord three days’ journey; and the ark of the covenant of the Lord went before them” (Numb. x. 33).

Here Sinai, the mount of law and fire, becomes the mount of the Lord, because the ark and mercy seat and the redemption they stand for had been provided.

Psalm xxiv. can never be understood without reference to Psalms xxii. and xxiii., the *cross*, the *crook* and the *crown*. The ascension into the mount of the Lord is by reason of righteousness and resurrection. Isa. ii. 3 and Mic. iv. 2 speak of the day that is coming when the Lord reigns upon earth, and Zech. viii. 3 speaks of the blessed period of *restoration* yet to be. Isa. xxx. 29 brings the mountain of the Lord into a context of judgment on His enemies, and also of the binding up of the breach of His people. Here once again we read of “devouring fire”:

“Tophet, ordained of old for the king, . . . . the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it” (Isa. xxx. 26-33).

We have considered this feature at some length in order to get scriptural light upon the position of the anointed cherub. When Moses came to the mountain of God, as recorded in Exod. iii.:

“The angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire . . . . and God called unto him . . . .” (Exod. iii. 2; cf. Acts vii. 35).

In the last reference by Moses we read:

“They saw the God of Israel . . . . the Lord said . . . . I will give thee tables of stone” (Exod. xxiv. 10-12).

Stephen, speaking of this same period, says of Moses:

“This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in mount Sinai . . . . who have received the law by the disposition of angels” (Acts vii. 38, 53).

Again in the opening reference to the mountain of the Lord we read:

“The angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven” (Gen. xxii. 11).

The angel of the Lord is mentioned in the next reference (I Kings xix. 7, 8); and yet once more, in Psa. lxxviii., we have the passage in reference to the mountain of God of verse 15:

“The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place” (verse 17).

It appears from these various passages that angelic ministry was constantly associated with the mountain of God. In some cases it is difficult to distinguish between the angels and God Who is represented by His messengers. We believe these things reflect light upon the office which was occupied by the anointed cherub before his fall, and show the nature of the “snare” of the devil (I Tim. iii. 6). Holding this high and lofty position he at length “thought it a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God”, saying, “I will be like the Most High”. One has only to remember also how the cherubim are very closely connected with the throne of God to appreciate this the more.

### **Stones of fire.**

One further item is given regarding the anointed cherub:--

“Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire” (Ezek. xxviii. 14).

*The Companion Bible* says these words refer to facts concerning which nothing further is known. This is true, but we believe we can improve our understanding a little by consulting Ezek. i. In describing the cherubim in that chapter, Ezekiel says he saw a brightness like the colour of amber, out of the midst of fire. And out of this midst came the cherubim, and their appearance was like burning coals of fire. Then when he describes the throne which was above their heads, he speaks of the likeness of the appearance of a man above upon it, and again he says that he saw the colour of amber, as the appearance of fire round about and within it (Ezek. i. 4, 5, 13, 26, 27).

John in Rev. i. speaks of the appearance of the Lord in glory:--

“His eyes were as a flame of fire, and His feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace” (Rev. i. 14, 15).

Again in Dan. x. 6 we read a description of the heavenly messenger sent to Daniel:--

“His body was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass.”

These passages are sufficient to show the excellent glory of that one of whom it could be said, “Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire”.

### **The sin of Satan.**

“Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created” (Ezek. xxviii. 15).

The first occurrence of this expression is that of Gen. vi. 9, “Noah was a just man and *perfect* in his generation”. The last time the Hebrew word is translated “perfect” is Ezek. xxviii. 15, the passage before us. *Tamim* occurs thirteen times in Ezekiel, and is translated “without blemish” in that prophecy eleven times.

Satan as created was “without blemish”. Of creation Scripture says that God did not create it *tohu* and *bohu*, “without form and void”, but that it *became* so (Gen. i. 1, 2; Isa. xiv. 18). Of man Scripture says:--

“Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made upright; but they have sought out many inventions” (Eccles. vii. 29).

So of the anointed cherub; at his creation he was perfect, the iniquity found in him being the result of his own pride. Speaking of the Lord the Psalmist says, “there is no unrighteousness in Him” (Psa. xcii. 15). The word translated “unrighteousness” is the same word that is translated “iniquity” in Ezek. xxviii. 15. It is set over against the word “upright”:--

“To shew that the Lord is *upright*  
He is my Rock,  
And there is no unrighteousness in Him” (Psalm xcii. 15).

This shows the condition into which Satan fell. From his original uprightness he became unrighteous.

There are many words used for sin the Hebrew and the Greek, and several definitions are given. There is one element common to many—a *negation*. Light is positive, its negation is darkness. Righteousness is positive, sin is its negation:--

“All UNrighteousness is sin” (I John v. 17).  
“Sin is lawlessNESS” (I John iii. 4).  
“Whatsoever is NOT of faith is sin” (Rom. xiv. 23).

Rom. iii. 23 shows that sin “comes short”, and the Hebrew word *chata* means “to miss”. The negation of perfectness could not have been discovered in Satan until he had turned aside from the path of obedience and aspired to forbidden things. This iniquity is seen from various angles in this chapter. It is closely connected with *merchandise* (16), and *traffic* (18). It rendered the anointed cherub *profane* (16), and by it he had *defiled* his sanctuaries (18). Its origin is given in verse 17:--

“Thine heart was lifted up because of *thy beauty*, thou hast corrupted *thy wisdom* by reason of *thy brightness*.”

There is evident allusion to this passage in the words:--

“Not a novice, lest being *lifted up with pride* he fall into the condemnation of the devil” (I Tim. iii. 6).

## The Slanderer.

The question arises, in what way can Satan be said to have dealt in merchandise or traffic?

*Rekullah* (fem.), the Hebrew word, occurs four times in Ezekiel, but nowhere else in Scripture, viz., Ezek. xxvi. 12; xxviii. 5, 16, 18, where it is twice rendered “traffic” and twice “merchandise”. *Rakal* (“merchants”) is of more frequent occurrence, being used eighteen times, and always translated *merchants*. *Rakil* (masc.) occurs six times, and is translated “talebearer” thrice, “slanders” twice, and “carry tales” once.

This throws light upon the “traffic” which filled the anointed cherub with violence and defiled his sanctuaries. He became a slanderer, in other words, at this point he ceased to be the anointed cherub and became SATAN. He was not so created or appointed. The word *diabolos*, “devil” is the N.T. equivalent and means “slanderer” (see I Tim. iii. 11, also 6 and 7):--

“Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers” (*diabolos*).

This evil is indicated in I Tim. v. 13-15, where the wandering from house to house, being idle, and *tattlers*, is associated with turning aside after Satan. This traffic in slander is associated in five out of the six references with the idea of “walking” or “going about”:-

“Thou shalt not *go up and down* as a talebearer” (Lev. xix. 16).

“He that *walketh* being a talebearer” (Prov. xi. 13, margin).

“He that *goeth about* as a talebearer” (Prov. xx. 19).

“Grievous revolters, *walking* with slanders” (Jer. vi. 28).

“Every neighbour will *walk* with slanderers” (Jer. ix. 4).

It will be seen that the reference given above in I Tim. v. 13-15 associates “wandering from house to house” with the same sin. It is making a traffic of talebearing. In this connection the note on page 47 of Volume XIV is of interest. The LXX translates *Rekullah* by *emporion*, and the numerical value of that word is 666. Satan’s iniquity therefore was twofold. He was lifted up because of his beauty, and he slandered God. The same twofold iniquity is displayed in the temptation of Eden, “Ye shall be as God”, “Yea, hath God said?” The anointed cherub “walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire”. The four horsemen of Zech. i. 10, 11; vi. 7, who report to the angel of the Lord, also “walk to and fro through the earth”. When the Lord said to Satan, “Whence comest thou?” (Job i. 7), Satan replied, “From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it”. The same question and answer are found in ii. 2. In both cases they are followed by “talebearing” or “slandering” of Job. No longer able to walk up and down in the midst of stones of fire, Satan with restless activity patrols this earth “seeking whom he may devour”.

**#4. The Anointed Cherub. (Concluded).**  
**pp. 130 - 133**

**Satan's doom.**

“I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God, and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire . . . . . I will cast thee to the earth, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee. Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffic, therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. All they that know thee shall be astonished at thee, thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more” (Ezek. xxviii. 16-19).

Let us record the steps in the punishment of this fallen cherub:--

1. / I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God.  
   \ I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.
2. / I will cast thee to the earth.  
   \ I will lay thee before kings.
3. / I will bring forth a fire from the midst of thee and it shall devour thee.  
   \ I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth.
4. / Thou shalt be a terror.  
   \ Never shalt thou be any more.

The first movement deprives the anointed cherub of his glory and office. The second casts him to the earth as a spectacle to kings. The third sees him reduced to ashes by the fire brought from the midst of himself. The fourth speaks of the effect of his destruction upon others.

**Deprivation and destruction.**

The first item in Satan's punishment is that of being cast out as profane from the mountain of God. This is entirely in harmony with the principle given in I Cor. iii. 17:--

“If any man defile (or destroy) the temple of God, him shall God destroy (or defile).”

The second feature is destruction, which in this connection is much the same as profaning. As the anointed cherub he was “destroyed from the midst of the stones of fire”, by being cast out as profane. Between these two statements that deal with the reduction of the anointed cherub and the remaining statement concerning his doom come further statements concerning the causes of his fall. The remainder of the record of punishment is future:--

“I will cast thee to the earth” (Ezek. xxviii. 17).

“And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth” (Rev. xii. 9).

“I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee” (Ezek. xxviii. 17).

We know that the same word that is translated “lay” is the word translated “set” in verse 14, “I have *set* thee so”, and the poetic justice of the change will be seen.

“I will bring forth a fire from the midst of thee” (Ezek. xxviii. 18).

The fire that belonged to his exalted station, the continual accompaniment of Divine glory, that fire, when once the Divine protection is withdrawn, becomes the very instrument of his destruction, for we are not left in uncertainty regarding its effect—“it shall devour thee”, “eat thee” as the word may be rendered. “I will bring thee to ashes on the earth”. With this we may read Mal. iv. 3:--

“And ye shall tread down the wicked: for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet.”

Also we may see a reverse movement in the case of Israel. The anointed cherub is brought from *beauty to ashes*, but in the day of Israel’s restoration they shall be given *beauty for ashes*.

### **Perfection . . . . . Perdition.**

“Thou shalt be a terror” (Ezek. xxviii. 19).

The word terror is most solemn in its meaning. *Ballahah* = “a worn out or wasted thing”. Job uses *balah* when he says:--

“And he, as a rotten thing, consumeth, as a garment that is moth eaten” (Job xiii. 28).

The LXX renders the passage *apoleia egenou*, “a destruction hast thou become”. The word is the alternative to “perfection” in Hebrews. “Let us go on unto perfection . . . . not draw back unto perdition” (Heb. vi 1; x. 39). Matt. xxvi. 8 renders the word “waste” which is parallel with the Hebrew.

What an end to him who was the “perfection of beauty!” What an object lesson to the universe.

“And never shalt thou be any more” (Ezek. xxviii. 19).

The LXX rendering of this is *kai ouch huparxeis eti eis ton aiona* = “and thou shalt not exist any more for the age”, which is equivalent to the Hebrew *ed olam*. A parallel is found in Ezek. xxvi. 21:--

“A terror will I make thee, and thou shalt not be: though thou be sought for, thou shalt not be found any more for the age.”

### **Never, or unto the Age.**

How are we to understand this usage of *olam* and *aion*? Does it imply that when the age is finished that Satan will exist again? A parallel usage is found in John iv. 14; viii. 51; x. 28 and xiii. 8. Translated literally the passages read:--

“Shall in no wise thirst unto the age” (John iv. 14).

“Shall not see death unto the age” (John viii. 51).

“Shall in no wise perish unto the age” (John x. 28).

“Thou shalt not wash my feet unto the age” (John xiii. 8).

Would it be setting forth the truth to say that immunity from thirst would cease when the age ceased? That the Lord's sheep should perish at the end of the age? That Peter's meaning was that the Lord should defer washing his feet until the age had finished? We know very well that such is not the case, and to translate *ou me eis tin aiona* with an age meaning is to miss the mark. Our English negative “never” is manifestly “n'ever” or “not ever” without the least thought of ages or eternity in it. If this fallen cherub is to live again after being brought to ashes and devoted to destruction, positive testimony must be brought from Scripture to prove it, such a doctrine cannot be deduced from the use of *olam* or *aion*.

### **Satan and redemption.**

The *katabole* or overthrow of the world (Gen. i. 2) was a judgment upon sin, and that sin the sin of those who were not men. Scripture declares that the Devil sinneth from the beginning and abode not in the truth. That he fell and in his fall drew away other angels with him. His glorious position is forfeited, and we have seen that man headed by Christ is destined to take that place of rule whether in the heavenlies or on the earth. As soon as man was given dominion, Satan saw his rival and plotted his downfall. What other bait should he use than that which caused his own fall?--

“Yea, hath God said?”—the slander (traffic).

“Ye shall be as God”—the impious pride that cause his fall.

“Ye shall not surely die”—the vain hope that sustained him (see parallels in Ezek. xxviii. 9; Psa. lxxxii. 6, 7).

Just as the sin of Satan profaned his sanctuaries, so the sin of man introduced by Satan made them “ashamed”. Just as the sin of Satan cause him to be cast out of the mountain of God, so the sin of man caused him to be cast out of the garden of God. Man however had been attacked, and for him redemption was provided in the great Kinsman. Redemption assumes a vaster import when seen as a whole, and as related to man's inheritance and Satan's attack upon the purpose of the ages. While the ages last, enmity will exist between the Seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. The serpent's head shall be crushed, all the true seed of promise shall be restored, paradise shall be regained, with its river and tree of life, the former things shall pass away and God shall once again all in all.

**#5. The Cherubim, their pledge.**  
**pp. 181 – 191**

In the last paper we devoted our attention to the record of the creation, fall and destruction of one called “the anointed cherub”, who, when he was cast out as profane from the mountain of God, became the great enemy of truth, Satan. In the paper we drew attention to the fact that in Gen. iii. the serpent, Satan, the one that was once the anointed cherub, stands at the beginning of the story of the temptation, and that the cherubim stand at the close. It is our intention in this article to seek an understanding of the meaning and message of the cherubim, in order to appreciate better the goal toward which redemption moves.

The teaching connected with the cherubim must be gathered from the occasions where they are introduced, and the context of these occurrences. We have seen the holy associations that are revealed in Ezek. xxviii. and although they were profaned and the glory departed, we must remember these essential features as we take up the theme as it is associated with man and his redemption.

As we have already seen, the cherubim are mentioned in Scripture in immediate association with the temptation, sin and expulsion of Adam and Eve, and in structural correspondence with the serpent or shining one. The structure of Gen. iii. is most illuminating, showing the various features of the chapter in their right place and relationship.

