

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 XXXIV.

1947 - 1948

The Berean Publishing Trust,
52a, Wilson Street, London EC2A 2ER.
U.K.

DEAR FELLOW-BELIEVERS,

By the grace of God and with loyal fellowship of our readers, we have been enabled to complete the present volume, and with it thirty-nine years of testimony to the truth of the mystery.

A glance at the Index will show that the claims of “right division” have been recognized, and that the right division of the Word of truth does not cramp or limit us, but enables us to believe and enjoy “All Scripture”.

The signs of the times indicate that the time for this testimony is short. The last members of the one body are being gathered out, and it is our prayer that *The Berean Expositor* may still be blessed to the enlightenment of those who seek to know “What is the hope of His calling”, while the day of grace continues.

Yours in “that blessed hope”,

CHARLES H. WELCH,
GEORGE T. FOSTER,
L. A. CANNING.

INDEX

ALL MY SPRINGS ARE IN THEE--	
The confession of Asaph and of Peter	25
“With Thee is the Foundation of Life” (Psa. xxvi. 9)	27
“Broken cisterns” (Jer. ii. 13)	29
“In Christ Jesus”	31
ATONEMENT, THE--	
Examination and justification of the word “atonement” in A.V. of Rom. i. 1	34
The “Blessedness” of “Covered Sin” (Psa. xxxii. 1)	37
<i>Kaphar</i> , since Gen. xi. means “to propitiate”	40
BEARING OF THE CONTEXT ON WELL-KNOWN PASSAGES, THE--	
“Light affliction” and the “Weight of glory”	44
“We glory in tribulations” (Rom. v. 3)	44
“Concerning zeal, persecuting the church” (Phil. iii. 6)	45
COMPARING SPIRITUAL THINGS WITH SPIRITUAL--	
The presence and absence of the name “Paul” in Hebrews and Ephesians	47
The words “Gentile”, “Fathers” and “People” in Hebrews and Ephesians	50
Angels (Hebrews), Principalities (Ephesians)	53
The use of O.T. Scripture and of Redemption	55
High Priest in Hebrews; Head in Ephesians	60
EPHESIA--	
The verbal adjective <i>pistos</i> —“Faithful”	16
FOUNDATION DAY MEETINGS, 29TH MAY	17
FUNDAMENTALS OF CHRISTIAN PRACTICE--	
Prayer doctrinally and dispensationally considered, First part	63
Prayer doctrinally and dispensationally considered, Second part	70
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
ISAIAH: The theme of the two “servants” introduced (xl. 22 - xlii. 17)	76
“Judgment unto TRUTH”; “Judgment unto VICTORY” (xlii. 1-4)	83
The Covenant for Israel; the Light for the Gentiles (xl. 12 - xlii. 17)	88
Restoration Promised, Conditioned, Foreshadowed (xlii. 18 - xlv. 15);	
Restoration Promised (xlii. 18 - xliii. 9)	89
The Lamb of God (lii. 13 - lvi. 8);	
The Material sorted and the structure of lii. 13 - liii. 12 discovered	92
“Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him” (lii. 13)	96
“GUESTS” OR “STRANGERS”?--	18

What is the true translation of Eph. ii. 12?	18
IN LOVING MEMORY – FREDERICK PETER BRININGER	15
GOSPEL OF JOHN, THE--	
The link between the third and fourth sign (v. 16-47)	99
The Sabbath and Sabbatarianism	99
The relationship of the Son	104
Equality of honour of the Father and the Son established	109
The Quickening or the Raising of the dead	113
Life in Himself. All judgment	118
MITSRACH: “TOWARD THE SUNRISING”	123
NEHEMIAH--	
Foreword	126
Prayer, Providence and Provision	130
“SEARCH AND SEE”--	
Pentecost and the Mystery	133
SECOND SPHERE OF BLESSING, THE--	
The subject introduced	141
The City described	145
SELF-DRAWN PORTRAIT OF THE APOSTLE PAUL, THE--	148
SIGN OF THE TIMES	13
SIMILARITIES DO NOT CONSTITUTE IDENTITY	6
SOME TITLES OF SCRIPTURE--	
The Word of God	14
SOUL SLEEP--	
The Companion Bible and Orthodoxy	8
THOROUGHLY FURNISHED (II Tim. iii. 17)--	
The text and its context	151
The fourfold equipment of the Man of God	156
“The Man of God”	160
The furnishing, and its completeness	165

TIME AND PLACE--	
The purpose of the ages implied in Gen. i. 1	169
Before the overthrow, and since the age-times Gen. i. 2	171
The seven days of Gen. i. 2 - ii. 2	174
The site of the Garden of Eden Gen. ii. 8-14	176
The land of Nod, the city of Enoch (Gen. iv. 16, 17)	179
The first registry of births and deaths (Gen. v. - vii. 6)	181
The Chronology and typical dates of the Flood (Gen. vii., viii.)	183
TIMOTHY, THE SECOND EPISTLE TO--	
"According to my gospel" (ii. 8, 9)	186
The faithful saying: the difference between living and reigning with Christ (ii. 10-13)	190
ii. 14-26. The structure of the passage, and the warning of v. 14	195
The approved of God— <i>Spoudazo</i> (study), <i>paristemi</i> (shew), and <i>dokimos</i> (approved)	199
The unashamed workman; and right division (ii. 15)	202
The unashamed workman; his attitude to error and evil (ii. 16)	205
TOOLS FOR THE UNASHAMED WORKMAN--	
Translations	209
TRUST--	
The removal of fear (Psa. lvi. 3)	213
The fixed heart (Psa. cxlii. 7)	214
The directed way (Prov. iii. 5, 6)	215
TRUTH FOR THE TIMES--	
The Prison Epistles are and teach "The Truth"	218
The Prison Epistles teach "Truth for the Times"	222
TRUTH IN THE BALANCE--	
"The root of the righteous yieldeth fruit" (Prov. xii. 12)	227
The Place of "works" before and after salvation	229
The Scriptural relationship of the epistles of Paul and the epistle of James	232
By works was faith perfected, and Gen. xv. "fulfilled" (James ii. 22, 23)	236
The "presentations" and "inheritance" of Colossians compared	240
The deity and humanity of the Son of God	242
WORSHIP--	
Due to God as "Our Maker" (Psa. xcv. 6)	245
Worship in the beauty of holiness (Psa. xcvi.)	248
Worship and the exaltation of the Lord	251
Reference to worship in the Gospels	254
Neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem	257

Similarities do not constitute Identity.

pp. 7, 8

*(An important principle of interpretation
considered and commended to all true "Bereans").*

On pages 173 to 177 of Volume XXXIII, we attempted to answer an objection that had been made to our teaching, based upon the incidence in Hebrews of words or expressions similar to others found in Ephesians. This objection was expressed in a letter, from which we gave an unedited extract. If this extract does not accord with a booklet since published by the writer of the letter, it will be understood that such variation, while within his rights, cannot reflect upon our own integrity.

The reasoning that underlies this method of examination is fallacious in that it discovers similarities but interprets them as identicals. Whether they are concerned with the problem put forward in the article referred to or not, we believe it would be a "word in season" to all our readers if this fallacious argument was exposed, because principles of interpretation are fundamental to all understanding, and should occupy a prominent place in the Christian worker's equipment.

The principle stated: Similarities, however many, cannot constitute identity in the presence of one proved contrary. This may sound rather involved, but the following illustration may convince of its essential truth.

The principle illustrated: Here is a supposed description, circulated by the police, of a wanted man:

"A man, past middle age, height 5'7½", dark hair, slightly grey at temples, eyes grey, complexion pale, aquiline features, tendency to stoop, interested in art and music, editor of a religious paper; last known place of residence, London, S.W."

The reader who is personally acquainted with the editor of *The Berean Expositor*, will recognize the foregoing as a fairly good description of him. Now, let us further suppose that the police, acting upon information, take the editor into custody. He is examined point by point, and found to tally with the description. Surely some would say, "This is the man!" *If a list of similarities proves identity*, then the prospects before the editor look rather bleak.