**The Serpent and the Cherubim (Gen. iii.).**

A		1-5. The serpent (cf. “living creature”, verse 1). Procuring man’s downfall.	\	
			\	
B		6. Tree of knowledge.	\	
C		7. Human covering—leaves.	/	SATAN.
		D   8-13. God’s enquiry of the man and the woman.	/	
		E   14. Serpent cursed.	/	
		E   15. Seed promised.	\	
		D   16-19. God’s answer to the man and the woman.	\	
		C   21. Divine covering—skin.	\	CHRIST.
		B   22-24-. Tree of life.	/	
A		-24. The cherubim (cf. “living creature”, Ezek. i. 5; Rev. iv. 6). Pledge of man’s restoration.	/	

Let us examine this passage. We perceive that it is divided into two sections, the one dominated by the serpent, the other by Christ. The serpent, the fallen cherub, brings about the downfall of man; the cherubim placed at the door of the garden pledge his restoration. The central members place in vivid contrast the serpent under the curse and the triumphing Seed of the woman. The serpent, the Seed and the cherubim are the three great features. When we deal with the question of human sin and its connection with

redemption, we shall have to pay greater attention to the intervening sections; at present we are limiting our study to that of the cherubim.

“So He drove out the man, and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life” (Gen. iii. 24).

### **The pledge of paradise restored.**

The cherubim stand closely connected with man’s loss.

“*So He drove out the man.*”—“Drove out” (*garash*) is used for “putting away” and “divorcing” a wife in Scripture (Lev. xxi. 7-14). It is used of those who were driven out of the land forfeited and given as an inheritance to Israel (Exod. xxxiii. 2). Its use here is significant of man’s forfeiture.

“*And placed in a tabernacle.*”—The Hebrew word “placed” is *shaken*. Its most usual translation is “to dwell”. With the prefix “*m*” (*mishkan*) it occurs 138 times, and of these it is translated 119 times of the tabernacle. The first occurrence of *mishkan* reveals it to be preeminently a holy dwelling place for God:--

“And let them make Me a sanctuary; that I may dwell (*shaken*) among them. According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle (*mishkan*)” (Exod. xxv. 8, 9).

At the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden it was rendered tenantless. Man could no longer walk in happy fellowship with his maker, God could no longer walk with man without mediation and:--

“So He drove out the man, and caused to dwell as in a tabernacle at the east of the garden, the cherubim.”

From this time onward, until the forfeited paradise shall be restored, the cherubim become the visible representatives of God among men, and by their composition, which we shall examine presently, they became the pledge of his restoration. When that restoration is complete, then shall the tabernacle of God be with men, and He will dwell with them, and then shall access once more be given to the tree of life (Rev. xxi. 3; and xxii. 1-5).

“And a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.”

Psalm. civ. 4 tells us that the Lord’s ministers are a “flaming fire”, and nothing can endure the withering destruction of this flaming sword, Joel ii. 3; and Psa. xcvi. 3. Here together with the cherubim we have a flaming sword.

It does not seem possible to see, unmoved, the simple testimony of the concordance, namely, that the first reference to the sword in the O.T. is that of Gen. iii. 24, and the last that of Zech. xiii. 7:--

“Awake, O sword, against my shepherd.”

This flaming sword was placed at the east of the garden of Eden with the express purpose:--

“To keep the way of the tree of life.”

To Adam the Lord gave the commission when he was placed in the garden of Eden:--

“To dress it and to KEEP it” (Gen. ii. 15).

The word means much more than to keep in order as a gardener does a garden, as may be seen from the usage of the word *shamar*:--

“Except the Lord keep (*shamar*) the city, the watchman (*shamar*) waketh but in vain” (Psa. cxxvii. 1).

“He put them in *ward*” (*shamar*) (Gen. xl. 3).

“I will stand upon *my watch*” (*shamar*) (Hab. ii. 1).

Adam failed in his charge. He did not watch, guard and keep the garden. No second opportunity is given to man, the keeping of the way of the tree of life is committed to the cherubim and the flaming sword, and they fail not, for they speak not of Adam but of Christ.

### **The basis of paradise restored.**

The next reference to the cherubim is found in Exod. xxv. 18; this time not in a tabernacle in the garden of Eden, but in a tabernacle in the wilderness. Much has transpired since Gen. iii. Satan so corrupted the way of God that nothing less than a deluge was necessary to destroy his handiwork, and after the flood the unclean usurpation of Messianic promises that is summed up in the system of Babel led to the setting aside of the nations (Rom. i. 18-32), and the choice of Abraham of one nation (Gen. xii.), whose peculiar prerogative was to be the tabernacle and the cherubim with all their associated privileges:--

“And thou shalt make two cherubim of gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy seat . . . . and the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat . . . . thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark, and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee, and there will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee” (Exod. xxv. 18-22).

The great feature of this second reference to the cherubim is the strongly expressed association with the mercy seat. The mercy seat in its turn demanded the ark, and not until the ark was beneath and the mercy seat above with covering cherub over all, could

God commune with Moses as a man speaks with his friend. It speaks once more of paradise restored.

Heb. ix. 4 and 5 gives a detailed statement that must not be ignored:--

1. The ark of the covenant, which contained:--
2. The golden pot that had manna.—Wilderness promises.
3. Aaron's rod that budded.—Christ's undying priesthood.
4. The tables of the covenant.—The unbroken law.
5. The mercy seat.—The propitiatory.
6. Shadowed by the cherubim.—The pledge of restoration.

It is most important to observe that the cherubim were not placed separately upon the mercy seat, but as the A.V. margin shows, they were made “of the matter of the mercy seat”.

The covering cherub of Ezek. xxviii., though perfect at his creation, stood upon the basis of creaturehood, which could not guarantee indefectibility. These cherubim and all that they stand for not only rest upon, but are part of, the mercy seat. Such shall never be cast out as profane from their sanctuaries, and the restoration they pledge is therefore secure.

### The Mercy Seat.

The Hebrew word translated “mercy seat” is *kapporeth*, which is the feminine form of *kopher*, variously translated “ransom” and “satisfaction”. It is very suggestive that the first occurrence of the word is associated with an ark other than that made by Moses, namely, that of Noah (Gen. vi. 14). There the word *kopher* is rendered “pitch”. The pitch was essential if the floods of divine wrath were to be kept out of the ark, and therefore in its context “pitch”, though black, is a precious figure of atonement. Similarly *kophar*, “thou shalt pitch it”, is the word that is rendered over and over by “atonement”. Other renderings are “be merciful”, “reconcile”.

There are some who have spoken of the idea of atonement as being an inadequate representation of the work of Christ, inasmuch as the underlying idea of the word is a “covering”, the argument being that the typical sacrifices only “covered” sin, whereas the offering of Christ “put it away”. Now the Hebrew *kapporeth*, mercy seat, is rendered by the LXX *hilasterion*, and the Hebrew word *kaphar*, “to make atonement”, by *exilaskomai* and *hilaskomai* in a great many passages. Both the words *hilasterion* and *hilaskomai* are used in the epistle to the Hebrews, and *hilasterion* in Romans, of the great sacrifice of the Lord Jesus:--

“Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people” (Heb. ii. 17).

“The cherubim of glory shadowing the *mercy seat*” (Heb. ix. 5).

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood” (Rom. iii. 25).

It is very clear from this Scriptural use of the word that the O.T. atonement is a very full and precious type of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus. Upon this great work accomplished by the Saviour, and essentially connected with it, is the purpose of restoration, pledged by the golden cherubim. The way of the tree of life was guarded by the flaming sword in the garden of Eden; here in the tabernacle in the wilderness the way of the tree of life was guarded by “the veil”, which Heb. x. 29 says was “His flesh”.

The word cherubim occurs in Exodus and Numbers, and in this plural form it is found 14 times.

### **The kingdom of peace; the type.**

The next place where the cherubim are found is in the temple built by Solomon, recorded in I & II Kings. There once more we find the word occurring 14 times. David himself was not allowed to build the house of God because he had been a man of blood, but Solomon, whose name means peace, was commissioned to do so. That kingdom, first subdued and governed by David and subsequently by Solomon, was a wondrous picture of the future reign of the great Prince of Peace. When the temple was completed, Solomon assembled all the elders of Israel and the leaders of the people that they might bring up the ark of the covenant:--

“And the priests brought in the ark of the covenant of the Lord unto His place, into the oracle of the house, to the most holy place, even under the wings of the cherubim” (I Kings viii. 6).

Then follows the dedication, blessing and prayer. Practically central in that truly marvelous prayer comes the great thought of God “dwelling” with His people:--

“But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee; how much less this house that I have builded?” (I Kings viii. 27).

The cherubim made for Solomon’s temple were not of gold, neither did they form part of the mercy seat, but they were made of olive wood overlaid with gold, and their outstretched wings touched either side of the holiest of all. Just as the cherubim were worked in embroidery upon the veil and hangings of the tabernacle, so were they carved upon the walls and doors of the temple. The great feature in the temple type appears to have been that of a “dwelling place”. The only references outside the description given in I Kings vi.-viii. which occur in the history of the temple speak of this one thing:--

“God . . . . Which dwellest between the cherubim” (II Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16).

“Thou that dwellest between the cherubim” (Psa. lxxx. 1).

“He sitteth between the cherubim” (Psa. xcix. 1).

Yet after all, this is just what we found in the record of the tabernacle.

## **Jehovah Shammah.**

Our next enquiry takes us beyond the kingdom into the period of captivity. Babylon, the seat of the Satanic opposition for the time, becomes dominant. The dwelling place of God is once more defiled and removed, and it is to Ezekiel in the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity that the heavens were opened and visions of God were given by the river Chebar. Before looking at the record of his visions in chapter i. we will settle the question as to the identity of these "living creatures" by turning to chapter x.:-

"This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river Chebar: and I knew that they were the cherubim" (Ezek. x. 20).

We can therefore return to the investigation of chapter i. with the consciousness that the mighty beings there described are the cherubim, the subjects of our study. The vision opens with a whirlwind coming out of the north, a great cloud and a fire unfolding itself, and a brightness about it in glory like to amber or molten metal. From the midst of the fire came the likeness of four living creatures. These creatures were composite, being like a man, yet having four faces, four wings, and feet like those of a calf:--

"As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion on the right side, and they four had the face of an ox on the left side: they four also had the face of an eagle" (Ezek. i. 10).

As for their likeness, the prophet could only say that their appearance was like burning coals of fire, like the appearance of lamps, and that from the fire went forth lightning. Then follows a description of wheels, rings high and dreadful and full of eyes, and further we are told that the spirit of the living creatures was in the wheels. We do not pretend to understand the import of these terrific accompaniments. They impress us with wonder and with power superhuman. Yet after all these wondrous beings are but the supporters of the throne of God. Above their heads the expanse was stretched in colour like the terrible crystal:--

"And above the expanse that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone, and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it . . . . as the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord" (Ezek. i. 26-28).

The most important fact for us at the moment is the association of the cherubim with the "glory of the Lord". The prophet being taken up by the spirit, and hearing the noise of the wings and the wheels of the living creatures, also hears the words "Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place" (Ezek. iii. 12). Ginsburg thinks *be rum* (arose) should be read here instead of *baruk* (blessed). "(When) the glory of the Lord arose from its place", i.e., when the vision was withdrawn (*see Companion Bible*). In chapter iii. 23 the fact is repeated:--

"And, behold, the glory of the Lord stood there, as the glory which I saw by the river of Chebar."

This statement is repeated in viii. 4 with the alteration, “in the plain”, for the words “by the river of Chebar”. The prophecy of Ezekiel, involved as it appears, upon close examination is simple as to its main plan and theme. He shows us in association with the cherubim the departing and returning glory of the Lord from the city and temple of Jerusalem. Let us mark the progress both of the retiring and the returning glory of the Lord:--

“And the glory of the God of Israel was gone up from the cherubim, whereupon he was, to the threshold of the house” (Ezek. ix. 3).

“Then the glory of the Lord went up from the cherubim, and stood over the threshold of the house” (Ezek. x. 4).

“Then the glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold of the house, and stood over the cherubim. And the cherubim lifted up their wings, and they mounted up from the earth in my sight; when they went out, the wheels were also beside them, and every one stood at the door of the east gate of the Lord’s house; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above” (Ezek. x. 18, 19).

“And the glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city, and stood upon the mountain which is at the east side of the city” (Ezek. xi. 23).

The glory of the Lord is here seen departing from the temple first of the threshold, then to the east gate, then to the mountain on the east side of the city. From this point onward for thirty chapters the prophet by signs (xii. 11), symbols (xiii. 10), riddles, parables (xvii. 2), proverbs (xviii. 1, 2), lamentations (xix. 1), which are repeated in subsequent chapters, together with denunciations against the nations, the great lamentation over the anointed cherub, and judgments against Egypt and other types of the evil one, unfolds the causes of the departing glory and the promises and means that must bring about the restoration.

From chapter xxxvi. the restoration of Israel begins to dawn. The valley of dry bones (Ezek. xxxvii.) will be remembered, and the two sticks joined together in that same chapter. Chapters xl.-xlii. are occupied with a description of a temple, and when that description is completed, then do we get the cherubim and the returning glory:--

“Afterward he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looked toward the east (note the eagerness of the prophet). And, behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east: and His voice was like a noise of many waters: and the earth shined with His glory. And it was according to the appearance of the vision which I saw when I came to destroy the city . . . . and the glory of the Lord came into the house by way of the gate whose prospect is towards the east” (Ezek. xliii. 1-4).

Here we have the beginning of restoration. If we are right in our thought that the cherubim and the glory are intimately connected with the idea of a dwelling place, here is the occasion to test it. What are the words that shall be spoken to Ezekiel from this returning glory?

“And He said unto me, Son of man, the place of My throne, and the place of the soles of My feet WHERE I WILL DWELL in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and

My holy name shall the house of Israel no more defile.” “I will DWELL in the midst of them” (Ezek. xliii. 7 and 9).

It should be noted that the word “dwell” in these verses is the translation of the Hebrew word *shaken*, “to dwell as in a tabernacle”. The last reference to the glory is found in Ezek. xlv. 4:--

“Then brought he me the way of the north gate before the house: and I looked, and, behold, the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord: and I fell upon my face.”

After the inheritance of the tribes has been appointed and the city described, we arrive at the concluding verse of the prophecy:--

“And the name of the city from that day shall be *Jehovah Shammah*, The Lord is there” (Ezek. xlviii. 35).

Here is the place where He will dwell, paradise shall have been restored (*see* Ezek. xlvii. 1-12 for the river and the trees), and the whole earth shall be filled with His glory.

### **Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men.**

We read no more of the cherubim in the O.T. The only reference to them by name in the N.T. is that of Heb. ix. 5. Yet there are two sections of the N.T. where we may see the cherubim and the reality for which they stand. The most obvious occurrences are of course those in the book of the Revelation. It is somewhat misleading to the average reader to find that John saw round about the throne in heaven four *beasts*, particularly as there is mentioned more than 30 times “the beast” whose number is 666 and whose career is one of blasphemy.

*Therion* is correctly rendered “beast”, but *zoon* should be translated “living creature”. The moment we thus translate the word we have a link with Ezek. i. and x., where the “four living creatures” (Ezek. i. 5) there described are declared to be the cherubim (Ezek. x. 20). Turning to Rev. iv. we are immediately in a setting parallel with that of Ezek. i. We have a throne, and the One who sits thereon is like a jasper and a sardine stone. Around the throne is a rainbow like an emerald. Four and twenty thrones encircled the great throne occupied by four and twenty elders, clothed in white and crowned with golden crowns. Lightnings, thunderings, voices proceeded out of the throne, and seven lamps of fire burn before it, which are the seven spirits of God. A sea of glass like to crystal stretches out before the throne, and round about the throne were four living creatures full of eyes before and behind:--

“The first living creature was like a lion, the second like a calf, the third had a face as a man, and the fourth was like a flying eagle” (Rev. iv. 7).

There is no possibility of mistaking their identity. When these four living ones gave glory and honour and thanks to Him that sat upon the throne, the four and twenty elders says:--

“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).

The words “all things” are a translation of *ta panta*. Our belief is that this expression refers to some specific creation and purpose and is not universal. This however we do not attempt to prove here, as we wish all to have the opportunity of testing the subject for themselves. The first thing therefore with which the cherubim are associated in the Apocalypse is adoration and praise for the accomplishment of the purpose of the creation of the all things.

We next find them with harps and golden vases of incense leading the praises of heaven in the new song, which celebrates the worthiness of the Redeemer, the redemption of the kingdom of priests (see the original covenant made at Sinai, Exod. xix. 6). Ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands take up the strain, “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain” (Rev. v. 12). This is echoed by “every creature” in heaven, earth, under the earth and in the sea, and finally confirmed with the united “Amen” of the four living creatures and the worship of the four and twenty elders. What an absolute contrast this whole-hearted worship and praise is, to that profanity that caused the downfall of the original covering cherub (Ezek. xxviii.)!

Without going into all the details, it will be perhaps more helpful if we see at a glance the way in which the four living creatures are introduced into the book of the Revelation.

- A | Rev. iv. “Glory, honour and thanks to Him that sat on the throne.”  
“Thou hast created the all things for Thy pleasure.”
- B | Rev. v. Vials of incense. Thou art worthy.  
Kingdom of priests. Every creature.
- C | Rev. vi. The seals opened.  
Rev. vii. The sealing of the 144,000.  
Rev. xiv. The new song of the 144,000.
- B | Rev. xv. Vials of wrath. They are worthy.  
The kingdom of the beasts.
- A | Rev. xix. Alleluia. Worship Him that sat on the throne.

### **Babylon destroyed.**

It will be perceived that the above has all the elements of correspondence, which we so often find underlying the arrangement of any particular theme, with the exception of one section. It opens and closes with the two great themes of the book. The triumph of the mystery of godliness, the overthrow of the mystery of iniquity. The vials of incense,

relating to the one mystery, are balanced by the vials of wrath which relate to the other, while centrally we have the seals and the sealed ones.

- A | iv. Worship. The purpose of the creation of the all things.
- B | v. Vials of incense. Thou art worthy.
- C | vi. The seals opened.
  - vii. The 144,000 sealed; the great multitude.
  - xiv. The 144,000; the new song.
- B | xv. Vials of wrath. They are worthy.
- A | xix. Worship. Babylon destroyed.

It only remains to draw attention to the fact that while the occurrences of the word *zoon* do not make a multiple of seven, there are seven separate occasions in the Revelation where the living creatures appear, neither more nor less, thus bringing the N.T. references into line with those of the tabernacle and the temple, which are in sets of 14. There is no need for us to go over the well-known ground as to the complete answer which Revelation gives to the beginning of sorrows in Genesis. Happy are we in the knowledge that this consummation shall be.

*(To be continued).*

## **Studies in the Book of the Revelation.**

### **#59. Rev. xx. 5-15.**

#### **The First Resurrection and the Second Death (xx. 5, 6). pp. 33 - 37**

How are we to understand the words “the first resurrection”? If it means the first of all that shall take place, then the resurrection of the church of the One Body must take place later. The statement of verse 5 has a bearing, for there we read:--

“But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.”

According to the teaching of Rev. xx. the resurrection that follows the “first” is that which brings all “the rest” before the great white throne. This increases the difficulty, for not only is the hope of the One Body involved, but the resurrection of I Cor. xv. and I Thess. iv. also. In Rev. xx. 1 we have these words:--

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away.”

Here we have the same word “first” used in xx. 5 and xxi. 1. Now we are already acquainted with the teaching of II Pet. iii. 4-13, where we find a distinct reference to a third heaven and earth:--

- (1). “The world that then was.”
- (2). “The heavens and the earth which are now.”
- (3). “A new heavens and a new earth.”

It will be noticed also that Peter’s argument goes back to “the beginning of the creation”, and so to Gen. i. 1. It is evident therefore that the heaven and earth which passed away in Rev. xxi. 1 is really the second, namely, “the heavens and earth which are now”, and the word “first” is in contrast with the word “new” and should be translated “the former”. This same meaning is intended in Rev. xx. 5:--

“This is the former resurrection (of the two under notice).”

#### **The Second Death and the Overcomer.**

These two resurrections have one thing in common, they are both connected with the second death. To the overcomer in Smyrna came the words:--

“Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life . . . . he that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death” (Rev. ii. 10, 11).

This overcomer is numbered among those whose part is in the “first resurrection”; for them the second death holds no terror:--

“Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power” (Rev. xx. 6).

Looking back again to Rev. ii. we observe the title of the Lord when He speaks to the angel of the church in Smyrna:--

“These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive” (Rev. ii. 8).

Most, if not all, the titles of the speaker to the seven churches are found together in the description given in chapter i. This can be seen by comparing the opening words to each church in chapter ii. and iii. with the description given in chapter i. The title with which we are immediately concerned is evidently taken from Rev. i., 17, 18:--

“Fear not, I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for the ages of the ages, and have the keys of death and of Hades.”

### **The Nature of Death.**

These statements throw light upon the character of the second death. According to our understanding of the first death will be our understanding of the second. The traditional view is that while the body turns to dust, the soul, or the person himself, passes on in an unclothed state, either to the immediate presence of the Lord, to Paradise, or the Purgatory. For ourselves we believe that the dead *are dead*. The body has returned to the dust as it was, the spirit has returned to God who gave it, the man has ceased to be a living soul, and knows nothing until resurrection.

If we take the view that death is not the cessation of consciousness or of mental and spiritual activity, we shall probably believe that the same may be true of the second death, and invest that second death with all the traditional horrors of the orthodox “hell”; if we believe that death is the end of all conscious being, we shall believe that the second death likewise is the end of all conscious being too. It does not follow that the second death will be exactly similar to the first, but it cannot be totally dissimilar, for that would invalidate the idea contained in the word “second”. For example, the Lord Jesus Christ is called “the second Man” (I Cor. xv. 47).

### **The relation of the First Death to the Second.**

In some aspects He is much unlike the first man, as the context elaborates. The one is natural; the other is spiritual. The one is earthy; the other is heavenly. The one is simply man; the other, while being the second Man, is the Lord. There is however no violence done to the conception of a series. There is an advance from earthly to heavenly, from soul to spirit, but throughout all the change and progression the one word “man” remains constant, whether spoken of Adam or of Christ. So in Heb. viii. 7 there is the “first

covenant” and the “second”. They have marked differences, as far apart as law is from grace, but they remain “covenants” all the way through.

So with the “second death”. However much more intense the destructive qualities of the lake of fire may be than the dissolution of body and spirit, commonly known as death, the character of death will remain constant right through. We find from I Cor. xv. 18 the character of the first death set forth by an extreme case:--

“Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PEERISHED.”

What makes the death even of the redeemed so utter and hopeless? The denial of the resurrection. Without resurrection the death even of the saint would mean hopeless annihilation. Is there a resurrection from the second death? Not a glimmer of hope can be found at the end of Rev. xx. Nowhere throughout the pages of Scripture is such a statement to be found. Some there are who see such a hope in I Cor. xv. 26, but this we cannot agree. Our reasons have been set forth in fair detail in the new volume *The Apostle of the Reconciliation*, and have been given further consideration in another series both in *The Berean Expositor* and in pamphlet form. There will be opportunity and occasion to speak more fully of the second death when we reach the closing verses of Rev. xx. in the order of exposition. We are at present more concerned with the overcomer of the second death than with those who pass into it.

We are told that the second death hath no power on those who attain to the first resurrection. The word “power” is a translation of *exousia*, and means authority. We shall find the origin of this statement in Luke xii. 4, 5:--

“Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear. Fear Him, which after He hath killed hath *authority* to cast into Gehenna; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him.”

The first death “kills the body”, and its authority ceases at that point. God can go further. Matt. x. 28 records the Lord’s utterance, and uses slightly different words to do so:--

“Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him Who is able *to destroy both soul and body* in Gehenna.”

If the Lord spoke in Aramaic to the people, then both Luke and Matthew together provide a full translation. Luke’s words “to cast into Gehenna”, become in Matthew’s record “to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna”. Gehenna is limited in its scope, but is a foreshadowing of the lake of fire at the end.

The second death has this authority. It is so constituted by the Lord that it can destroy both soul and body. Apart from philosophy altogether, it is obvious that the destruction of soul and body is to all intents and purposes annihilation. Such will cease to be. Who they are and why they pass under this dread authority we leave until we reach the passage in Rev. xx. All those who attain the *first* resurrection are free from all fear of the second

death. It is not so with those who wait until the second resurrection. Some of those do enter into the second death.

### **The reign of the Overcomers.**

The reign of these favoured ones is the reign of priests. Both on earth and in the heavens “over the earth” (Rev. v. 10) there will be a royal priesthood. The nation of Israel on earth; the overcomers over the earth; and under their dual ministry the nations are taught the truth of God, and many will pass from darkness to light.

The apostle Paul, in Rom. xv. 16, speaks of his ministry to the Gentiles as a priestly work: “that the offering up of the Gentiles might be accepted.” If Paul’s ministry among the Gentiles, as set forth in the Acts, is any foreshadowing of the priestly ministry of the royal priesthood during the thousand years, the blessedness of that millennial rule cannot be described in words. We can only look forward with high hope and anticipation. But, like as it was in the case of Paul, so will it be again. While an unnumbered host are saved, apostasy and revolt follow hard upon the close of the period. Perfection comes under the personal administration of Christ. The millennial reign is the final preparation for the working out of the great commission.

### **Satan’s Last Act (xx. 7-10). pp. 37 - 42**

When the thousand years have run their course, Satan is let loose out of his prison. Rev. xx. 3 has already told us that “he must be loosed a little season”; here we see the purpose. We must notice carefully what the Scriptures actually say here. We must not make a mistake and speak of the nations as a whole. The nations that yield to Satan’s last deception and perish at the hand of God are specified:--

“And when the thousand years expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea.”

During the priestly rule of Israel and the overcomers many nations shall be joined to the Lord, as prophecy testifies. The nations who are deceived by Satan at the close of the millennium are found in the four corners of the earth as far away as can be from God’s holy city and centre. Their name is given as Gog and Magog. This will not be the first time that Gog and Magog have threatened the land and people of Israel.

In Exek. xxxviii. and xxxix. we read of a gathering of nations under Gog of the land of Magog. Just who Gog and Magog may be is a very difficult problem to solve. It is usual to interpret them as general names of the northern nations of Europe and Asia. This may be true, but is not by any means all the truth or the most important aspect of it. We are not concerned as to whether these nations originally occupied the north, for after the

millennium they will be upon the outskirts of the earth at all points of the compass. We are much concerned with their relation to Israel and the purpose of God.

### **The Seed of the Serpent.**

Israel's first entry into the land of promise was accompanied by conflict with the Canaanites. These nations were of such a nature that nothing less than *utter extinction* was decreed against them. In Deut. iii. 1-13 we read of Og, king of Bashan. We read that only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of the giants, and his bedstead was nine cubits long and four cubits broad. The threescore cities mentioned in verse 4 have all been seen and counted in our own time. That the rendering "giants" is the true one, any reader of Dr. Porter's *Giant Cities of Bashan* will agree. In Numb. xxiv. 7 Balaam refers to Israel's ascendancy in the millennium:--

"And his king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted."

The Samaritan Text here reads "Agog" instead of Agag, and this appears to have been the word before the translators of the LXX, for they give "Gog". These sidelights give a somewhat different character to the nations that spring into open revolt at the end of the thousand years. Is there not sufficient history recorded in the Word to show that certain nations are to be reckoned peculiarly the Devil's own? Was Og, king of Bashan, not "of his father the Devil"? Do we credit the Lord with the responsibility of the creation of the Rephaim, the Nephilim, the giants and monsters of antiquity? Did not God give an exhibition of His utter abhorrence of the result of the marriages of the sons of God with the daughters of men, by sending the flood? Does not the order for the utter extermination of the Amorites, the Amalekites and the Canaanites generally point to the same thing? Does not Goliath of Gath typify the same awful and Satanic enemy?

When Satan goes out to the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, he goes out to *his own*. They rise as one man and compass the camp of the saints about and the beloved city. Their destruction is immediate and without remedy:--

"Fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them" (Rev. xx. 9).

In chapter xix., the armies led by the beast and the false prophet are slain by the Lord, and their flesh is afterwards devoured by the fowls of the heavens. Here the fire from God not only kills but devours, nothing is left for the birds of the air.

We do not believe Gog and Magog will stand before the great white throne. The fire which falls from heaven is for them the second death. Of such Psa. i. 5 speaks:--

"The ungodly shall not stand (or rise) in the judgment."

### **Israel's oppressors remembered.**

When Israel's day comes, and they sing their millennial song of triumph (Isa. xxvi. 1), they will look back upon the days when the seed of the serpent had dominion over them. Of such they say:--

“They are dead, they shall not live; they are the Rephaim (giants), they shall not rise; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and made their memory to perish” (Isa. xxvi. 14).

So will it be with Gog and Magog at the end of the millennium. The conflict of the two seeds, “the seed of the woman” and “the seed of the serpent”, runs throughout the Scriptures and the entire course of the ages. The seed of promise triumph in Christ their great kinsman redeemer. The seed of the serpent perish utterly and completely, so much so that they have no resurrection. Here in Rev. xx. 9 we see another section of them “visited and destroyed”. It is God's intention to gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and the new heavens and new earth can only be ushered in by the fire of Rev. xx. 14, 15.

Not only will Israel remember their oppressors in the day of their exaltation, they will also be very sensibly reminded of their past sins.