As we have seen, the believer may put into a parallel columns words found in Hebrews and Ephesians, and say, in effect, "These prove identity", "This is the same calling", but, happily, the police do not mistake similarities for identity. One clear

statement of fact that introduces a contrary, sets aside columns of similarities in the matter of identity. The editor of *The Berean Expositor* would have had not the slightest qualm in going up for examination, for he was in possession of one essential fact which disproved his identity with the criminal concerned: the wanted man was *born in New York*, whereas the editor was *born in London*. We cannot conceive that any official would interpose and say, "We are not concerned with where this man was born, we are more concerned with the many items of similarity. *He must be the man.*"

Alas, the children of this generation are often wiser than the children of light, and would at once admit that one established contrary destroys assumed identity based on many similarities. "Similar" is not the "same".

In Ephesians we discover a revelation never before made known; a choice from "before the foundation of the world"; a calling "far above all"; a unique position, "seated together in heavenly places". Any one of these is a "contrary" to the revelation, the choice, the calling, or the position revealed in Hebrews.

One item alone in Hebrews is enough to destroy any attempt to make the callings of the two epistles identical. Embedded in the heart of Hebrews is "The New Covenant", and this one fact is so foreign to the whole teaching of Ephesians as to cancel any number of similarities, if they are used with the object of establishing identity.

We will not occupy valuable space with further illustrations of this principle, for we believe it is obvious. The reader can work out other illustrations by, for example, noting that the "ransom" occurs in Matthew and in I Timothy, and disprove the conclusion that the callings of Matthew and I Timothy must therefore be identical. In this case the emphasis on the *Gentile* in the epistle, and the emphasis of *Israel* in the gospel provide the "contraries".

Parallel passages abound in Scripture, but, instead of impinging on the domain of other callings, they, like those of Euclidean geometry, never meet. Let us "try the things that differ"; let us "rightly *divide* the word of truth". We shall then approve the things that are more excellent, and be workmen who need not be ashamed.

“Soul Sleep.”

The Companion Bible and Orthodoxy.

pp. 61 - 65

If it is to be truly profitable, all true ministry must be “a word in season”, and it is not possible nor expedient to attempt to teach all the truth, or witness to every doctrine, at any one time.

The fact that within a week we have received more than one enquiry concerning the teaching of Scripture regarding death as a sleep, leads us to see that it would be a word in season to devote some of our limited space to a consideration of this subject. In the first place let us turn to John xi. 14: “Jesus said unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead” (*Lazaros apethane*). The Greek verb here translated “is dead” is from *apothnesko*. As John xi. 21 and 41 will show, the word *thnesko* means “to die”. “The addition of the prefix *apo* intensifies the conception representing the actions of the simple verb as consummated and finished, to die out, to expire, to become quite dead” (*Dr. E. W. Bullinger’s Lexicon*). In John viii. 52 we read “Abraham is dead” (*Abraham apethane*). Here therefore is fact #1: Lazarus was as literally and completely dead as was Abraham.

In the second place let us turn to Luke viii. 52. There we read “She is not dead” (Greek *ouk apethanen*). Here we have the negative “not”, which sets before us the exact opposite of the proposition made in John xi. Here therefore is fact #2: “She is not dead.”

Now we find that many use the words of Luke viii. 52 to deny or belittle the language of John xi. 14, but by so doing they are making Christ contradict Christ, which is impossible. The third fact (#3) therefore which emerges, and which demands acceptance, is, that Lazarus *was* dead and the little maid was *not*; both statements must be accepted, and neither contradicts the other.

In the fourth place, we are reminded that in both passages the word “sleep” occurs, and this is brought forward as a proof that Lazarus was not really dead. But when we “open the book” and “search and see” we discover that this “proof” is based on the supposition that the Greek word for “sleep” in both passages is identical. This, however, is not the case:

“Our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*”, Greek *koimaomai* (John xi. 11).

“She is not dead but *sleepeth*”, Greek *katheudo* (Luke viii. 52).

These two words represent two distinct thoughts; they are used with purpose, and recorded by inspiration of God. Those who desire the truth will adhere to the words that the Lord chose; those who wish otherwise will probably pay little or no attention to the essential difference between them. The word in John xi. 11 is used in the passive and

means “To fall asleep involuntarily”, consequently it is used of death. The word in Luke viii. 52 is active, and means “To compose oneself to sleep”. A good illustration of the essential difference between the two words occurs in the first epistle to the Thessalonians. In iv. 13-15 we read of them which “sleep”, and these believers are spoken of as “them which sleep in Jesus” (verse 14) and “the dead in Christ” (verse 16). Moreover these are contrasted with those who are “alive and remain”. In these passages the word consistently used is *koimaomai*, for this “sleep” means “death”.

In I Thess. v., however, *katheudo* is used, and not *koimaomai*:

“Let us not *sleep*, as do others” (verse 6).

“They that *sleep*, *sleep* in the night” (verse 7).

“Whether we wake of *sleep*” (verse 10).

Were the word “sleep” here synonymous with death, we should be able to restate verse 6 as follows: “Therefore let us not die as do others”! but, alas, we have no such option. The word “sleep” finds its synonym, not in death, but in “drunkenness”, its contrast in being “sober”.

The reader of the A.V. should remember that the words “watch” in I Thess. v. 6 and “wake” in verse 10 are the same. The original word is *gregoreo*, and is translated “be vigilant” once, “wake” once, “watch” twenty times, and “watchful” once; consequently I Thess. v. 10 should read, “Who died for us, that, whether we be watchful or drowsy, we should live together with Him”, although, of course, other scriptures make it plain that the unwatchful believer may not be granted to “*reign* with Him”, a doctrine not in view in the chapter before us.

Here therefore is fact number four (#4); that two essentially different ideas are presented by the two different words translated “sleep” in Luke viii. and John xi., and must therefore not be confounded.

There is however one further statement in Luke’s Gospel that demands attention. It is, “And her spirit came again” (Luke viii. 55). It is to Mark’s account of the raising of Jairus’ daughter that we are indebted for the fact that on that occasion (Mark v. 41) the Saviour spoke Aramaic, not Greek, from which it is clear that her parents and those concerned were acquainted with the Hebrew scriptures, and familiar with its idiom. Having that in mind, let us refer to I Sam. xxx. 11, 12, where we read:

“And they found an Egyptian in the field, and brought him to David, and gave him bread, and he did eat; and they made him drink water; and they gave him a piece of a cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins: and when he had eaten, HIS SPIRIT CAME AGAIN to him.”

This passage proves that the expression used in Luke viii. 55 does not necessitate death.

We learn therefore that Lazarus was actually dead, whereas, while the family and friends of the little maid *thought* she was dead, they were mistaken. The word used of

Lazarus meant “to fall asleep involuntarily”, whereas the word used of the little maid meant “to sleep”, not as the dead, but as those who were in a coma or heavy sleep.

Untrammelled by these subsidiary considerations we can now face the scriptural fact that the dead are said to be asleep. Even the heathen poets, of necessity well acquainted with their mother tongue, realized that the figure of “sleep”, as used of death, implied a subsequent awakening, and so we find them continually adding the epithets “perpetual”, “eternal”, “unawakened”, “brazen”, to the word “sleep”, in order to *exclude* the idea of awakening natural to it. *Estius* says “sleeping is thus applied to men that are dead, and this because of the hope of resurrection; for we read no such thing of brutes”. The early Christians rightly called their burying places *koimeterion*, “sleeping places”, from which comes the English cemetery.

To the believer who is prepared to accept whatever may be the teaching of the inspired Word, these passages are of themselves sufficient proof that in the Scriptures death is likened to sleep, and because the Scriptures are true, and no figure employed by them can be misleading, the two words “sleep and awaken”, used to indicate “death and resurrection”, leave no room for a conscious interval, where, it is taught, the disembodied dead are more alive than they were in this life.

In order that no unexplained difficulty shall be permitted to becloud the issue, we can now return to John xi.

“He whom Thou lovest is sick” (John xi. 3).

“This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified” (John xi. 4).

We have already seen the Lazarus died, and the record of his burial follows. The words “not unto death” cannot therefore means that our Saviour was mistaken. We may learn the intent behind these words by comparing them with another comment found in John:

“Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him” (John ix. 2, 3).

In this passage the Lord is not teaching that the man or his parents were the exceptions to the universal rule, and were sinless. He was teaching that this special calamity of blindness was allowed, or even planned, in order that, by the miracle of his healing, the works of God, that set Him forth to be the Messiah, should be made manifest. So, also, the sickness of Lazarus, though it ended in actual death, had a greater purpose in it, namely the glorifying of God and of His Son. In verse 14 of John xi. we read, “Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead”.