### **Israel's sins remembered.**

This may be seen by reading the closing verses of Ezek. xvi. We cannot quote at length, but give the last verse:--

“That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God” (Ezek. xvi. 63).

Another suggestive passage is Ezek. xlv. 9-14, where we find certain of the Levites who went into idolatry are not permitted to exercise their office in full, but are made servants at the gate, not being permitted to come near unto the Lord. This particular honour is reserved for the sons of Zadok. These are rewarded for their fidelity, they

“kept the charge of My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me” (Ezek. xlv. 15).

It is evident from this distinction that the element of reward and loss obtain in the millennial kingdom. This is further exemplified in Ezek. xlviii., when compared the 144,000 sealed overcomers, but they do not lose their place in the earthly apportionment of the kingdom which is theirs by covenant, not by merit, for the tribe of Dan is mentioned in Ezek. xlviii. 1.

## Reward and Loss in Millennium.

The question of reward or forfeiture in the Gospels and Epistles has much to do with position and glory in this kingdom. Those being found faithful in small things are rewarded by being made responsible for great ones. Those who hid their talent in the earth are deprived of glory in the Lord's presence.

Returning to Rev. xx., we take notice of one further item. We have seen Satan loosed, and the nations that were deceived suddenly devoured by fire. We now notice what is said of Satan himself:--

“And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for the ages of the ages” (Rev. xx. 10).

The expression “for the ages of the ages”, *eis tous aionas ton aionon*, occurs in the Book of the Revelation 13 times, and is distributed as follows:--

### “For the ages of the ages.”

- A | i. 6. The kingdom of priests ascribe glory and dominion to Christ.
- B | i. 18. Christ. Living for the ages of the ages.
- C | Worshippers of God (fourfold).
  - a1 | iv. 9. The living creatures.
  - b1 | iv. 10. The twenty-four elders.
  - a1 | v. 13. Every creature.
  - b1 | vii. 12. All the angels.
- A | x. 6. The mighty angel. The mystery of God finished.
- B1 | xi. 15. He shall reign.
- C | Worshippers of Satan (fourfold).
  - a2 | xiv. 11. Smoke of torment.
  - b2 | xv. 7. The seven angels.
  - a2 | xix. 3. Smoke of torment.
  - b2 | xx. 10. The Devil, Beast and False Prophet.
- B2 | xxii. 5. They shall reign.

The passages which are specially connected with our present subject are the two groups of four, lettered C, C. In the first set we have all creation, including the four living creatures, the twenty-four elders, and all the angels joining in praise to God and to the Lamb. It is important to notice the universality of the scope of v. 13. What words can convey to us the sense of the universal better than these?

“And every creature  
which is in heaven  
and on earth  
and under the earth  
and in the sea  
and all that are in them.”

Yet the worshippers of the beast, together with Satan, the beast and the false prophet themselves must be excepted, otherwise we introduce discord into Scripture. This should be remembered when we are tempted to make universal application of the “all’s” and “every’s” of Scripture. In the case of those who worship the beast, and of Babylon itself, we read:--

“The smoke of their (or her) torment ascendeth up (or rose up) for the ages of the ages.”

The ages of the ages is the great converging point of all time. There the smoke ceases to ascend, there every enemy is subjected, there the reign of the saints reaches its goal, there in fact the Son Himself shall vacate His mediatorial throne, and having accomplished the purpose of the ages He shall:--

“Deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father . . . . . that God may be all in all”  
(I Cor. xv. 24-28).

In Ezek. xxviii. 11-19, which we understand to speak of Satan, we read that God says:--

“Therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, and it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee”  
(Ezek. xxviii. 18).

Thus ends the awful conflict of the ages. The thought of this torment and destruction is a terrible one, yet He Who measures the guilt by the gift of His Son is righteous in His vengeance, for perfect love must also know perfect hatred, otherwise it would be for ever one-sided unreal.

**The Great White Throne. The Books and the Book (xx. 11-15).  
pp. 42 - 48**

At the opening of the sixth seal great convulsions took place, causing the sun to become black, the moon to be like blood, the stars to fall, the heaven to be parted asunder as a scroll rolling itself up, and every mountain and island to be moved out of their places. Thus was ushered in the day of wrath, foretold in Isa. xiii. 6-13; xxxiv. 1-5; Hag. ii. 6, 7, 21, 22; and Matt. xxiv. 35. We now have brought before us a more terrific movement. Not merely do the heavens part asunder and the mountains move, but John says:--

“And I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from Whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them” (Rev. xx. 11).

“No place” seems to signify more than the mere idea of “room” or “position”; it seems to indicate that the heavens and the earth that Peter said “are now” have accomplished their purpose. This idea may be seen in such a passage as Heb. viii. 7:--

“For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should *no place* have been sought for a second.”

Or again, Heb. xii. 7:--

“For he found *no place* of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.”

In neither of these passages does “place” bear the idea of physical or material locality, and the same applies to Rev. xx. 11.

### **Satan’s rebellion and the present Creation.**

The heavens and the earth that are now will have run their appointed course by the time that the great white throne has been set up. They began as a result of Satan’s first rebellion, suggested though not stated in Gen. i. 2 when the first earth perished in the water. They will end when Satan’s last rebellion has come to its inglorious close, and not with a flood of water but with a lake of fire:--

“By the word of God . . . . the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word laid up in store, kept for fire for the day of judgment and destruction of impious men . . . . in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with a fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up” (II Pet. iii. 5-10).

In spite therefore of the words of a great commentator on Rev. xx. 11, “To seek a *literal* sense in such a passage would be quite a superfluous undertaking”, we believe that we have here as literal a cosmic movement as in Gen. i. 2, the Deluge, the terrors of Sinai, or the rending rocks and opened tombs at the crucifixion of the Saviour:--

“And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God” (Rev. xx. 12).

Unless one had actually heard it denied, it would hardly seem necessary to say that “the dead” who thus stand before this throne are raised and living again.

### **The rest of the Dead.**

There are two items in this very chapter that necessitate the resurrection of all those that were not raised at the commencement of the millennium.

- (1). *The First Resurrection*.—We observed earlier that the word “first” means “former”, “the former of two”, and implies a second or later resurrection to follow.
- (2). *The rest of the dead lived not again until* . . . .—“Lived not again until” necessarily means that when the limit set by the word “until” has been reached, those others called “the rest” shall “lived again”.

This company called “the rest of the dead” are included in I Cor. xv. 22, 23:--

“For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, but every man in his own order.”

It is obvious that these died “in Adam” and consequently must be “made alive”. The second death lies beyond the sphere of Adam and no promise of resurrection or life is made to any who come under its dread dominion.

The revised text reads “stand before the *throne*” instead of “before God” in Rev. xx. 12, and this reading is followed by J.N.D., Rotherham, Companion Bible, as well as the R.V. We know from other Scriptures that “He Who sits on that throne” is none other than Christ:--

“For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father” (John v. 22, 23).

“Because He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained” (Acts xvii. 31).

It is important to notice the character of this judgment. The word “sin” is not mentioned. This is covered by the death of Christ. Sin entered the world by one man, Adam. It involved all in its consequence—death. But the Scriptures as emphatically affirm that there is a perfect parallel between Adam and Christ, and that:--

“As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto a justification of life” (Rom. v. 18).

If any should object to our words “a perfect parallel” we will agree that the parallel is not perfect, that throughout Paul’s argument in Rom. v. the grace of God in Christ is “not as it was by one that sinned”, but that continually we must say when speaking of the grace of God “much more”. For Christ not only died for “sin”, but in the case of all those who received the abundance of grace, He shed His blood on account of “sins” also, and consequently “no condemnation” can be theirs. This is not the case with “the rest of the dead”. The “sin” that was theirs in common with “all in Adam” has been put away, and the death that ensued has been revoked. There is for them a “justification of life”. These however never knew the forgiveness of “sins” (is there a passage anywhere in the N.T. that speaks of the forgiveness of “sin”?) and they are here found standing before the throne to hear the judgment of God concerning their works.

### **The Books and the Book.**

Our attention is most particularly drawn to the presence of two sets of books which are to be opened at this great judgment:--

“And the BOOKS were opened: And ANOTHER BOOK was opened which is the book of LIFE. And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, *according to their works*” (Rev. xx. 12).

Whoever undertakes to interpret this passage ignoring this most important distinction, thereby stamps himself as an untrustworthy expositor. Judgment is out of the *books*, not out of the *book*. The judgment of the great white throne is a judgment upon “works”. Further there is no word “wrath” in the record of this solemn judgment. The vials of wrath poured out by the seven angels completed the wrath of God. This is the testimony of Scripture, and J.N.D. thus translates Rev. xv. 1, “For in them the fury of God is completed”. Rotherham reads “ended”, the R.V “finished”. It is not for us to theorize, but it is for us to adhere faithfully to the word of truth. There are two words rendered “wrath” in Revelation, *thumos* and *orge*, and they both terminate with the conclusion of the seven vials. The last reference to *thumos* is Rev. xviii. 3 where Babylon is in view, and the last reference to *orge* is at Armageddon (Rev. xix. 15). We do not believe a single Israelite will stand before the great white throne, for Israel being an elect nation were saved by Christ, and the judgment of their works falls within the millennium. We must be guided by the Word however and remember that “They are not all Israel that are of Israel”, for even in that elect race the holy seed had become corrupted, and some in our Lord’s day who were lineal descendants of Abraham were nevertheless said to be “of the father the Devil” (John viii. 44). With that one reservation we can boldly say “And so all Israel shall be saved” (Rom. xi. 26). There will not stand before that throne one of any dispensation from Adam onwards who has walked by faith. “The rest of the dead” includes that great company of Adam’s sons, who were not elected to any of the companies of faith, and who never attained either by award (Matt. xix. 16), fruit (Rom. vi. 22), or faith (John iii. 16), the life of the age that had then gone by, usually translated “everlasting life”, and made parallel with the kingdom (Matt. xxv. 34 and 46).

### **Eternal life and the rest of the Dead.**

Tyre and Sidon and Sodom (Matt. xi. 21-24) shall find it “more tolerable” than some who on the surface were nothing near so vile. We have it upon no less authority than that of the living God Himself that Sodom was “more righteous” than Israel:--

“As I live, saith the Lord God, Sodom thy sister hath not done, she nor her daughters, as thou hast done, thou and thy daughters . . . . they are more righteous than thou . . . . thou hast justified thy sisters” (Ezek. xvi. 48-52).

Just as the enormity of Israel’s sin “justified” Sodom, so we read that Nineveh’s repentance “condemns” Israel:--

“The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall *condemn* it” (Matt. xii. 41).

It is not possible for any human judge to deal with a man upon the ground of what he *would* have done under altered circumstances—the whole world would cry out against such an administration. But He Who sits upon this great white throne is One Who “tries the reins and the heart”. He knows what Sodom or Tyre *would have done* had the favours shown to Chorazin and Bethsaida been shown to them. He alone can judge the “secrets of men”, and that “according to my gospel” says Paul (Rom. ii. 16). Paul’s gospel touches *Adam* and *sin*, no other gospel goes so far back nor so deep. We know it is quite

apart from all the lurid pictures of orthodoxy to think of a gospel in association with the great white throne, but we nevertheless believe that such is the case.

### **The Second Dead and utter Destruction.**

After the judgment according to works has been given we read:--

“And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, even the lake of fire” (Rev. xx. 14).

Death and gravedom, together with the present heavens and earth, have accomplished their end. Like all other things that are temporal or cause offence, they are destroyed before the kingdom of righteousness can be set up. By no conceivable interpretation can we understand that God’s intention is to *preserve* or to *change* death and the grave by casting them into the lake of fire. Death, so far as it may be spoken of as a state, has been destroyed by the resurrection of all the rest of the dead. So far as it may be spoken of as an enemy it is here seen to be destroyed in the lake of fire.

The book of life is now put into operation, and this book alone is connected with the second death. No man will ever enter the second death as a result of judgment according to his works. It would be to ascribe most unbecoming trifling to the Lord Jesus to say that it would be more tolerable for one company who are cast into the second death than for another. The word “whosoever” in Rev. xx. 15 is apt to mislead the English reader. *Kai ei tis* can only be translated “and if anyone”, and the words are so rendered by the R.V. We now leave the great multitude for the individual. A mistaken zeal often prompts the evangelist to declare:--

“If any one stands before the great white throne he is necessarily doomed. Nothing but the lake of fire which burneth with fire and brimstones can be his lot. Flee from the wrath to come!”

These words contain serious mistakes. The second death is not the period spoken of in Scripture as “the wrath to come”. The day of wrath has peculiar reference to Babylonianism, Antichrist, etc. (*see* Rom. i. and Revelation). “Wrath” does not occur in the inner part of Romans, viz., v. 12 - viii. 39. It is not true to say that to stand before the great white throne is just the same as being condemned to the lake of fire.

### **The name written in the Book of Life.**

“If any one” denies that. None shall go into the lake of fire unless his name shall not be found in the book of life. This book of life was written “from the overthrow of the world”. The translation that we believe to be the true one of Rev. xiii. 8 is:--

“And all that dwell on the earth shall worship Him, everyone whose name had not been written from the overthrowing of the world in the book of life of the slain Lamb.”

When Satan’s rebellion brought about the “overthrow” of Gen. i. 2, and the purpose of the ages was put into movement, a second heavens and earth were made (which were

to pass away when their purpose was accomplished), and a people were written in the book of life. Sin entering brought the first death, and sin brought punishment, but the ultimate destiny of this people of purpose had no reference either to Adam's one sin or their own many sins. The consequences, both of the one offence and of the many offences, were undertaken by Christ, and in accordance with the outworking of the purpose of the ages, different companies were called to a saving knowledge of the truth. At length the last company is reached. They too suffer for their works, or are rewarded as the case may be, and being found in the book of life, pass into the new heavens and the new earth for the final movement in the great age purpose. There are some however whose names, apparently, will not be found therein. Can we find anything in Scripture to help us understand this omission? Turning once more to Rev. xiii. 8, let us notice what it says of those whose names had not been written in the book of life:--

“And all that dwell on the earth, every one whose name had not been written in the book of life of the slain Lamb, SHALL WORSHIP HIM, i.e., the dragon and the beast.”

Terrific judgments are pronounced against such in Rev. xiv. 10, 11. A promise is made to the overcomer in Rev. iii. 5 that the Lord will in no wise (double negative) blot out his name from the book of life.

*(To be continued).*

**#59. (contd.).**

**Rev. xx. 11-15.**

**Can a name be blotted out?  
pp. 57, 58**

These two passages raise certain questions concerning the book of life that must be faced:--

- (1). Rev. xiii. 8 indicates that the worshippers of the beast are those who have not their names in that book. There will be a company therefore on earth who are not reckoned in the great transaction of Adam and Christ; in other words, we perceive some of the false seed who are of “their father the Devil”.
- (2). The promise not to blot out the name of the overcomer suggests that there may be some point in the life even of one of the true children of Adam where such an awful thing may take place.

We are reminded of the words of Moses in Exod. xxxii. 32, 33:--

“And if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of that book which Thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, ‘Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book’.”

We must however be careful to note that this does not say “the book of life”, and may refer to other things. In Psa. lxxix. 28 we read:--

“Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous.”

Rotherham in a footnote says, “Or list (or register) of the living”, and it is by no means certain that the Psalmist has “the book of life of the Lamb” in mind. The expression is parallel with “the land of the living” (Psa. lxx. 5 and Isa. lxxiii. 8). It should be read with Psa. xxxvii. 29:--

“The righteous shall inherit the earth, that they may settle down to futurity (Heb. *ad*) thereupon.”

We can be certain as to this, that those who worship the beast as recorded in Rev. xiii. 8 have not their names in the Lamb’s book of life. Whether anyone whose name *is* in that book can possibly commit such an act and so take the side of Satan, is more than we can say. Enough for our present purpose to understand that the second death is the end of those whose names are not in the book of life.

We do not read “the book of aionian life”, neither do we read of “the book of glory”, or “blessing”, or “peace”, or “victory”, or “holiness”. All these other aspects of the future will have been settled. One issue, and one issue only remains. Life or death. The second death is the only alternative. It cannot mean purgatory, it cannot be a place of reformation, it is not a place of torment. Where the lake of fire is used as a place of torment is before the great white throne (Rev. xx. 10), and the lake of fire is described as *either* a place of torment *or* second death, never *both*. The second death resembles the first in this, that apart from resurrection it means destruction (I Cor. xv. 18).

### **Binding the “tares” to burn them.**

Before the righteous can shine forth in the kingdom of the Father, the “tares”, “the children of the wicked one”, the “false seed” must be destroyed. The figure used to describe the end of the children of the wicked one is taken from agriculture. Every man who cultivates the ground knows the necessity and the purpose of the annual bonfire. The weeds are raked together into a heap, and a fire is kindled in order that he may rid of them. If anyone should venture to suggest that he entertained a hope that by means of the fire some of the thistles should reform and become figs, the gardener would rightly put such a one down as mad. Now the figure taken from husbandry was taken by the Lord to *illustrate*, and if the gathering of the bundles of tares (the children of the Devil) to be burned is not to destroy them, then the Lord has *misled* us!!--

“They shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend . . . . then shall the righteous shine . . . .” (Matt. xiii. 42, 43).

We have no warrant for believing that either Satan, the Beast, the False Prophet, the Angels that fell with Satan, or his monstrous seed sown in the earth to corrupt the true

seed of the woman, ever have had their names in the book of life. These, together with the death and the grave, are consumed in the second death.

The platform has now been prepared. All is ready for the last act which is ushered in by the coming of the new heavens and new earth. These John beholds immediately following the lake of fire. This exact sequence is preserved in II Pet. iii. where the day of the Lord eventuates in the burning up of the heavens and the earth, and which in turn is followed by the day of God. This fixes for us the lake of fire. It is the great dissolving and destroying agency at the end.

## **#60. All things new (xxi. and xxii.). pp. 65 - 79**

The Scriptures are divided into three great sections, viz.:--

- (1). The heaven and the earth which were created. "In the beginning" (Gen. i. 1).
- (2). The heavens and the earth which were created during the six days. "Which are now" (Gen. i. 3-ii. 3; II Pet. iii. 7).
- (3). The new heaven and the new earth (II Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1).

One constant factor throughout the second division is the presence of sin. During the ages which span this section the wondrous purposes of grace and redemption are worked out. The last act which pertains to this section is that of casting death and hades into the lake of fire. The millennium is the day of the Lord (II Pet. iii. 10), and this is followed by the day of God (II Pet. iii. 12). For this the believer "looks and hastens unto", "looking, according to His promise, for the new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (II Pet. iii. 13). The section therefore which now claims our attention, though brief, is of stupendous significance. It is nothing less than the goal of the ages, the fruit of redemption, and the triumph of truth.

The subject "the new heaven and new earth" occupies chapters xxi. 1 - xxii. 5. First we have a brief statement occupying xxi. 1-5, then secondly we have an expansion of one aspect of the subject which has particular connection with the theme of the Revelation. It is important to a right understanding that we have this arrangement of the subject clearly before us.

### **The new creation and its heirs.**

A1	xxi. 1-5.	All things new.
A2	xxi. 6 - xxii. 5.	These things inherited.

The first part of the subject is general—"all things". The second part of the same subject is that which is peculiar to the overcomer—"he that overcometh shall inherit these things". Five verses are sufficient to tell of the new heavens and new earth, while

twenty-seven verses are taken up with the description of the inheritance of the overcomer. Let us consider these separate groups.

**“All things new” (xxi. 1-5).**

- A | a | 1. New heaven. New earth.
- b | 1. Former heaven and earth pass away.
- c | 1. No more sea.
- B | 2. The Holy City.
- B | 2. The Tabernacle.
- A |     c | 4. No more death.
- b | 4. Former things pass away.
- a | 5. All things new.

So complete is the change that takes place that the Scripture repeats, in order to emphasize, that “the former heaven and earth” and “the former things” pass away. In Isa. lxv. 17 we read:--

“For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the *former shall not be remembered*, nor come upon the heart.”

Just as the passing of the old heavens and earth is vitally connected with the “former things” in Rev. xxi., so in Isa. lxv. 16, for we read:--

“*The former troubles are forgotten . . . . they are hid from mine eyes.*”

Further, there is no more sea in that new earth, which is balanced by the statement that there shall be no more death, sorrow, crying or pain. Now why should the sea be associated with death? In exactly the same way that the “former heaven and earth” are associated with the former “troubles”.

**Sin and its cosmic relations.**

Seeing that we have reached in this chapter the great cosmic change, the goal towards which creation and redemption have pressed, it is not to be wondered at if sin is viewed, not from an individual point of view, nor even from a racial and federal point of view; it is seen rather as the primal sin that caused the overthrow of the world, made the present creation necessary, and which is behind all sin in general and “Mystery Babylon” in particular.

With the repeated emphasis upon the passing away of former things, and the complete cessation of death, it is simple to believe that all who were cast into the lake of fire suffer destruction, that they become “no more” even as the sea, death and sorrow, that they have passed away as completely as the former heaven and earth. To believe that a countless mass of unsaved humanity are still suffering torment contradicts these plain words, as does also the other teaching that the second death is in some measure a purgatory or place of temporary detention.

We look in vain in this chapter of Revelation for any further description of the new heaven and new earth. Immediately following the briefest of introductions John focuses upon one phase of this new world:--

“And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband” (xxi. 2).

Again a pause, and a further expansion:--

The city is named . . . . . New Jerusalem.  
The city is located . . . . . Coming down from heaven.  
The city is likened . . . . . Prepared as a bride.

Here the description ceases. Presently the theme is resumed with a wealth of detail, but in the brief summary which prefaces this section the above suffices. John “saw” the city. He also “heard” a great voice out of heaven saying:--

“Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God” (xxi. 3).

### **The city--a tabernacle.**

This is an evident explanation of the purpose of the new Jerusalem. It is to be in reality what the tabernacle was to Israel in type. It was further to be for “men”, whereas the tabernacle was exclusive to Israel. At the close of the description (xii. 1-5) we read Eden, paradise restored. It will be seen therefore that there are to be a series of steps ever back to “as it was in the beginning”.

- (1). THE MILLENNIUM.—Jerusalem on earth, a holy city.  
Special feature THE TEMPLE (Ezek. xl.-xlvii.)
- (2). THE NEW HEAVEN.—Jerusalem, heavenly city.  
Special feature THE TABERNACLE.
- (3). THE NEW EARTH.—Paradise, “The day of the age” (II Pet. iii.).  
Special feature THE TREE OF LIFE.

We have already suggested that the new Jerusalem is closely associated with the “overcomer”, and a glance back to some of the promises in Rev. ii. and iii. will show that some of them are not fulfilled until after the millennium.

### **Reward extend beyond the millennium.**

“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the *paradise of God*”. (ii. 7).

“He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the *second death*”. (ii. 11).

“He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the *book of life*”. (iii. 5).

“Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of My God, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, which is *new Jerusalem*, which cometh down out of heaven from My God” (iii. 12).

In these four passages, we have four items that are connected with our subject:--

- (1). The paradise of God.
- (2). The second death.
- (3). The book of life.
- (4). The city of God.

It will be found that Nos. 2 and 3 are indicated in xxi. 8 and 27 where the two statements “the second death” and “the book of life” are mentioned in connection with the new Jerusalem.

As we hope to deal with the typical teaching of the tabernacle in the series entitled *Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth*, we will not stay over details here. The very close resemblance between the tabernacle and the city becomes evident upon examination.

The materials for the tabernacle are given in Exod. xxv. 1-7 and they are gold, silver, brass, blue, purple, scarlet, precious stones, etc. The breastplate of the high priest contained twelve precious stones. These closely resemble the twelve precious stones with which the foundations of the wall were garnished. There is also an intended contrast with Babylon. In Rev. xvii. and xviii. we have the mystery of iniquity and there we read of purple and scarlet, gold and precious stones and pearls in the description of the harlot, and among the merchandise of that great city we find gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, fine linen, purple silk, scarlet. Again in the description of the king of Tyre (Ezek. xxviii. 12-19) who sets forth in symbol Satan, we have a description which includes “every precious stone”, and nine precious stones are mentioned by name.

The great city, Babylon, falls to rise no more; the great city, new Jerusalem, manifests the triumphant conclusion of the conflict of the ages.

### **The sanctuary--a dwelling place.**

We may observe here that one feature of the tabernacle which is given first place in Exod. xxv. is the one feature mentioned in Rev. xxi.

Exod. xxv. 8.—“Let them make Me a Sanctuary; that I may dwell among them.”  
Rev. xxi. 3.—“The Tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them.”  
(See also Ezek. xliii. 7; Zech. ii. 10, viii. 3).

Another important item is brought to mind by these parallels. The references to Zechariah and Ezekiel are millennial and to Israel, whereas the reference in Rev. xxi. is beyond the millennium and is to “men” and not to Israel alone. The new heaven and the new earth together with the heavenly Jerusalem will be anticipated in the millennium in Israel and the Jerusalem that will be built according to the prophecy of Ezek. x.-xlvi.

Isaiah mentions the new heavens and new earth in connection with Israel, the millennium and the Jerusalem of that day, and unless the typical and anticipatory

character of Israel's history be remembered, a great difficulty will be experienced in placing these passages. They are Isa. lxv. 17 and lxvi. 22:--

“For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered nor come upon the heart. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy . . . . and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying” (Isa. lxv. 7).

Yet this cannot be the same as Rev. xxi., for the next verse speaks of a sinner dying an hundred years old and being accursed, whereas in the new earth of Rev. xxi. there is no more death, and in Rev. xxii. no more curse.

### **Israel's blessings are foreshadowings.**

In Isa. lxvi. the new heavens and earth are connected with Israel, and the carcasses of men shall be seen in Gehenna, and be an abhorring unto all flesh.

There is one more item given in Rev. xxi. upon the nature of the new creation, which though briefly stated is infinitely precious:--

“And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death” (Rev. xxi. 4).

When God wipes away all tears, it indicates that death has been vanquished:--

“He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces” (Isa. xxv. 8).

There shall not enter into the new heavens or earth any who do not stand in new life in Christ.

We must now pass on to the more detailed description of the new Jerusalem, which commences at Rev. xxi. 9. The intervening verses (4-8) form a transition:--

“And He said (the One that sitteth upon the throne), Behold, I make all things new.  
And He said, Write: for these words are true and faithful.  
And He said, it is done.”

Some authorities read “they have been accomplished”, but the sense of fulfillment remains unaltered. The word *gegone*, “it is done”, is the word that was uttered as the last vial of wrath was poured out “and great Babylon came into remembrance before God”. At this utterance “every island fled away, and (certain) mountains were not found; and there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven” (Rev. xvi. 17-21). Here we see the great contrast.

<b><i>It is done.--Judgment.</i></b>	<b><i>It is done.--Blessing.</i></b>
The great city, Babylon.	The great city, new Jerusalem.
Precious stones, pearls and gold.	Precious stones, pearls and gold.
No more harper, candle or rejoicing.	No more death, sorrow or curse.
The habitation of demons, foul spirits.	Nothing that defileth.
Islands flee, mountains not found.	Earth and heaven flee away.
The harlot.	The bride.
Kings of the earth corrupted.	Kings of the earth bring glory.
Nations made drunk.	Nations walk in light.

The reader may lengthen this list; we have given enough to show the evident contrast between the two cities and the two conflicting purposes that attach to them. The mystery of iniquity ends in destruction utter and complete, the mystery of godliness ends in glory beyond description.

### **The Alpha and the Omega.**

Who is it that sits upon this throne? Who is it that says “Behold, I make all things new”? Who is it that says “It is done”?

“I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end” (Rev. xxi. 6).

This title has occurred in Revelation before, namely in Rev. i. 8. There it is shown to be parallel with the great name Jehovah, and the Almighty:--

“I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.”

It is also closely associated with death and resurrection:--

“Fear not, I am the first and the last; I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for the ages of the ages, Amen; and have the keys of hades and of death” (Rev. i. 17, 18).

Or again:--

“Thus saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God” (Rev. iii. 14).

Both *Alpha* and *Omega* are vowels. A vowel is required to form a complete sound. Without Christ the promises of God can never be fulfilled, but with Him every jot and tittle shall be accomplished. He Who bowed His head upon the cross crying, “It is finished”, shall one day sit upon the throne and say “It is done”.

### **The overcomer’s portion.**

One blessed promise is given here:--

“I will give unto him that thirsteth of the fountain of the water of life, freely” (Rev. xxi. 6).

At first sight this seems no more than that of:--

“A pure river of water of life” (Rev. xxii. 1), or  
“Whosoever will, let him take the water of life, freely” (Rev. xxii. 17).

A moment’s consideration however will reveal a difference. First we have “the fountain”. Secondly we have “the river”, and thirdly we have “the water” without reference to either river or fountain.

Now in Rev. vii. 17 we have a millennial anticipation by the overcomers of this same blessed promise:--

“The Lamb . . . . shall lead them unto the fountains of the water of life (R.V.), and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes.”

We read in Jer. ii. 13 that the Lord Himself is “the fountain of living waters”, and the promise of Rev. xxi. 6 takes the overcomer to the very source of that pure river which flows out from the throne to water the paradise of God. It is an “overcomer’s” portion, and not that of “whosoever will”. This promise is immediately followed by the words “He that overcometh shall inherit these things” (*tauta*, these things, instead of *panta*, all things). There is no practical difference between “all things” and “these things” in this passage, for “these things” must refer to something stated in the context, which seems to be the all things that are made new.