“*Plainly (parrhesia).*”—Four times this word occurs in John’s Gospel as the translation of the Greek *parrhesia*, and in each case it is used in the explanation of a parable or proverb.

“If Thou be the Christ, tell us *plainly*” (x. 24).

“Then said Jesus unto them *plainly*, Lazarus is dead” (xi. 14).

“These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you *plainly* of the Father” (xvi. 25).

“His disciples said unto Him, Lo, now speakest Thou *plainly*, and speakest no proverb” (xvi. 29).

In John x. 6, in allusion to the previous verses regarding the fold, the shepherd and the robber, this word *paroimia*, “proverb”, is translated “parable”. This “proverb” is then “plainly” stated in John x. 7-18. When therefore the Lord said “plainly”, “Lazarus is dead”, He was but explaining the meaning of the figure “sleep”.

The reader will probably be alive to the fact that death, conceived of as a sleep from which there is no awakening until the resurrection, is so contrary to the teaching of many who have embraced the unscriptural teaching known as “The immortality of the soul”, and its consequent sequel “The intermediate state” (with, incidentally, all the encouragement that such false teaching gives to “Spiritism”) that so-called orthodoxy is obliged to stoop to the use of questionable methods in order to prevent the seeker after truth from finding it. Here, for instance, is a review, published in 1946, of *The Companion Bible*:

“COMPANION BIBLE, bearing no author’s name but well known to be the work of Dr. Bullinger, gives the A.V., very much that is helpful and of literary value. Had it contained only orthodox matter it would have been a valuable book of reference. We must add that only students or those grounded in the faith should handle, as references and notes abound with Dr. Bullinger’s views of “Soul sleep”, “Hell, the grave”, “Prison Epistles” and other dangerous theories, especially in the appendices. *Do not invest in this book*” (the italics are the author’s).

The reader will observe the term “Soul sleep”. *Dr. Bullinger* repudiates the term, saying that he did not know what it meant. Anyone who knew the meaning of the word “soul”, as taught by Scripture, would never use such an expression, but it is good enough to frighten the timid seeker.

The reader will moreover notice the appropriation of the title “orthodox” by those who thus criticize and condemn “The Companion Bible”. If we set out to discover what this “orthodoxy” is, and where its seat of authority is to be found, we shall be driven to the Bible and the Bible only.

Shall we say that orthodoxy is found only in that Church “by law established”? If so, then those whose criticisms have just been quoted will be found very unorthodox. Are Wesleyans, Baptists, Congregationalists and Brethren orthodox? What would happen to such a company if one should follow the lead of Paul when he observed that one part of the Sanhedrin were Pharisees and one part Sadducees? What an exhibition of “orthodoxy” would follow a few questions direct to such an assembly! This appeal to so-called orthodoxy is a confession of weakness. Let all such come out plainly and appeal only and solely to the teaching of the Scriptures and the field will be cleared of cant.

We can well understand the fears of “orthodoxy” if an enquirer should turn to Appendix 13 of “The Companion Bible”. There the 754 occurrences of the Hebrew word *nephesh* are tabulated and analysed. In an introduction of this list *Dr. Bullinger* says:

“This Appendix will exhibit all the varieties of translation; and while it is not intended to teach either Theology or Psychology, it will give such information as will enable every Bible reader to form his own views and come to his own conclusions on an important subject, about which there is such great controversy.”

It is such an exhibition of the facts that “orthodoxy” would smother with pious warnings.

Orthodoxy has put many a saint of God to death, and those whose opinions we have cited would necessarily be obliged to class *Tyndale* among the heretics, for he says:

“I marvel that Paul did not comfort the Thessalonians with that doctrine if he had wist it, that the souls of their dead had been in joy; as he did with the resurrection that their dead should rise again. If the souls be in heaven in as great glory as the angels, show me what cause be of the resurrection” (*Tyndale*).

Inasmuch as both the A.V. and the R.V., together with all translations and versions since the days of *Tyndale*, bear the impress of that man of God, the “orthodox” would be well advised to warn any but those who are “grounded in the faith” against reading the Bible at all.

May the Lord ever keep us free from the blinding power of tradition, and ever lead us in our intentions to base all our doctrine squarely upon what is “written”, leaving “orthodoxy” to its inglorious emulation of the Scribes and Pharisees who made void the Word of God that they might keep the traditions of the elders.

Signs of the Times.

p. 80

“Yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, they have *fulfilled* them in *condemning* Him” (Acts xiii. 27).

These tragic words come into mind when we read that Dr. E. W. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, writes in his recent book that the stories of the Virgin Birth have “a pagan background”. Of the miracles he writes that man is naturally superstitious but science has proved that nothing can happen contrary to observed sequences of the laws of nature; and concerning the record of the crucifixion and of the resurrection he writes that myth and marvel steadily become more in evidence as the story moves to the burial and resurrection, and “we are in the domain of religious romance, not religious history”.

Bishop Barnes, however, is unconsciously confirming the truth of Paul’s epistle to Timothy, where he says:

“The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto myths” (II Tim. iv. 3, 4).

(“*The Rise of Christianity*” by Dr. E. W. Barnes,
published on 24/3/47 by Longmans as reviewed in the “*News Chronicle*” of that date.)

Some Titles of Scripture.

#11. The Word of God.

p. 120

Where this title occurs in the N.T. it is the translation of either *logos* or *rhema*:

“Not as thought the word of God hath taken none effect” (Rom. ix. 6).

(Here the word used in *logos*.)

“Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Rom. x. 17).

(Here the word used in *rhema*.)

Logos always retains some element of its original meaning, that of a *logical account*. The word “reasonable” in Rom. xii. 1 is *logikos*, and a “reason” in I Pet. iii. 15, is *logos*, while “account” in Rom. xiv. 12 is also *logos*.

“*Rhema*, like *logos*, always keeps in view the substance of what is said, but differs from *logos* in bringing into prominence the fact that something is uttered, and thus denotes the *word* as the expressed *will*, while *logos* denotes the expressed *thought*” (*Cremer*).

In Loving Memory

p. 141

It is with a profound sense of loss that we record the falling asleep in Christ, on 27th November, 1947, at his home in Amersham, Bucks., of our beloved brother

FREDERICK PETER BRININGER

The fellowship now broken by death, and which reached to within one month of forty years, was as unique as it was full. Without in any sense undervaluing the unstinted fellowship which has been extended to us during all these years of endurance for the faith, we believe we can say without reserve of our brother's loyal friendship:

"I have no man like-minded."

We who are left bow in the presence of infinite Wisdom, and know that we shall honour his memory best by a deeper consecration of ourselves to the furtherance of that truth for which the best years of Mr. Brininger's life were so unselfishly devoted.

It is with some sense of ultimate triumph, even in our present sense of loss and sorrow, that we use the language of the Apostle in our tribute to his memory:

*"I have finished my course,
I have kept the faith."*

EPHESIA.

#13. pp. 161, 162

“Faithful”, *pistos*. This word is a “verbal adjective” derived from *peithein*, “to persuade”. By an “adjective” grammarians mean, “A word with a noun to distinguish or describe the thing named or spoken of”. The Latin word *adjectivum* means “added to”. Adjectives derived from verbs are called “verbal adjectives”, as is *pistos*.

Adjectives are divided into three classes:--

- (1) *Quality*. The *large* house; The *good* man.
- (2) *Quantity*. *Much* rain; *Few* saved.
- (3) *Demonstrative*. *The* man; *This* house; A book.

Pistos may be used either actively or passively. Accordingly we find the word used actively in such passages as

- “Be not faithless but *believing*” (John xx. 27).
“A Jewess, and *believed*” (Acts xvi. 1, lit. *A believing Jewess*).

There are, however, but few occurrences of this active usage in the N.T (John xx. 27; Acts xvi. 1; II Cor. vi. 15; I Tim. iv. 3, 10, 12; v. 16; vi. 2). In the majority of cases the word is used passively, “faithful”, and *pistos* occurs only in the passive, and usually translates fifty-three times. In the Hebrew *Emum* (Amen). It is fairly obvious, that *pistos* could not be translated “believing” in such passages as:--

- “But God is *faithful*” (I Cor. x. 13);
“But as God is *true*” (II Cor. i. 18);
“This is a *faithful* saying” (I Tim. i. 15);
“*Faithful* high Priest” (Heb. ii. 17).