### **The reward of the inheritance.**

An inheritance, in the Scriptures, seems to have a two-fold significance. There is the inheritance that is associated with birth, and the inheritance that is associated with merit. Christ was appointed “heir of all things” (Heb. i. 2), but there seems an added feature in the statement, “He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name” (Heb. i. 4). So with Abraham: “When he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed” (Heb. xi. 8). This inheritance doubtless was the land of Palestine, but it included more. Isaac and Jacob were heirs together with Abraham of the same promise, and dwelt in tents as sojourners in a strange country:--

“For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God . . . . They desire a better country, that is, an heavenly . . . . He hath prepared for them a city” (Heb. xi. 9-16).

The inheritance spoken of therefore in Rev. xxi. looks to the new Jerusalem in particular for its fulfillment and enjoyment.

In severe and awful contrast with the overcomers are placed throughout the Revelation those who receive the mark of the beast or the number of his name. Their characteristics are given in verses 8 and 27. The last word in these two lists is connected with *the lie*.

## **The lie.**

“All liars” (verse 8). “Whatsoever worketh abomination or a lie” (verse 27).

If we are to take the words “all liars” in an unrestricted sense, then the Editor must confess that his place is herein indicated; but we rejoice in the forgiveness of sins, and see in this statement something more specific. It is that system of which Satan is the father:--

“He is a liar, and the father of IT” (John viii. 44).

This lie usurped the place of the truth of God, when the Gentile world became submerged in idolatry (Rom. i. 23-25), and will finally obsess the worshippers of the man of sin and his “lying wonders” (II Thess. ii. 9-11). This basic lie is connected with specific murder (John viii. 44; I John iii. 12), and with abominations (Rom. i. 26; Rev. ii. 20, etc.). With this dreadful company are joined “the fearful”, and “the unbelieving” (Rev. xxi. 8), which we understand also in the same restricted sense, otherwise the very apostles must come under this awful doom (*see* the same word used of them, Matt. viii. 26).

Abraham looked for a “city which had foundations” and a “heavenly country”, and these are now to be described with a wealth of detail. One of the seven angels who had been instrumental in the destruction of Babylon comes forward and says to John:--

“Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb’s wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God” (Rev. xxi. 10).

There is an evident parallel with Rev. xvii. here:--

“And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither, I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters . . . . . so he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness, and I saw a woman . . . . . the woman which thou sawest is that great city . . . . .” (Rev. xvii. 1-18).

Once again we shall find that the millennial city foreshadows the heavenly Jerusalem:-

“In the visions of God brought He me unto the land of Israel, and set me upon a very high mountain, by which was as the frame of a city on the south” (Ezek. xl. 2).

## **The Bride and the Wife.**

Many expositors see a difference between “the bride” and “the wife”, and teach that Israel is the wife, whereas an elect remnant constitute the bride: the wife being earthly, and the marriage taking place at the beginning of the millennium, whereas the bride being heavenly, her marriage takes place after the millenniums. It appears to us that there are several features of this subject that make it difficult to believe that this distinction is

intended here. For example Rev. xix. 7 makes it clear that the marriage is the marriage of the Lamb, and when it says “His wife hath made herself ready” cannot mean that she was already His wife before this marriage, but simply that this woman was the betrothed, and about to be married.

The word “wife” is *gune*, a word which is translated “woman” in the A.V. 129 times, 17 of the occurrences being found in the Revelation. *Gune* is translated “wife” 92 times, two of these occurrences being found in the Revelation. Like the word *aner*, which means both husband and man (*see* “the perfect man”, Eph. iv. 13), so *gune* means any woman who is of marriageable age, as well as a wife.

“I will show thee the *bride*, the *wife* of the Lamb” (Rev. xxi. 9).

Are we to believe that the marriage consummated in Rev. xix. is dissolved by either divorce or death at the end of the millennium? No one can believe that the Lamb of God will even in type and symbol break the law of God concerning marriage and practice polygamy. It was customary for a wedding ceremony to cover a period of seven days. “Fulfil her week” (Gen. xxix. 27) refers to this period. So also from Judges xiv. 17, 18 we gather the same thing. The marriage festivities of the Lamb last for a longer period, how long we do not know, but after the end of the millennium, when the new heaven and earth appear, the holy city descends from heaven prepared as a bride adorned for her husband and it is then the bride is called the Lamb’s wife.

There are several references in the O.T. to Israel as a wife, a wife divorced and taken back again, which must not be ignored if we would have the truth. One such passage is Isa. liv. 5-8. The first verse of the chapter provides a suggestion as to the interpretation of verses 5-8:--

“Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing.”

This verse is quoted by Paul in Gal. iv. 27 as a proof text that this refers to “Jerusalem which is above”. The heavenly Jerusalem, though seen in vision for the first time by John in Rev. xxi., has evidently been in existence throughout the ages, reserved in heaven until the present heaven and earth pass away. To this effect is Heb. xii. 22, 23:--

“But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly, and to the church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven.”

This passage comes in the second section of Heb. xii. The first half deals with sons, the second half with the firstborn and the birthright. These facts are all of help to the understanding of Rev. xxi. Another passage to be noted is Hos. ii. 16-23, where we read “Thou shalt call Me my husband . . . . and I will betroth thee unto Me for ever”, or yet again, Jer. iii. 14, “Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord, for I am married unto you”.

The simple solution seems to be to keep distinct the titles of the Lord, as (1) The God of Israel and (2) The Lamb, God manifest in the flesh; the restoration of the nation of Israel being one thing, the inheritance of the new Jerusalem being another. "If children, then heirs, *heirs of God*", that is one position. "Joint-heirs with Christ, if so be we suffer with Him" (Rom. viii. 17), that is another, and is somewhat parallel to the case before us.

### **The glory of God.**

Let us now read the description of this wondrous city:--

"He showed me the holy Jerusalem . . . . having the glory of God" (Rev. xxi. 10, 11).

The glory of God is a theme that requires separate treatment, and we must content ourselves here with pointing out a few outstanding features:--

- (1). The glory of God is directly attacked by the Babylonian system that flooded the earth with idolatry (Rom. i. 23).
- (2). Sin causes all to come short of the glory of God (Rom. iii. 23).
- (3). Only by virtue of redemption may any therefore entertain the hope of the glory of God (Rom. v. 2).
- (4). Immediately following the rebellion of Babel "the God of glory" called Abram out of Chaldea (Acts vii. 2).
- (5). The glory of God is vitally connected with resurrection:--
  - (a). Christ was raised from the dead "by the glory of the Father" (Rom. vi. 4).
  - (b). At the tomb of Lazarus, the Lord said in connection with the raising of Lazarus "Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?" (John xi. 40).

We may at least see in the new Jerusalem these five elements. The Babylonian attack has perished for ever; sin has passed away with the former things; redemption is the foundation upon which this city rests, and resurrection life is its animating principle.

This glory is said to be, not "her light" but "her luminary" (*phoster*). There was no need in this city for the light of either sun or moon. The wall is "great and high", and there are twelve gates, with twelve angels, the names of the twelve tribes of Israel being inscribed on the gates. Verse 21 adds the information that each gate was a pearl.

### **Paul, not one of the twelve apostles.**

The super-structure of the wall is of jasper (verse 18), but the wall rests upon twelve foundations, bearing the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. With the exception of Matthias no doubt is entertained concerning the names of the remaining eleven. We have given our reasons in *The Berean Expositor* for June, 1923, for believing that Matthias is the twelfth apostle; and in the expositions upon Ephesians the peculiar position of the apostle Paul is considered. It is our firm belief that the name of Paul is not to be found upon the foundations of the new Jerusalem, also that Paul is not one of the apostles of "the Lamb".

The measurements of the city are given and must be received, and nothing we can write will be of any service beyond stating that we must accept the explanation as a matter of fact. It is possible that the shape of this city is that of a pyramid, which would be in harmony with the archaeological evidences of early Babylonian buildings. Near to the ruins of Babylon is a huge mound which is called Birs-Nimrud, or the tower of Nimrod:--

“It covers a square surface of 49,000 feet, and is nearly 300 feet high . . . . Herodotus saw it while it still retained something of its ancient glories.”

He describes it as being constructed of a series of eight towers, with a way running spirally around them. Nebuchadnezzar leaves a record to the effect that he restored this tower, using different coloured tiles for each stage of the building (*see* Volume V of *The Berean Expositor*, page 30). This seems to be Satan’s anticipation and travesty of the glorious colours of the new Jerusalem.

It is somewhat difficult to decide whether the word “building” in verse 18 means the super-structure, as some translate it, or the buttresses, as others suggest. It is evidently something different from the foundations themselves, as one could scarcely adorn jasper with jasper. Those who have opportunity may find in the Museum at South Kensington the twelve stones mentioned in this description. We do not think any spiritual good can come by a lengthy description; most have some fair knowledge of their general appearance, and when we do see this vision of beauty we shall doubtless say “the half was not told me”.

### **No temple, no sun, no moon.**

During the millennium there will be the glorious temple described with such minuteness by Ezekiel (in chapters xl.-xlvii.), but the greater glory of the new Jerusalem is that it needs no temple:--

“And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it” (Rev. xxi. 22).

While temples, altars, sacrifices and priests stand, full access is denied (*see* Heb. ix. 8, 9; x. 19-22 for the principle). During the millennium:--

“the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold” (Isa. xxx. 26).

but of the city of Jerusalem itself we read:--

“The sun shall be no more thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee, but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory” (Isa. lx. 19, 20).

This is but another anticipation of the heavenly city:--

“And the city hath no need of the sun, neither the moon, that they should shine on her; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof” (Rev. xxi. 23).

Future blessedness in the minds of many is somewhat nebulous. They imagine an immaterial state, with nothing much to do except to sing and to praise. The new earth at least presents a very different aspect. There are nations there and kings, “and the nations shall walk by means of her light’, which is but following out the anticipation of the millennial city:--

“Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee . . . . and Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising” (Isa. lx. 1-3).

“Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the wealth of the nations, and that their kings may be conducted through” (Isa. lx. 11).

The kings of the earth were ruined by Babylon, the nations were made drunk by the harlot, but the nations shall walk by the light of Jerusalem earthly and heavenly, and kings shall be blessed by her.

### **No defilement, no more sacrifice.**

The concluding words regarding this city are those which repeat the solemn witness of verse 8:--

“And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life” (Rev. xxi. 27).

The city is likened to the tabernacle. The ritual of the tabernacle impresses us with the need for cleansing. The leper, being unclean, or any who had contracted defilement, was not allowed to come near until their defilement had been removed. The provision for the removal of sin and uncleanness is found in the blood of Christ. This had been rejected by those who were cast into the second death. There remaineth no more offering for sin. Christ dieth no more.

Throughout the record of chapter xxi. illumination is found in the story of Israel. This principle of interpretation which looks to the typical people of Israel to supply the correct grounds for interpreting the unfolding of the purpose of the ages we commend to our readers, who will find much more than we have brought forward here that will make the vision plain.

### **Paradise restored.**

We now arrive at the last members of the great structure which comprises the purpose of the ages, and are brought not to Israel nor Jerusalem, but back to Eden and paradise. Rev. ii. 7 gives us warrant to use the word paradise of Rev. xxii. 1-5. Genesis speaks of the garden planted by the Lord with its rivers and its trees of fruit and its tree of life. The

picture is revived in this closing section. Ezek. xlvii. Provides a millennial anticipation of this river of living water. Its healing power is brought before us by a physical and geographical fact:--

“These waters issue out towards the east country (used of the Jordan, Josh. xxii. 11), and go down unto the desert (or plain), and go into the sea (that is the Dead Sea), which being brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed” (Ezek. xlvii. 8).

Is not this a blessed symbol? In verse 12 we read of the fruit trees with similar characteristics and virtues as those of Rev. xxii.

The leaves of the tree are for healing the nations, not for those who have the right of entry into that city. We are however not to suppose that sin or death is at work among the nations, for the Scripture immediately adds, “And there shall be no longer any curse”, even as there shall be no longer any night, or death, or crying.

There in that renewed paradise shall be the throne of God and the Lamb, there His servants shall serve Him and see His face, bearing His name upon their foreheads. Basking in the light that the Lord God Himself shall give, they shall reign unto the ages of the ages. This is the farthest point to which the book takes us in the outworking of the great purpose of God. One by one the barriers are broken down. The last to go here is the temple with its priesthood. Paul places the top stone upon the edifice by revealing that when the reign of Christ has brought everything into line and order, the goal of the ages will then be reached and God shall be all in all.

The remaining verses of chapter xxii. form the epilogue or conclusion of the book. The conclusion has much in common with the introduction.

### **The one thing needful -- come!**

We have the coming of Christ mentioned or suggested in the chapter at least four times:--

“Behold I come quickly” (7)  
“Behold I come quickly” (12, 13).  
“The morning Star” (16).  
“Surely I come quickly” (20).

A blessing is pronounced upon those who keep the words of the prophecy of this book (7), while severe judgment is threatened to any who shall either add to or take away from these prophetic words (18, 19).

John sees the Lord, not only as the root and offspring of David, but as the bright and morning Star. From the dark night of sin and sorrow ascends to the Lord the bright harbinger of everlasting day, the one word COME, “He who testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly”.

As we review the black night of tribulation that cast its gloom over this book, as we see the persecution of the saints, the mark of the beast, the worship of the dragon, our hearts unite with that of John in response to this word of promise. AMEN. EVEN SO, COME, LORD JESUS:--

“Oh what a bright and blessed world  
This groaning earth of ours will be,  
When from its throne the tempter hurled  
Shall leave it all, O Lord, to Thee.”

*“The grace of the Lord Jesus be with all the saints, Amen.”*

### **A note on the measurements of the new Jerusalem. pp. 142, 143**

Readers will remember that we brought this series of studies to a conclusion in the May number of *The Berean Expositor*. Since that date we have received a copy of “THE FAITH” for May-June 1925, which contains so helpful an explanation of the measurements of the new Jerusalem, that we feel we must pass on the gist of the article to our readers.

Our own attitude toward the subject may be gathered from page 76 of the present Volume:--

“The measurement of the city are given, and must be received, and nothing we can write will be of any service beyond stating that we must accept the explanation as a matter of fact.”

The reader doubtless gathered that we desired to bow to the teaching of Scripture, but that we had no clear understanding what the Scripture really intended to teach. The passage in question is Rev. xxi. 16, 17:--

“And the city lieth foursquare, and its length is as great as its breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, 12,000 furlongs (*stadia*). The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. And he measured the wall thereof, 144 cubits.”

Dr. E. W. Bullinger in his “APOCALYPSE” says, “In this case the city will be 1,500 miles high”, and referring to another computation which takes the 12,000 furlongs as being the measurement of the circumference, he says, “Is 375 miles high easier to believe than 1,500?” and we must confess that either measurement presents a great problem.

The suggestion made by the writer of the article in “THE FAITH” is that the 12,000 furlongs is the area of the square base. The square root of 12,000 is 109, which taking the stadium as being equal to 582 feet (see *Twentieth Century Dictionary*)

gives about 12 miles for the length of one of the square sides. By comparing this dimension with that given in Ezek. xlviii. 35, "round about eighteen thousand measures", we get helpful confirmation. The measure here is a "reed", and measures "six great cubits".

The sacred cubit is given by some as 25 inches, which gives 46 miles for the circumference of the city. Divided by four this gives 11-1/2 miles for the one side, which is very near to the 12 miles suggested above, especially if an outer wall had to be reckoned in addition. The height of the wall 144 cubits, or 100 yards, is proportionate to a city twelve miles in height, but is not so obviously proportional to either 1,500 or 375 miles.

While we are prepared to believe that the new Jerusalem will be 1,500 miles in height, length and breadth if Scripture reveals such to be the case, we realize that it is not an act of faith nor is it to the glory of God to be merely credulous. A city twelve miles square is a reasonable proposition, and twelve miles in height would give it worldwide domination. We cannot see that any liberties have been taken with the text in arriving at this interpretation, and we therefore feel that our readers should have the benefit of it.

We tender our hearty thanks to the Editor of "THE FAITH" for this suggestive article.

## **Sin, and its relation to God. pp. 172 – 175**

### **Inspiration, and a disputed translation.**

When the apostle Paul reached Rome, we are told in Acts xxviii. 22 that the elders of Israel said:--

“We desire to hear of thee what thou **THINKEST**.”

When Paul, however, had the opportunity of speaking to them he took higher ground, for he did not tell them so much what he *thought*, but rather what God had SAID (Acts xxviii. 23).

An appeal to a human authority, however high, is always open to challenge. It is after all something that someone has *thought* to be truth. On the other hand an appeal to what God has *said* places all matters beyond dispute.

### **An incontestible authority.**

Gesenius is a great authority on Hebrew, but he is not beyond the reach and the right of criticism. The Septuagint version of the O.T. is a great and venerable authority, but it is not inspired. So with the A.V. and the R.V. There is, however, one fundamental doctrine that we do not discuss in this magazine, and that is the verbal inspiration of the Hebrew and Greek originals of the Old and New Testaments.

Whenever we enter into discussion in these pages it is taken for granted that this is common ground, and the fact that we do feel called upon at times to discuss a point with others must always be understood to imply that we believe that those writers who are criticized hold the truth of inspiration as dear as we do ourselves.

There is a question before us as to the right translation of certain forms of the Hebrew word *chata* and its bearing upon the vital doctrine of the sacrifice for sin. The A.V. translates the “intensive” form of *chata* = “sin”, by “offer for sin”, “make reconciliation”, “purify”, &c. The writer we criticize denies the accuracy of these translations, saying:--

“They are contrary to the laws of the Hebrew language.”

*“Instead of being the opposite of sin, as you suggest, it is sin more intensely sinful.”*

These are the writer’s own words and italics. It is farthest from our intention to misrepresent or misunderstand his meaning. He tells us that as a result of considering the laws of the Hebrew language whereby the simple form of the verb is intensified when put into the *Piel* form, that, “Now we have solid ground”.

To some, the “laws of the Hebrew language”, like the man-made laws of any other language or science, may not appear to be such a solid basis that one can without qualm erect upon it the fabric that this writer would. We believe that we have a far more solid basis than these can ever be, viz., the very rock of inspired Scripture.

### **The Acid Test.**

“WHAT THOU THINKEST” *versus* “IT IS WRITTEN”.

The *Piel* form of the Hebrew verb *chata* – “sin” is translated in the A.V. as follows:--

“I bare the loss of it” (Gen. xxxi. 39).

“Took the blood . . . . and purified the altar” (Lev. viii. 15).

“The ashes of the heifer . . . . a purification for sin” (Num. xix. 9).\*\*\*

“Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean” (Psa. li. 7).

We maintain that the above renderings are correct. This is denied. After quoting from Gesenius and another authority on Hebrew, also supplementing by eleven examples from the A.V., the writer says:--

“What other deduction can we come to than that the renderings of the intensive form *sin*—‘offer for sin’, ‘make reconciliation’, ‘purge’, ‘cleanse’, ‘purify’, ‘bear the loss’ (for these are the great variety offered in our versions) are themselves sins of translation? Sin is lawlessness. They are contrary to the laws of the Hebrew language.

Now we have some solid ground. Since the *Piel* form gives new intensity to the simple verb, it not only partakes of the nature of sin, but does so in a greater degree than the simple word sin. *Instead of being the opposite of sin, as you suggest, it is sin more intensely sinful . . . . So the Piel of sin is not purify, but make sin.*”

We have read and re-read these words in order that we may not misrepresent their intention. Partaking of the nature of sin in a greater degree cannot mean merely apparently so. No, here we have unqualified denial and condemnation of the translations offered by the A.V. and the Septuagint.

Now for the test. Both critic and criticized subscribe whole-heartedly to the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and this being so we have the end of all argument in the epistle to the Hebrews. Whether Paul or Luke or Apollos wrote the epistle matters not, we both believe God inspired its every word.

### **The test passage.**

Our test passage is Num. xix. The whole chapter is devoted to the provision of the ashes of the heifer and its purpose. “Hyssop”, referred to so impressively in Psa. li. 7, is found in the prescription. The A.V. tells us that these ashes were to be kept to make a water of separation, further explained as “a purification for sin” (xix. 9). This is supposed to be a lawless translation. Coming to the application of this water we read:--

“He that toucheth the dead body of any man shall be *unclean* seven days; he shall *purify* himself with it on the third day . . . . Whosoever . . . . *purifieth* not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord . . . . he shall be *unclean*” (Num. xix. 11-13).

The word “unclean” is not in dispute; the word “purify” is. Heb. ix. 13, 14 refers to this passage, and we give the translation as found in the *Concordant Version*.

### **The Oracle of God.**

“For if the blood of he-goats and of bulls and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the contaminated, is hallowing to the cleanness of the flesh, how much rather shall the blood of Christ, Who through the eonian spirit offers Himself flawless to God, be cleansing your conscience from dead works” (Heb. ix. 13, 14).

The notes at the side of the translation in the Concordant Version read:--

“13. This refers to the two great sin-offerings of Lev. 16 and Num. 19. The victim was burned, the ashes preserved, and water that flowed over them availed to purify. This ordinance fills an important place in Israel’s future as well as its past” (Ezek. 36:25).

According to this comment, the ashes of the heifer did “avail to PURIFY”, and according to Ezek. xxxvi. 25 avails to “cleanse”. So far this but confirms the A.V. But the notes in this version, like all other human products, may be challenged. Not so the actual passage from Heb. ix. quoted above. The effect of the sprinkling of the unclean:--

“Sanctities or hallows to the purifying of the flesh” (Heb. ix. 13).

The Septuagint of Num. xix. uses the verb *hagnizo* “to purify”, to translate *chata* which is very parallel with Heb. ix. 13, 14.

*Hagiazō* = “to hallow” or “to sanctify”, occurs in Hebrews six times, viz., ii. 11, ix. 13, x. 10, 14, 29, xiii. 12. Other derived words translated “holy”, “holiness”, &c., occur many more times. This is the word which God uses in Heb. ix. 13 to translate the Hebrew word *chata* in Num. xix. We maintain that “sanctify” is the opposite of “sin”. Here we have something more solid than deductions from man-made laws of language; we have the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture.

The only question open to us now is concerning our attitude of heart towards the Word of God. The inspired writer of Hebrews sets his seal upon the A.V. rendering of *chata*. To say that the rendering “purify” is a sin of translation is to say that to “sanctify” is even more a sin. Until it can be proved that Heb. ix. 13, 14 is not dealing with Num. xix., or that *hagiazō* means an intensive form of sin, or that *hagiazō* is not God’s own translation of the Hebrew *Piel* form of *chata*=*sin*, or that “to sanctify” is not the extreme “opposite” of “to sin” (which is our contention), the argument is closed. To debate the subject further would be but to magnify human “deductions” and “laws” against the Word of God, a debate we decline.

“To sanctify” gathers up the words “cleanse”, “purify”, “make reconciliation” which are found in the A.V. Old Testament. Here then we reach a simple issue:--

- (1). The *Piel* form of *chata* = “sin” should be translated “purify”, “cleanse”, “make reconciliation”, “sanctify”. This is our position.
- (2). “The *Piel* form of sin IS NOT PURIFY, BUT MAKE SIN.” This is the teaching that we have criticized and which we repudiate, for it is an unqualified denial of Heb. ix. 13, 14.

For our position we have the solid ground of the Word of God as given in Heb. ix. 13. For the other position we have the quicksand of human deductions and laws. As this teaching must be held in spite of the express statement of Heb. ix. 13, we have nothing more to do than to repudiate it. We make no aspersions, we do not pretend to analyse the intentions of others, that is not our office.

The fact that we turned from the Greek word “sin” to the Hebrew apparently had the appearance of “policy”. It was the outworking of a “principle” adopted by us for some time. This, however, we must explain at some future time.

\*\*\* p. 191  
**A Correction. (\*\*\*) The Acid Test).**

We regret that a mistake occurred in the article on page 173 of the November issue, which we desire to rectify: instead of reading:--

“The ashes of the heifer . . . . a *purification* for sin” (Num. xix. 9).

read:--

“He shall *purify* himself” (Num. xix. 19).

Verses 17-21 should be read together in order to see the context.

This correction is necessary owing to the limitation of the references to the *Piel* form. All the references quoted from Num. xix. are various forms of the one Hebrew word *chata*, and must be read together.

# The First Epistle to Timothy.

#2. (Continued from Volume XIV, page 80).  
pp. 14, 15

There are one or two objections to the later date suggested for I Timothy which it will be wise to face.

## 1. Timothy's Youth.

"Let no man despise thy youth" (I Tim. iv. 12).

We do not know the age of Timothy when he first joined the apostle, but somewhere about 17 or 18 years of age is generally considered approximate. The date of Acts xvi. must be somewhere about A.D.50. If we therefore place I Timothy at A.D.64, Timothy would be about 32 years of age. Judging by modern standards we should not look upon Timothy as a youth, but judging according to the standard of Aulus Gellius, *lib. x. c.28*, where he cites Servius Tullius, Paul was well within bounds. The Roman's divisions of man's age were as follows:--

CHILDHOOD . . . . .	1 year to 17 years.
YOUTH . . . . .	17 years to 46 years.
OLD AGE . . . . .	46 years to end of life.

Not only, therefore, was Timothy still a youth, but Paul could say of himself, "such an one as Paul the aged".

Further, when one considers the great responsibility of the high and difficult office to which Timothy had been called, involving the ordination of bishops and deacons, and the many duties that a growing church and a fast growing apostasy bring with them, a man of 32 years would, even to-day, be considered very young for the post. No serious objection to the later date of I Timothy can be found here.

## 2. Paul's statement in Acts xx. 25.

Paul said to the elders at Ephesus:--

"I know that ye all . . . . shall see my face no more."

It is objected, that if I Timothy had been written after this statement Paul could not have expressed the hope of revisiting Ephesus. We know upon other occasions the apostle had to revise his plans. He hoped to visit Spain, but we are not certain that he ever did so. II Cor. i. 15-24 shows his attitude in these things. He would rather be found changing his plans than running counter to the will of the Lord. We believe however that the apostle had no intention of revisiting Ephesus. He had devoted a long time to the church at Ephesus, and in writing to the saints at Colosse he speaks of those whose face

in the flesh he had not then seen. It appears, from his letter to Philemon, that he hoped, upon his release from Rome, to pay a visit to Colosse, saying:--

“But withal prepare me also a lodging for I trust through your prayers I shall be given to you” (verse 22).

If Paul could send for the elders of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus when he had a message of so great importance to give them, he could also send for Timothy to meet him at Colosse. Paul had also expressed a desire to revisit Philippi after his release, and writing to Titus he tells of his intention to winter at Nicopolis. These further items help us to understand that the apostle might well feel justified in omitting any further visit to Ephesus.

### **3. The Bishops and Deacons.**

The fact that there were elders in the church when Paul met them at Miletus is no serious objection to the later date of I Timothy, for surely as the years passed and the church increased, fresh elders would be needed, and the rapid increase of false teachers would demand just that supervision that is indicated in the epistle.

*(To be continued).*

### **#3. pp. 30, 31**

The reader has already remarked the way in which the epistles group themselves by reason of verbal peculiarities. Thus a comparison of Galatians with Romans would indicate that these two epistles belonged to the same dispensation. The parallel between Ephesians and Colossians is pronounced and needs no emphasis from our pen.

When we come to consider the verbal peculiarities of the epistles to Timothy and Titus, we find that these three epistles are thereby manifested to be one group. Now the fact that II Timothy was written in view of the apostle's own death places it beyond the close of the Acts, and the verbal links with I Tim. and Titus necessarily place those epistles beyond Acts xxviii. also. Let us look at some of the words that are peculiar to these epistles.

*Anosios* (I Tim. i. 9 and II Tim. iii. 2, and nowhere else in the N.T.).—The A.V. translates it “profane” and “unholy”. The word links the strong warnings of I Tim. with the prophetic forecast of the great apostasy at the end of the dispensation.

*Astocheo* (I Tim. i. 6; vi. 21; II Tim. ii. 18, and nowhere else in the N.T.).—The A.V. translates “to turn aside”, “to err”. The first epistle connects this turning aside with “vain jangling” and “vain babblings”, the second with the “vain babblings” of those who taught erroneous views concerning the resurrection. In I Tim. the swerving is

connected with the “faith”; in II Tim. with the “truth”, words which are brought together more than once in these epistles.

*Diabolos* (I Tim. iii. 11 and II Tim. iii. 3).—This word occurs many times throughout the N.T. with the usual meaning “Devil” but in the two passages instanced it is used of men with the meaning “slanderers”. In perfect harmony with this peculiarity is Tit. ii. 3, where the one occurrence of the word is used of “the aged women” that they be not “false accusers”.

*Epophaneia* (I Tim. vi. 14; II Tim. i. 10; iv. 8; Tit. ii. 13).—With the exception of II Thess. ii. 8 (which is not strictly parallel) this word is peculiar to these three epistles. It is used by the apostle to express the hope of the church subsequent to Acts xxviii., when the “hope of Israel” expressed in the word “*parousia*” was temporarily set aside with the closing of the dispensation.

*Eusebeia, eusebeo, eusebos* (I Tim. ii. 2; iii. 16; iv. 7, 8; vi. 3, 5, 6, 11; II Tim. iii. 5; Titus i. 1; I Tim. v. 4; II Tim. iii. 12; Titus ii. 12).—These words occur 13 times in these epistles. They are focused for us in that wonderful revelation of I Tim. iii. 16, “The mystery of godliness”. The subject is too vast for a note in this review, but a consideration of the question of the true reading of this passage will be given separately.