The word occurs nine times in the Prison Epistles, as follows:--

- “The faithful in Christ Jesus” (Eph. i. 1);
“Faithful minister” (Eph. vi. 21);
“The faithful brethren” (Col. i. 2);
“A faithful minister” (Col. i. 7, iv. 7);
“A faithful . . . brother” (Col. iv. 9);
“Faithful men”, “Faithful saying”. “He abideth faithful” (II Tim. 2, 11, 13).

“The Saints” therefore are “the faithful”, and both are “in Christ Jesus”. The double title suggests their twofold calling. As saints they have been redeemed, called, sanctified and assured of glory but this does not mean that because salvation is not *of* works it is not *unto* works. Those who are thus called and sanctified are expected to respond. They rise and walk in newness of life and this is largely expressed in “faithfulness”, and related to service.

Foundation Day Meetings, May 29th.

p. 162

Among the signs of the times that have a close connection with the present dispensation are those which are foretold by Paul in the second epistle to Timothy.

In chapter iii. he enumerates among other perils that beset the truth in the last days, “Truce-breakers” and “Traitors”, and in chapter iv. reveals the dread consequences of this betrayal of trust. We are living in the closing days of this dispensation, and betrayal of truth now takes the place of the betrayal of Christ by Judas.

The Berean Forward Movement is a sacred trust, and in order that the truth entrusted shall be preserved inviolate, we hold every year in the month of May “Foundation Day Meetings”, where the four basic tenets of the trust are reaffirmed and made public.

We appeal to all of like precious faith to do their utmost to stand by us in this endeavour to “Guard the good deposit”. The foundation day meetings will be held at 3.0 and 6.0 with an interval for light refreshments.

Those responsible for the provision of the refreshments would be greatly helped if those who hoped to partake would send a post card, as no extra food is allocated by the authorities.

“Guests” or “Strangers”?

What is the true translation of Eph. ii. 12?

pp. 179 - 182

If the reader consults the A.V. or the R.V. of Eph. ii. 12, he will read “strangers from the covenants of promise”. The only alteration that J. N. D. makes in his translation is to read “strangers to the covenants of promise” instead of “strangers from”. Rotherham reads exactly as the A.V. Weymouth translates the passage:--

“With no share by birth in the covenants which are based on the Promises.”

These five versions of the N.T. differ from one another in several particulars, but, apparently, none of the Editors seem to have felt it necessary to translate *xenos* by “guest”, in Eph. ii. 12. The fact that there is this unanimity however, is not proof of accuracy, and the *Berean Expositor* would be the last to refuse an examination of any rendering put forward in good faith. The matter is important, for at least two reasons.

First. Quit apart from its possible bearings upon our own hope or calling, we should be zealous for the truth, and jealous of the truth, earnestly desiring as near as is humanly possible, a translation in our own tongue that shall express the meaning of the original.

Secondly. Coming as the word does in a context that deals with the status of the Gentile before the revelation of the mystery, the whole passage must be coloured by the translation adopted, and must influence our minds and our teaching concerning the constitution of the church of the One Body.

The first thing we must do is to note the occurrences of the word in the N.T. The Greek word under consideration is *Xenos*, and occurs fourteen times.

Matt. xxv. 35, 43.	“I was a stranger.”
Matt. xxv. 38, 44.	“When saw we Thee a stranger?”
Matt. xxvii. 7.	“The potter’s field, to bury strangers in.”
Acts xvii. 18.	“A setter forth of strange gods.”
Acts xvii. 21.	“All the Athenians and strangers which were there.”
Rom. xvi. 23.	“Gaius mine host.”
Eph. ii. 12.	<i>The passage under consideration.</i>
Eph. ii. 19.	<i>This passage also goes with Eph. ii. 12.</i>
Heb. xi. 13.	“Strangers and pilgrims.”
Heb. xiii. 9.	“Divers and strange doctrines.”
I Pet. iv. 12.	“As though some strange thing happened.”
III John 5.	“To the brethren, and to strangers.”

It is evident that the five references found in Matthew can have no other meaning than “stranger”, a “stranger” can only become a “guest” if he is “taken in”, such a meaning is not resident in the word itself. The “strange” gods of Acts xvii. 18, and the “strange thing” of I Pet. iv. 12, allow of no alteration. The believers mentioned in Heb. xi. 13,

were most certainly “strangers” and not “guests”. The “resident strangers” at Athens, are very like the “strangers of Rome” (Acts ii. 10) and cannot be translated “guests”. In Rom. xvi. 23, we have the word *xenos* translated “host”. This can only be justified if the word is used figuratively, for no one would suggest using the translation “host” in any of the thirteen references given above.

Eustathius says, concerning this usage of *xenos*,

“Both he who entertained and he who was entertained were called *xenos*, in respect of each other.”

Parkhurst says of this word:

“Properly, a person who belonging to one country, dwells or sojourns in another, a stranger, foreigner.” “In a more general sense, a stranger, a person of another nation of religion.” “As an adjective, strange, foreign, wonderful.”

The transition from the idea of “stranger” to “hospitality” is natural, and this has taken place, but because this is so, that does not justify the substitution of “guest” for the translation “stranger” unless the evidence of the context be overwhelmingly in its favour.

Cremer, in his Biblico-Theological Lexicon does not treat of *xenos* except to place it as a synonym with *paroikos*.

Paroikeo, in Biblical Greek means, according to Cremer,

“Strangers who dwell anywhere, without citizen rights or home title.”

Paroikia only in Biblical and patristic Greek.

- (a) Dwelling as a sojourner in a foreign land without home or citizen rights;
- (b) A foreign country as the dwelling place of him who has no home rights there.

Paroikos expresses a conception capable of many applications. Guest of God (Lev. xxv. 35), earthly homelessness (Psa. cxix. 19), etc.

The LXX uses *xenos* to translate the following Hebrews words,

- (1) Traveller, *helek* (II Sam. xii. 4). This word means primarily to go, or to walk, and so by an easy transition it becomes a tax, custom or duty, laid on ports or ways. Should the reading *arach* be preferred here, there is no essential difference, *arach* meaning “To go in a track” and as a noun, “a common road, highway; a traveler”.
- (2) Stranger *Gur* (Job xxxi. 32). To sojourn, to dwell anywhere for a time, to live as not at home. Translated “alien” in Exod. xviii. 3, associated with the name *Gershon*.
- (3) Stranger, *Nokri* (Ruth ii. 10). A foreigner, outlandish. As a verb the word means “to alienate”.
Nekar is used of “the stranger” and “the alien” as contrasted with Israel in Exod. xii. 43; Isa. lx. and lxi. In Lamentations the word is used in a sense very suggestive of Eph. ii. 12.
“Behold our *reproach*, our inheritance is turned to *strangers* our house to *aliens*” (Lam. v. 1, 2).
- (4) Those Bidden *Qara* (I Sam. ix. 13).

This passage indicates that *xenos* is once used in the LXX in the sense of “guest”.

The reader can see for himself that “stranger”, “alien”, “foreigner”, is the primary significance of the word *xenos* and that “guest” and “host” is a derived or secondary meaning.

We now come to Eph. ii. 12 to see what the context demands. The scale is already dipped by the weight of Scripture usage in favour of the translation, “stranger”, and there will have to be very strong reason to justify any alteration.

The phrase under consideration, is in correspondence with another of like import.

“Being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel” (Eph. ii. 12). This alienation finds its dreadful echo in the practical section of the same epistle where we read:--

“That ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God” (Eph. iv. 17, 18).

The reader may have seen in his newspaper some sort of “Quiz” in which general knowledge and intelligence tests are a feature. One such test is that which is known as “Spot the intruder” or some such name, and is generally a collection of words containing one that is outside the category. For example, in such a list of names as Shakespeare, Tennyson, Shelley, Beethoven, Byron, and Browning, it is obvious that “Beethoven” is the intruder, a Musician among Poets. Eph. ii. 11-13 contains a list of words and it will be seen that “Guest” would be an intruder among such words as Gentiles, In the flesh, Uncircumcision, Made by Hands, Without Christ, Aliens, *Guests*, No hope, Without God, In the world and Far off.

Is it conceivable that one who was a “guest” of the covenants of promise could be at the same time Godless, Christless and Hopeless? The church that the apostle has in mind in Eph. ii. is a new thing, created so by God, for the passage in the fifteenth verse that reads “To *make* in Himself of the twain” should be translated “To *create* in Himself of the twain” as the R.V. indicates.

The Church of the mystery is no mere evolution, it is a new creation, and as with all other “New creations” of God, “Former things” pass away, and with that passing of “former things” the dispensational place of the Gentile, whatever it may have been, is swept aside, the new thing completely taking its place.

**Some alterations in the order of certain articles
necessitated by the continued season of austerity.**

p. 182

During the period of the war, we comforted ourselves that with the advent of peace, we should soon be able to revert to a monthly issue of the *Berean Expositor*.

We had hoped that the Workers Training Classes would soon lead to the more definite approximation to a "College" even though we could never hope to fill out the true meaning of that word. While those who have attended these classes have found them a help and a blessing, we ask the prayerful fellowship of all like minded believers to make these classes more widely known and better attended.

The subject for the session May and June is important. It is

THE PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION.

Changes too are necessary in the presentation of the truth (but not, thank God in the Truth itself), and with the new volume which commences with the January number of 1949 certain series with which the reader has grown familiar will have to be discontinued.

It will take another NINETEEN YEARS to print all the articles that we have on hand on John's Gospel! and it will take SEVEN YEARS to finish those on ISAIAH. As there is so much "present truth" that demands a hearing we have reluctantly decided to discontinue the series on John, and to omit all on Isaiah except those on chapter liii.

Those articles which are withdrawn, however, will be kept intact against the day when it might be possible to continue their publication as a series, or to gather them up and reproduce in book form.

**“Thy Pound hath gained Ten Pounds” (Luke xix. 16).
p. 226**

We cannot hope to emulate such stewardship, but in our lesser degree it is a joy to realize that some approximation is open, both to ourselves as publishers and to the reader as having real fellowship in our ventures of faith. In earlier issues of this magazine we confided in our readers, and from them received overwhelming evidence that our desire to save many articles already published in the *Berean Expositor* from oblivion was shared by them. For nearly two years we have been trying to make a commencement with this new and important phase of our publishing, but have been hitherto hindered by reason of paper shortage. At length, as the reader is aware, we have been enabled to place “PARABLE, MIRACLE AND SIGN” and this volume will shortly be available to our readers.

It is with thanksgiving that we now announce that both the necessary funds and the necessary paper have become available, and that negotiations are already afoot for the production of the second volume of this series which will be entitled:

JUST AND THE JUSTIFIER

An exposition of the epistle to the Romans considered Doctrinally,
Dispensationally, and Practically, together with complete structural analysis.

Among the last acts of service rendered so ungrudgingly to the cause of Truth by Mr. Brininger was the preparation of this series for publication in book form. We feel that it will make a fitting memorial to his memory, and his name will appear in the Preface with that intent.

When the reader receives his copy of “Parable” we believe he will find it to be value for money. He may not be so fully aware, however, that for every 8/6 expended in the purchase of this book a large proportion will be returned to the fund to be used again in the production of “Just and the Justifier”. This we believe will commend itself to all who desire to make their money go as far as possible. No salary, no office expenses, no profits are deducted from this sum, and it will be used again and again until used up completely in this particular form of service.

1949

The Apostle James reminded his readers that they “Know not what shall be on the morrow”, and whatever our calling may be or whatever the dispensation under which we live, this limitation is true and the recognition of it is timely. With all our projects and purposes they must be prefaced with hearty approval the words “If the Lord will”.

PENTECOST 1948. This is a date to be remembered, and present day believers may look back upon May 1948 as the most critical period through which they have passed, for it may well be that a line has been drawn across the “times of the Gentiles” where the legs of iron join the feet of clay (Dan. ii.). (*Israel’s independence?*)

Prophecy hinges upon Israel, and Israel have two important phases. At present they are still what is called *Lo-ammi* “Not My people”, but a door of hope is to be opened to this scattered and persecuted people, a door that will give them hope of a national standing once again. True it is that not until they look on Him Whom they pierced will the light dawn and the veil be removed, but that day nevertheless draws near. The vision of the valley of dry bones seen by Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxvii.) may well be receiving its fulfillment before our eyes. As one Jewish delegate said at the Scarborough Conference in May, using a figure of speech that we can all appreciate, “I have been waiting 2000 years” for this.

The Fig tree has begun to put forth its leaves, and therefore we know that summer is nigh. Those of us who rejoice in the calling of the Mystery have no immediate relation to “times and seasons” or with the fulfillment of O.T. prophecy, yet it is evident that if the hope of Israel is near the hope for which we wait must be nearer still. Whether our hope is near or whether much time is yet to elapse before the day of glory dawns is not for us to know, we are assured however that to us, as to those of other callings, the word is “Occupy till I come”.

THE BEREAN EXPOSITOR 1949. As indicated in the May number we have felt that stewardship suggested one or two changes in the type of article that the nature of the times demands. Among them we believe the series on the BOOK OF JOB which we hope will commence in January next will be found timely, and the new approach to that ancient book we trust will be stimulating and helpful. To all those who value light upon the problems and the purpose of the ages these studies we believe will prove invaluable.

Another series of an entirely different character entitled “LESS THAN THE LEAST or treasure in earthen vessels” tells the story of the inception and conflict associated with the *Berean Expositor* and where such detail is likely to be edifying some idea of the early life of the Editor accompanies the record. This series has long been asked for, but up till now private reasons have prevented us from making intimate matters such as these public. Again as space permits we hope to deal with some of the “Signs of the Times” that belong to the dispensation in which we live.

“PARABLE, MIRACLE, AND SIGN.” After nearly two years of enquiry and frustration we have at last been able to place this first of the “Reprints” from early volumes of the *Berean Expositor*, and we hope that a book bearing this title will be ready in the Autumn. The reader will find with the September number an order form, and we sincerely hope that this effort will be encouraged by prompt and free ordering by our readers.

“JUST AND THE JUSTIFIER.” As the back volumes of the *Berean Expositor* go out of print it is all the more needful to encourage this “Reprint” section of our publication department, otherwise teaching that would prove a blessing might be lost to the present generation. When we made a canvass some time ago, some readers expressed their wish that *this* or *that* series should be included in the books reprinted, but without exception everyone included the articles on Romans. These occupied a period of fourteen years and are fundamental to all our teaching. The book would be bulky, running into 500 pages, and at present rates would cost not less than 15/-. We desire very much to produce this work, but hesitate to spend so much of entrusted funds without some assurance that a book at such a price would be readily taken up by our readers.

It would help us considerably if interested friends would send a postcard to Mr. Canning saying that such a venture would receive their support. Much spade work had already been done on these articles by our dear brother Mr. Brininger, and it would be a splendid testimony to his love of the truth if this volume could see the light of day.

pp. 205, 206
(*Italics mine, DHC.*)

All my springs are in Thee.
(Psa. lxxxvii. 7).

#2. The confession of Asaph and of Peter.
pp. 41, 42

“Fountains”, “wells” and “springs” are in constant reference in the Scriptures, where they are used as figures of life, fertility and blessing. This can well be understood when the geography of Palestine is considered. When the land of promise was described by Moses, it was not only called “a land flowing with milk and honey”, but “a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of the valleys and hills” (Deut. viii. 7). The particular word which is translated “springs” in Psalm lxxxvii. is the Hebrew word *mayan*, a word derived from *ayin*, “the eye”, from the supposed resemblance to the eye as “a fountain of tears”, a figure that is found in the Greek language also. These “fountains” may be as vast as those that cause the Deluge, when “the fountains of the great deep were broken up”, or as small as a fountain that waters a garden (Song of Sol. iv. 15), and Isaiah uses the word when he speaks of “the wells of salvation” (Isa. xii. 3). To any who lived in the East, therefore, the joyous exclamation at the close of Psalm lxxxvii. would need no explanation; it would come spontaneously to the mind.