*Zetesis* (I Tim. i. 4; vi. 4; II Tim. ii. 23; Titus iii. 9. No other occurrence in Paul’s writings).—The word is rendered “questions”. The contexts reveal the state of affairs that obtained, and which in some measure drew forth these epistles. Titus iii. 9 is a good summary:--

“But avoid foolish questions and genealogies, and contentions and strivings about the law: for they are unprofitable and vain.”

(*To be continued*).

### #3. (*Concluded from page 31*). pp. 59, 60

*Muthos* (I Tim. i. 4; iv. 7; II Tim. iv. 4; Titus i. 14. The only other occurrence is II Pet. i. 16).—The word is translated “fables”. The context in each case sets these “fables” over against “the truth”, and that as specially taught by the apostle.

*Pistos ho logos* (I Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; iv. 9; II Tim. ii. 11; Titus iii. 8).—This expression is peculiar to these epistles. It is rendered “a faithful saying”, and “a true saying”, and links these three epistles together by its peculiar usage.

*Sophron* and its derivatives (I Tim. ii. 9, 15; iii. 2; II Tim. i. 7; Titus i. 8; ii. 2, 4, 5, 6, 12).—One of the words *sophroneo* is used by Paul elsewhere, once in Romans and

once in II Cor.; the remaining ten occurrences are found only in these three pastoral epistles. The words are rendered “sober”, “sobriety”, “sound mind”, “discreet”, “sober minded”, “soberly”. Surely there must have existed some special reason, common to all three epistles, to call for this strong emphasis?

*Hugies* and *hugiaino* as applied to doctrine (I Tim. i. 10; vi. 3; II Tim. i. 13; iv. 3; Titus i. 9, 13; ii. 1, 2, 8).—The words are translated “sound”, “wholesome”. The necessity for sound doctrine and example which he calls a “pattern”, or a “form”.

*Hupotuposis* (I Tim. i. 16 and II Tim. i. 13).—We have with the last exception given a list of words that are found in the three epistles. Those which are peculiar to I Tim. and Titus will not be of service in fixing their date so much as those which link them together with Paul’s last epistle, II Timothy.

If the reader will meditate upon the words given above and if he is open to any argument that may be derived from peculiarities of diction and vocabulary, he will scarcely be able to avoid the conclusion that the three pastoral epistles are closely connected in theme and time of writing, and must therefore be placed after the three prison epistles, viz., Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians.

In order to complete our examination of the verbal connections that exist between the two epistles to Timothy, we give the following supplementary list of words which occur only in these two epistles, but not in Titus:--

BEBELOS (I Tim. i. 9; iv. 7; vi. 20; II Tim. ii. 16; only other occurrence, Heb. xii. 16).—Profane.

EKTREPOMAI (I Tim. i. 6; v. 15; vi. 20; II Tim. iv. 4; only other occurrence, Heb. xii. 13).—To turn aside, turn away, avoid.

KENOPHONIA (I Tim. vi. 20; II Tim. ii. 16).—Vain babblings.

LAGOMACHEO (or IA) (I Tim. vi. 4; II Tim. ii. 14).—Striving, or strife about words.

PAGIS TOU DIABOLOU (I Tim. iii. 7; II Tim. ii. 26).—Snare of the devil.

PARAKATATHEKE (I Tim. vi. 20; II Tim. i. 14).—Committed.

PARAKOLOUTHEO (I Tim. iv. 6; II Tim. iii. 10).—To attain, to fully know.

TUPHOOMAI (I Tim. iii. 6; vi. 4; II Tim. iii. 4).—To be lifted up, proud, highminded.

XALIS, ELLEOS, EIRENE (I Tim. i. 2; II Tim. i. 2).—Grace, mercy, peace, in salutation. Omitted in best texts of Titus.

We cannot help giving expression to the belief we hold that there is a far more important and worthy lesson to be learned from this list of peculiar words than the mere proof of the period when these two epistles were written, but that is a theme which must be held over for a future study.

It is however important to keep in mind the evidences which these epistles contain concerning their oneness of dispensational setting, even though, when we note not only their parallels but their differences, we see how rapidly the corporate manifestation of the

truth degenerated, and rule gave place to ruin, collective testimony to individual faithfulness.

## Words in Season.

Dispensational problems are not to the fore in this series. We address ourselves rather to those elementary problems of doctrine and practice that present themselves to those who have started the pilgrim pathway. It will not be possible to avoid controversial topics entirely, otherwise hardly a single teaching of Scripture would be left to us. In order to avoid misunderstanding, let us say that “A” does not represent any particular individual, but we trust that should the case be applicable to any reader at any time, such applicability will be accepted as indicating a “word in season”.

### #1. Faith.

#### Faith says Amen to God.

pp. 97 - 99

A.—I do not wish you to think that I question the truth of Scripture or the power of God, but I am somewhat mystified by the many kinds of “faith” that are spoken of in theological writings. I read of “*historic* faith”, and “*saving* faith” and other descriptions of faith, but I do not seem to have a clear and simple conception as to what faith really is.

B.—In the first place I think you will find that Scripture stresses the thought of *what* we are to believe, rather than discusses *how* we believe, although it does speak of that too.

Without attempting to justify or explain the following statement, I have come to the conclusion that the language of revelation and of doctrine is not primarily N.T Greek, but O.T Hebrew, and that it is dangerous to build up a theory upon the etymology of Greek words without continually checking it by the Hebrew equivalent. We may look into this matter upon some future occasion.

A.—I do not pretend to understand your meaning, do you propose answering my question from the O.T.?

B.—While it would be manifestly absurd to ignore the teaching of the N.T. upon such a subject as faith, yet the primary significance of the term may be discovered in the Hebrew word that is employed in the O.T. Will you tell me where the word “believe” first occurs in the O.T.?

A.—(*Using a concordance*).—I find the first occurrence to be Gen. xv. 6:--

“And he believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness.”

B.—What is the Hebrew word there translated “believe”?

A.—It is *aman*.

B.—As you do not know a letter of Hebrew, will you say for the encouragement of others how you can so readily reply?

A.—Most gladly. I am using *Young's Analytical Concordance*, which not only gives the English word, but places it under its corresponding Hebrew or Greek word, enabling one to keep differing words distinct.

B.—Will you now turn to the word “faith” and tell me how it is used in the O.T. and what Hebrew words are used?

A.—The word occurs but twice, viz., Deut. xxxii. 20 and Hab. ii. 4:--

“Children in whom is no faith” (Heb. *emun*).  
“The just shall live by his faith” (Heb. *emunah*).

I notice moreover that “faithful” is the rendering of *emun*, *emunah*, *aman* or *emeth*, and that with the exception of Psa. v. 9 every occurrence of “faith” and “believe” in the O.T. is a translation of *aman* or its cognates.

B.—The Hebrew word “amen” has passed over into the English language, and it is used to endorse a prayer, or to express one’s complete agreement with whatever has been affirmed. The words of John iii. 33 may be taken as a practical comment on the Hebrew word for faith:--

“He that received His testimony hath set his seal that God is true.”

The simple conception of faith suggested by the words used in the O.T. may be expressed in some such way as this, “Faith says amen to anything that God has said”. Whatever the doctrine or the practice that may be the subject at the time, faith bows the head and says, “That is true”. Of course I do not pretend that such a statement either exhausts the subject or takes in every point of view, but this simple primary definition will bring comfort where philosophy may bring distraction.

A.—If your suggestion is that when Abraham believed in the Lord he just bowed his head with a humble “amen”, I see this echoed in the words of Rom. iv. 20, 21:--

“He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being *fully persuaded* that, what He had *promised*, He was able also to *perform*.”

It is certainly very simple and rids the subject of a great deal that does not properly belong to it.

I should appreciate a few words on the question of “how” we believe, at some future time.

**#2. Faith.**  
**Faith is the crediting of a Testimony.**  
**pp. 133 - 135**

A.—Your suggestion made to me some time ago that the O.T. conception of faith could be expressed in some such way as: “Saying Amen to all that God has said”, is certainly simple, but to my mind does not seem impressive enough.

B.—I do not mean to teach that such a statement exhausts the meaning of faith, but I do believe that it lies very near the foundation.

A.—It seems to me that if man is dead to everything spiritual until the Lord gives him life and light, then faith must be something more miraculous and wonderful than your suggestion would lead us to suppose.

B.—Yet, after all, for a man spiritually dead and at enmity with God and His truth to turn and believe is something very marvelous. On the other hand the Scripture does not seem to turn our attention so much to the metaphysical side of the question of faith, but lays before us a more matter of fact and everyday presentation of it. Would you cease to breathe because you could not satisfactorily resolve the problem as to which comes first, life or breathing? Why disturb your mind with unprofitable speculations?

Let us see how faith is used in the Scripture. Think of the well known words of Isa. liii. 1, “Who hath believed our report?” You know what it is to believe, or give credit to, a testimony or a report, well this aspect of faith is one that is found in Scripture. This passage from Isa. liii. 1 is quoted by Paul in Rom. x. where one or two further thoughts on the nature of faith are to be found. Will you turn to Rom. x. and tell me what you discover?

A.—(*Reads the passage silently*).—The first thing that strikes me upon reading this chapter is this. Instead of saying, as I have rather thought, that faith is a matter of great height and depth, Paul quotes the words of Moses, saying:--

“Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above), or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead), but what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach” (Rom. x. 6-8).

B.—And moreover you will see that even though faith is said to be “in the heart”, yet it is connected with the preaching of the word in such a way as to be to all outward appearance the believing of a report. You will see that while the believing of a testimony given by accredited messengers is stressed, the more secret and supernatural phase, which

has evidently perplexed you, is passed over without reference. Perhaps you will read the passage.

A.—(*Reads*).—

“How then shall they call on Him in Whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of Whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? . . . . So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Rom. x. 14-17).

B.—You observe that there is no “still small voice” that is to be heard, but the word of God, as preached by one sent, and that the inference is that without the word to hear, there will be no faith.

A.—I must admit, so far as this passage goes, that it is so, yet I feel a little disappointed over the discovery.

B.—Are you not a little Naaman the Syrian who would gladly have done some great or spectacular thing, but despised the simple process ordained by God for his cleansing. Turn to I John v. 9-11 and see how the apostle speaks of faith. You might, when you read, observe that “witness”, “record” and “testify” are one and the same.

A.—(*Reads*).—

“If the testimony of men we receive, the testimony of God is greater. For this is the testimony of God that He has testified concerning His Son. (He that believes on the Son of God has the testimony in himself; he that does not believe God has made Him a liar; because he has not believed in the testimony which God has testified concerning His Son). And this is the testimony, that God has given to us *aionian* life, and this life is in His Son.”

B.—The continual iteration of testimony and testify undoubtedly is not such good English as the variation introduced by the A.V., but its insistence is striking and beyond dispute. Faith, here, is belief in a testimony, that testimony being given by God and concerning His Son. To believe that testimony is equivalent to believing “God” (verse 10), the One Who gives the testimony, and believing on the Son, the One concerning Whom God has testified (verses 9 and 10).

Moreover, the inspired apostle has no scruple in comparing the testimony given by God with that of man, simply urging that if we give credence to sinful men upon slight evidence, the demand upon us for giving equal credence to the testimony of God is “greater”. And further unbelief makes God a liar, which is the practical reverse to saying Amen to all that God has said.

A.—I see very clearly that my view of faith would never have allowed the argument from men that is used in verse 9, and that the emphasis upon believing a testimony is very strong indeed. I confess that the subject is clearer and simpler and makes faith and belief

the more to me than I could have credited. Perhaps we shall have an opportunity of looking at the subject from another angle.

**#3. Faith.**  
**“Historic” and “Saving” Faith.**  
**pp. 156 - 158**

A.—While I admit that there is much more in the Word as to faith being the belief of a testimony than I had thought, yet I am conscious that there is something not quite satisfactory to my mind. You will remember that James says:--

“Thou believest that there is one God: thou doest well; the demons also believe, and tremble” (James ii. 19).

This is what I call “historic faith” as distinct from “saving faith”. Yet “faith that believes a testimony” is historic faith, and I am therefore left rather perplexed.

B.—Your perplexity arises out of confusing things that differ. For the moment let us step outside the scope of Scripture and use some everyday illustration. We both believe the testimony of historians as to the date of the Norman Conquest—“1066 William the Conqueror”. Do you call such belief “historic faith”?

A.—Yes, I should, and moreover it is a good illustration that “historic faith” differs from “saving faith”, for no one can be the better for believing “1066 William the Conqueror”.

B.—Let us try again. Demons believe that there is one God, some men do the same, but that belief saves neither demons nor men. Why is this?

A.—I cannot quite see.

B.—Well, I think the most obvious reason is that nowhere in Scripture does salvation depend upon believing that there is one God. It is not the “faith” but the *object* of faith that makes the difference. If I believe that “Jesus died and rose again”, that is “historic faith”, and you will remember that throughout the “Acts” and in many of the epistles evidences and witnesses are brought forward to prove that death and resurrection to be an historic fact. Now how is it that if I really believe that “Jesus died and rose again” such faith bring salvation, whereas believing another historic fact of Scripture, viz., “there is one God”, does no such thing?

A.—Is there not more than mere history in the death and resurrection of Christ?

B.—There you touch upon the difference, though possibly you do not mean just what I see. When I believe the historic fact that “Jesus died and rose again”, it is impossible to

believe *that* and to deny that when He *died* He died for our sins, or that when He *rose* He rose because of our justifying. So far as the “faith” is concerned there is no difference, but so far as the subject of faith is concerned there is.

No gospel of salvation attaches to “1066 William the Conqueror”, therefore though my faith in the accuracy of that date leaves nothing to be desired, it produces nothing. Salvation from sin and death was the very purpose of the death and resurrection of the Son of God, and it is quite impossible for anyone to believe the historic fact of the death and resurrection and deny the purpose and the results of that death and resurrection. This it is that makes “*historic* faith” “*saving* faith”, and not anything attaching to faith itself.

A.—Do we not read that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him? Does not this statement overturn yours?

B.—Whether it is within the power of natural man to overcome the bias and enmity of his unregenerate heart is one thing, and whether the faith exercised in believing the testimony of God which is said to be “greater than the testimony of man” is different in its nature from believing any accredited testimony is another.

A.—I think I begin to see where we have differed. You do not deny the inability of the natural man to believe God, you agree that apart from grace he never will, but what you do deny is that when by grace a man does believe the testimony of God, it is only what any reasonable creature should have done long before.

B.—When Scripture affirms that the natural man cannot receive the things of God, it does not mean that the natural man cannot understand, read, hear, ponder or think, but that seeing that his understanding is *darkened*, his heart *hardened*, his intelligence subjected to *vanity*, he can no more believe the testimony of God than he can perform the right acts that even his own conscience indicates. The very simplicity of faith is the severest condemnation of sin and natural man.

We must pursue the subject further, however, so that we may obtain an all-round view of this important subject.