The word *mayan* occurs but five times in the Psalms, and that with a certain evident connection of theme:

***Mayan* in the Psalms.**

- A | lxxiv. 15. Reference to dividing the waters and cleaving the fountains (13-15).
- B | lxxxiv. 6. Valley of Weeping turned to a well in blessing.
- C | lxxxvii. 7. All my springs are in Thee.
- A | civ. 10. Waters rebuked, they fled. Not another deluge. Springs sent (6-10).
- B | cxiv. 8. The sea fled. Water from the rock in blessing.

The figurative use of a spring is common to most languages. In our own tongue it has a number of allied usages. A rising, as of a river; a source of anything; the beginning, as of the day or year; springtime. The act of springing or leaping, and so, the origin of movement, as by a steel “spring”.

To the believer, the Lord Himself is the spring, source and never-failing supply of all his needs, whether temporal or spiritual, and it is to this aspect of the subject that we direct our attention.

To any acquainted with the Scriptures, examples of this blessed fact come readily to the mind. We think of Asaph (Psa. lxxiii.) who had been envious at the apparent prosperity of the wicked and whose faith had been sorely tried, so much so that he had said, “Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency”. The turning point in Asaph’s spiritual experience was the vision he obtained in the sanctuary:

“Until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end.” Asaph, now, could see how it was that he could say, “my feet were *almost* gone; my steps had *well nigh* slipped”—“almost”, “well nigh”, but not quite, for he now confesses, “Thou hast holden me by my right hand”. The wicked still prospered, they still appeared to have “more than heart could wish”, but Asaph’s envy had given place to confident trust, “Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever”. Providential mercies were guaranteed—“Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel”—and a blessed hope awaited fulfillment—“And afterward receive me to glory”. Asaph could surely say, “All my springs are in Thee”.

A New Testament example of this same recognition is provided by Peter. The Lord had revealed Himself as “the True Bread” which had been given by the Father, in contrast with the Manna, which, though given by God and eaten by the fathers in the wilderness, yet did not give those who partook of it everlasting life. Moses gave not that “True Bread”, “for the Bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world”. “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.”

The Lord emphasized that the “True Bread” was not to be considered apart from sacrifice. It involved His very flesh and blood, which, said He, “I will give for the life of the world”. Many of those who heard the Lord on this occasion declared His message to be “a hard saying”, and “many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him”. It was at this point that the test was made; the Lord turned to the twelve and said to them, “Will ye also go away?” Then Peter, with the words of the Psalm, “All my springs are in Thee”, in heart, if not in mind, made the great confession, “To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God” (John vi. 68, 69).

“Whom have I in heaven BUT THEE?”

“TO WHOM shall we go?”

“All my springs are in THEE.”

#3. “With Thee is the Fountain of Life” (Psa. xxvi. 9). pp. 81 - 83

To the believer and the diligent student of Scripture, the statement that God Himself is and must be the Spring and Fountain of all blessing is so obvious a truth as to amount to a truism. This truth is taught by nature and by creation, but it awaits the revelation of Scripture to retranslate these facts into evangelical experiences, and to teach that even though the Ultimate Source of all being and blessing is God, these blessings are mediated to their unworthy recipients through the Person and Work of the Son of His love. Gospel grace does not come to man straight from God, as God; it comes to man as a sinner seeking salvation through God manifest in the flesh. As we read the words of John i. 16 we are reading a N.T. version of the acknowledgment, “All my springs are in Thee”. The passage reads: “And of His fullness have all we received, and grace for grace.”

To appreciate the rich grace here indicated we must go back to the opening of the chapter in which the words occur. Even there, “in the beginning”, when the purpose of the ages was planned and when the redeeming Lamb was foreordained (I Pet. i. 19, 20) we are not taken into the presence of God in the absolute sense, but into the presence of the Mediator, “The Word”, “The Image of the invisible God”, “The express Image of His substance”, of Whom it is written, in the contexts of these several statements:

“All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made” (John i. 3).

“By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible” (Col. i. 16).

“By Whom also He made the worlds (ages)” (Heb. i. 2).

The fabric of creation is the work of His hands, and the ages, during which the Divine purpose shall be attained, are all vested in Him.

Immediately following the statement of John i. that all things were made by Him, come the words of so great import to us, “In Him was life”. Of no creature can it be said that such has “life in itself”; inherent life is the prerogative of Deity. John goes on to say that this life “was the light of men”, revealing that in the beginning, even before man was created, it was Christ (in Whose “image” he was later formed), Who was the Fount and Source of Life, even as, in fullness of time, Christ was revealed to be the Spring of all the graces of redeeming love. But not until the Deity took another step in corresponding love could the Fountain flow in all its fullness to the sons of men; and so we read:

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

Here is the “fullness” out of which we all have received; here is the “grace for grace” that describes its nature.

However, before we further pursue this aspect, let us fortify our understanding by reading what is written concerning this One Who became “flesh”. Was such a descent accompanied by the loss of inherent life? Could it be said of Him Who was found in fashion as a man and Who had actually come to die for sin, that He still had “life in Himself”? Yes, blessed be God, it is so written; we are not left to inference, however sound may be our reasoning.

Because the Saviour had cured a man on the sabbath day, the Jews sought to slay Him, and, instead of placating, He added to their wrath by saying, “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work”. “Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only broken the sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God” (John v. 16-18).

Then follows a series of stupendous claims, any one of which is a wonder, and any one a proof of His Deity. He saw what the Father did, and did “likewise”. He quickened the dead, even as the Father raised up the dead and quickened them. He was the appointed Judge of all men, the Father judging no man. All men were required to give equal honour to the Son as to the Father.

“For, as the Father hath *life in Himself*; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself” (John v. 26).

When He made Himself of no reputation and became man, He necessarily laid aside the insignia and the associations of Deity and, unless it had been revealed, we might have felt that although as “The Word” it could be written “In Him was life”, yet, when He became flesh, this mark of Deity would be absent. For our peace it is not so. As the “Son” and the “Word became flesh”, He possesses “life in Himself” and so is the Author and Fountain of life to all who believe. When therefore we read: “Of His fullness have all we received”, we know that once again we are at the Source of all life and blessing.

The confessed purpose of John in writing his Gospel is “life” (John xx. 31), and this last reference is the last link in a chain of thirty-six occurrences of *zoe*, “life”, in his Gospel. If to these we add the thirteen occurrences of the word in the first epistle, we have a total of 49, or 7*7, for perfection is indeed found here.

As we trace the use of *zoe* throughout John’s Gospel we find that the goal of the gospel there preached is everlasting life (iii. 15, 16), and that this life is ours only by virtue of the sacrifice of “His flesh, which” said He, “I will give for the life of the world” (John vi. 51). Further, this life is essentially “resurrection life”. Those who receive it “pass from death unto life” (John v. 24), and hear the voice of Him Who said, “I am the resurrection and the life” (John xi. 25).

As we become conscious of our sin and consequent death, and as we perceive the fullness that dwells in Him, can we not, with a full heart, look up to Him Who is Himself “The Way, the Truth and the Life” and say, “All my springs are in Thee”.

#4. “Broken cisterns” (Jer. ii. 13). pp. 121, 122

“*With Thee is the fountain of life*”, said the Psalmist, and this blessed confession formed the basis of our last meditation together. This, sadly, was not the universal attitude of Israel; had it been, they would never have departed so wickedly from their God, nor would they have crucified the Lord of glory.

“My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken Me, the Fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water” (Jer. ii. 13).

The chapter opens with a remembrance of “the love of thine espousals”, when “Israel was holiness unto the Lord” (Jer. ii. 1-3). The chapter ends with Israel as a “gad about” (Jer. ii. 36), a maid that has “forgotten her ornaments”, a “bride that has forgotten her attire”, “trimming” her way to seek illicit love (Jer. ii. 32, 33). Israel’s departure from the Lord is often likened to the sin of adultery and it is with such a figure that Jer. iii. opens.

“What iniquity”, said the Lord, “have your fathers found in Me, that they are gone far from Me, and have walked after vanity and become vain?” (Jer. ii. 5).

Here are the “two evils” of verse 13. Israel went away from the Lord, the Fountains of living waters, “they followed after vanity”, likened to the hewing out for themselves cisterns; “they became vain”, for *these* cisterns could hold no water. So the charge is made throughout the chapter. We will not load the page with verse enumeration—the reader can follow better without—but here are the charges: “They are gone far from Me.” They did not say “Where is the Lord that brought us up out of Egypt?” “They walked after vanity”, “they walked after things that do not profit”, “Thou hast forsaken the Lord thy God when He led thee in the way”. Israel had not only hewn cisterns, instead of turning to the Lord as the Fountain of living waters, but, to change the figure without changing the fact, they had gone down to Egypt “to drink the waters of Sihor”. The Sihor, or Shihor, is a river of Egypt, probably on the southern boundary of Canaan, whose name means “turbid”, or “slimy”. It was to *this* that Israel turned rather than drink of the Fountain of life. Or, again, the prophet demands, “What hast thou to do in the way of Assyria, to drink the waters of the river?” Such is the sad context of this record to departure. Let us now come a little closer to the actual passage. Reduced to its barest simplicity the structure is:

- A | ii. 1-3. Espousals.
- B | ii. 4-37. Remonstrance and Pleading.
- A | iii. 1-11. Adultery.

Lifting out verses 11-18 from a great mass of detail we observe that it falls into the following disposition of subject-matter:--

Jeremiah ii. 11 - 18.

- A | 11. | a | Changed gods.
 b | Yet no gods?
 a | Changed glory.
 b | For no profit?
- B | 12. Be astonished; horribly afraid; very desolate.
- C | 13. Two evils. | c | Forsaken Me, the Fountain.
 d | Hewed cisterns, no water.
- A | 14. | a | Is Israel a servant?
 b | Is he a homeborn slave?
- B | 15, 16. Roar, yell, waste.
- C | 17, 18. Two evils. | c | The Lord. Forsaken.
 d | Water of Egypt in Assyria.

Until we acquaint ourselves with the statement of scripture on the subject, the question of “profit” appears to be somewhat remote as a spiritual motive, yet we observe that it finds a place in the Divine argument. Israel are said to have walked after Baal and those things that “do not profit” (Jer. ii. 8), and, in verse 11, “My people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit”. So in chapter vii. verse 8 we read, “Behold ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit” and, again, in xxiii. 32, lying prophets “shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord”. It is right to ask, “What is the profit?” It is wrong to spend our money for that which is not bread and our strength for nought. The Saviour enforces the same question of profit in Matt. xvi. 26 and again and again Ecclesiastes asks, “What profit” is there in all the labour that man does “under the sun”? It could certainly not be deemed a profitable undertaking that forsook the Fountain of living waters, only to find that the cisterns hewn with such vast labour were useless.

“Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? but My people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit” (Jer. ii. 11).

The reader is urged by the prophet to go over to the isles of Chittim, (probably Cyprus and the north coast line of the Mediterranean), or travel to Kedar, in Arabia: in other words, whether he goes West or East he will not discover such a senseless thing as Israel had done. Israel had followed in the way of the darkened heathen, “changed their glory”, (see Rom. i. 23), and corrupted themselves. Apart from the great labour involved in hewing cisterns out of the rock, the profitlessness of such labour is exposed by the fact that, when hewn, they were found to be “broken” and could “hold no water”. The spiritual teaching behind these figures may be seen when we find the same word, “to hold”, translated “comprehend” in Isa. xl. 12, and “abide” in Joel ii. 11 and Mal. iii. 2. The power of the living God cannot be contained by any man-made medium. The ONE Mediator is Christ; He alone is the Channel through which infinite power and Divine life can pass to man, without harm or fear. In view of the two evils here brought to light let us the more take to ourselves the language of faith:

“Lord, to Whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.”

#5. “In Christ Jesus.”

**“And a river went out of Eden to water the garden;
and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads” (Gen. ii. 10).**

pp. 183 - 185

The Fountain of all being and all blessing is God, but in such overwhelming power that nothing but destruction would be the result of immediate contact with Him. In the person of Christ, infinite Power and Wisdom are *mediated*, and, thus, are found to be full of blessing. No man can look upon the face of GOD and live, yet to see the glory of God *in the face of Jesus Christ* is life. This therefore is our theme.

Over and over again in the epistles, we meet with such expressions as “in Christ”, “in the Lord”, “in Jesus Christ our Lord”, “in Christ Jesus” and other variations of the same blessed truth. These are the “heads” into which the river of life is “parted” for our sakes. Taking the epistles in the canonical order in which they are found in the N.T., the first occurrence of the phrase “in Christ Jesus” is in Rom. iii. 24, where we read “Redemption that is in Christ Jesus”. The phrase does not recur until we come to Rom. viii. There it occurs three times: “No condemnation in Christ Jesus”, “The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus” and the blessed fact that nothing can separate us “from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom. viii. 1, 2 and 39).

The phrase “in Christ Jesus” is found in Ephesians (R.V.) seven times, and is associated with Paul’s apostleship (Eph. i. 1), and “the faithful” (Eph. i. 1). The peculiar privilege, granted alone to the church of the mystery, of being “seated together in heavenly places” is also “in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 6). In the ages to come this favour is to be intensified, for “exceeding riches of grace in His kindness” are to be shown toward us “in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 7), while we are declared to be “His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus” in Eph. ii. 10. Those who were the recipients of such overwhelming grace however, were, by nature, “far off” sinners of the Gentiles, but are “made nigh” in Christ Jesus (Eph. ii. 13). The title “Christ Jesus” is limited to the doctrinal section of Ephesians, the last occurrence being Eph. iii. 21, where the prayer ends in the doxology, “Unto Him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations of the age of the ages. Amen”.

These aspects of truth “in Christ Jesus” lie at the root of the revelation of the mystery but no attempt can be made here to expand their teaching: at the moment all we insist upon is that they are ours only “in Christ Jesus”. Passing over the remainder of Paul’s epistles, we come to II Timothy, where the phrase “in Christ Jesus” occurs seven times. The teaching associated with these seven occurrences will be more appreciated if the passages are seen together. Accordingly we throw them into an alternate correspondence.

“In Christ Jesus” (II Timothy).

- A | i. 1. The Promise of Life.
- B | i. 9. Purpose and Grace. Holy calling, not of works.
- C | i. 13. Form of sound words. Doctrine.
- D | ii. Be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.
- A | ii. 10. Salvation WITH glory.
- B | iii. 12. Persecution and godly living. Practice.
- C | iii. 15. Holy Scriptures. Salvation.

Turning to the briefer phrase “in Christ” we find it used in contrast to being “in Adam” and in other doctrinal and practical associations. It occurs seven times in II Corinthians where the passages may be taken to indicate the character of blessing that was found “in Christ” by the apostle.

The first sounds a note of triumph.

“Now thanks be unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph *in Christ*”
(II Cor. ii. 14, R.V.).

The second avers faithfulness.

“But as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we *in Christ*” (II Cor. ii. 17).

There follows the ministry of the new covenant and contrasts of liberty, life and glory, with the bondage, death and passing glory of the old covenant. Paul tells us that when Israel read the old covenant, a veil is upon their eyes and heart but that this veil “is done away *in Christ*” (II Cor. iii. 14). Pursuing the wondrous theme, he passes from the new covenant to the new creation, saying “Therefore if any man be *in Christ* he is a new creature” (II Cor. v. 17). From the new creation he proceeds to speak of the reconciliation, saying, “God was *in Christ* reconciling the world unto Himself” (II Cor. v. 19). To Paul, salvation was to be found “*in Christ*” and when referring to his conversion and commission, he says, “I knew a man *in Christ* above fourteen years ago” (II Cor. xii. 2). In his last use of this phrase in II Cor. xii. 19 he again refers to his ministry as “speaking before God *in Christ*”. In conclusion let us turn to Eph. i. 1-14, and, instead of limiting ourselves to one title, as “Christ” or “Christ Jesus”, let us observe how the word “in” is used.

The preposition *en*, “in”, occurs nineteen times in Eph. i. 1-14 and is translated “at” (i. 1); “with” (i. 3); “wherein” (i. 6); and sixteen times is rendered by the word “in”. Let us set out these verses, omitting those references that use the word “in” before such terms as “heavenly places” and marking only those which speak of blessing “IN Him”.

“Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful **in Christ Jesus**:

Grace [be] to you, and peace, from God our Father, and [from] the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed [be] the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly [places] **in Christ**:

According as he hath chosen us **in Him** before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the

adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted **in the Beloved. In Whom** we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed **in Himself**: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, He might gather together in one all things **in Christ**, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; [even] **in Him**:

In Whom also we have obtained an inheritance that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted **in Christ**.

In Whom ye also [trusted], after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation:

In Whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.”

Here we see that the faithful in Christ Jesus find in Him Blessing, Choice, Acceptance, Redemption, Inheritance, and Hope; while at the same time and in association with these blessings, we find this great Purpose is *in Him*, and that *in Him* shall be gather together in one all things in heaven and on earth.

As he contemplates such riches of grace and glory, verily, every believer in the truth of the mystery, can exclaim,

“All my springs are in Thee.”

The Atonement.

#1. Wherein the choice of the word “Atonement” in the A.V. of Rom. v. 11 is examined, and fully justified. pp. 108 - 111

The primary object of those responsible for *The Berean Expositor* is a testimony to “The dispensation of the Mystery” and the principle of “right division”. This does not, however, imply any narrowness of outlook or any neglect of the teaching of all Scripture, and a glance through the “Contents” of Volumes I-XXXIII will reveal a lively interest in all the great fundamental doctrines of the faith. Among such doctrines, that must always occupy a prominent place, is the fundamental one of the Sacrifice of Sin. At recurring intervals, articles bearing upon this theme have appeared in these pages, and we sincerely hope that, until the day comes when we lay down our pen for the last time, this most moving and precious doctrine of the Scripture will find a prominent place in our ministry.

The present series of articles will not traverse the ground already covered, but is intended rather to focus attention upon one aspect only of the finished work of Christ. There have been quite a number of “theories of the atonement” put forward, many of them widely different from one another, yet all propounded by sincere believers, and all based upon some one or more aspects of the truth, or upon some one or more key-words of the Old or New Testaments.

“The difficulties in the way of a solution in the case of the doctrine of the Atonement are at least threefold—exegetical, theological and spiritual: and due effect must be given to each of them” (*Dr. J. Scott-Lidgett*).

The exegetical difficulty lies in the problem of interpreting the terms used.

“It was impossible for all these requirements to be met and their difficulties to be overcome when Hebrew teacher was interpreted by Greek philosopher or Latin schoolman, prophet and priest by jurist, ancient seer by modern theologian, with little or no historical and critical sense or apparatus. And many of the most erratic explanations of the Atonement are due primarily to the misunderstandings, incongruities, and faults of proportion of such unequipped and faulty exegesis” (*Dr. J. Scott-Lidgett*).

The theological difficulties in the way of a satisfactory theory of the Atonement have been equally serious. These concern the Person of Christ, His relation to God, the relation of God and Christ to man, and the nature and consequences of sin. And finally, we must not forget that a spiritual apprehension of the revelation of God in Christ is most necessary if we are to arrive at a correct exegesis or a satisfactory theology.

“A comprehensive and painstaking intellect is insufficient. Mental defects are harmful, but still more faults of heart. Yet until the truth of Christ has by a living experience pervaded every faculty, and brought at last the intellect of man into full accord with itself, agreement in a complete doctrine of the Atonement is impossible” (*Dr. J. Scott-Lidgett*).

These are weighty words, and will, we believe, receive the assent of all our readers.

In this series we are not attempting the impossible; we have but one item of truth to examine, and this we must begin to consider in this opening article. The question, then, before us is: Should the word “atonement” be removed from Rom. v. 11? Is it not true that “atonement” means “covering”, and that nowhere in the N.T. do we read that Christ made a “covering” for sin, but rather that He “took away”, or “put away” sin, which it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to do? Should not the word “atonement”, therefore, be reserved for the O.T. sacrifices, and not be used of the one offering of Christ?

The reader will perceive that much is involved in this question, not only the translation offered in the A.V. but the very use of the word “atonement” in connection with the sacrifice of Christ. It will also be observed that in all this there is a desire to honour the Lord, and acknowledge the completeness of His one offering. In fact, it is this that is partly responsible for the objection to the word “atonement” as being too limited. We shall discover eventually that the whole problem revolves around the intention of the Scriptural writers when they used the word *kaphar*, which primarily meant “to cover”, whether we understand this “covering” to be a mere O.T. expedient or regard it as foreshadowed, though never provided, by the O.T. sacrifices, and eventually fully accomplished by Christ. In other words, Does *kaphar* mean “to cover up” or “to atone” and “propitiate”? And is the sacrifice of Christ greater than the O.T. types, or different from them? This most important question will be approached, in this series, in the following sequence:

- (1) An examination of the translation “atonement” in the A.V. of Rom. v. 11
- (2) An examination of the idea expressed by the “covering” of sin.
- (3) An examination of the Septuagint translation of the Hebrews word *kaphar*.
- (4) The bearing upon the subject of “type”, “shadow”, “figure” and “pattern”.

Following this sequence, let us devote the space available in the present article to a consideration of Rom. v. 11: “By Whom we have now received the atonement.” The marginal note indicates that the word could be rendered “reconciliation” and refers to verse 10. It is therefore evident that the A.V. translators were perfectly familiar with the word “reconciliation”, and yet deliberately used the word “atonement”. It would be easy to sweep this rendering aside, but such an attitude would hardly do justice to the fact that the A.V. is the crown of many earlier translations, nor would it exhibit that becoming modesty, that would attribute to these translators *at least* as much common sense and understanding as we ourselves possess. The fact is that the word “atonement” means “reconciliation”, and was in common use at the time of the A.V. translation. It was selected with deliberate intent, and shows that these translators, rightly or wrongly, intended the reader to link this one great “reconciling” sacrifice of Rom. v. with the “atoning” sacrifices of the Levitical law. To the translators of the A.V. the word “atonement” meant no mere “covering”, but “reconciliation”—a fact that even a superficial acquaintance with Elizabethan English makes clear. Surely then we must not set aside the considered testimony of these translators because they used the language of

their own day, or blame them because that language has changed during the three hundred years since. Shall we not rather regret that we cannot to-day use so homely a word as “at one” (written *aton*) to represent concord, friendship, reconciliation, and harmony?

The verb “to atone”, meaning “to reconcile” or “to make one”, is used by Shakespeare as follows:

“He desires to make atonement
Between the Duke of Gloster and your brothers” (*Richard III. i. 3*).

“He and Aufidus can no more atone
Than violentest contrariety” (*Cor. iv. 6*).

“Since we cannot atone you, we shall see
Justice design the victor’s chivalry” (*Richard II. i. 1*).

“I was glad I did atone my countrymen and you” (*Cym. i. 5*).

And by Philpot: “What atonement is there between light and darkness?”

The word “onement” has now dropped out of use, but is found in Wyclif’s writings, and was employed, according to the Oxford Dictionary, in the year 1598 for “atonement”.

The A.V. translators were perfectly right to render the word *katallage* by the, at that time, common word “atonement”, as they were also right to render the same word in Rom. xi. 15 “reconciling”, and in II Cor. v. 18, 19 “reconciliation”. In the same way we find Shakespeare using the word “reconcile” on occasion, whereas in other plays he uses the word “atone”.

“Let it be mine honour that I have reconciled your friends and you.”

The translators of the A.V. would have been perfectly within their rights and have been fully understood by their own generation if they had written:

“For if the casting away of them be the *atonement* of the world” (Rom. xi. 15).

“And all things are of God, Who hath *atoned* us to Himself and hath given us the ministry of the *atonement*, to wit, that God was in Christ *atonement* the world to Himself” (II Cor. v. 18, 19).

Such a rendering only sounds stranger to our ears because we have lost the word that was in common use at that time, but if the A.V. translators had proceeded in this way, the apparent intrusion of the word in Rom. v. 11 would never have been questioned. It is *we*, and not the A.V. translators, who need to be adjusted and rectified.

When the Revisers in 1881 undertook to produce a new version, they substituted for the archaic one a modern word “in equally good use at the time the A.V. was made, and expressing all that the archaism was intended to convey, but more familiar to the modern reader”. They therefore adopted “reconciliation” in Rom. v. 11, but left the sense unaltered. “Atonement” and “reconciliation” are synonymous, the only difference being that “atonement” is English in origin, and “reconcile” Latin.

As things stand, therefore, we incline to the belief that the word “atonement”, so consistently employed in the A.V. to translated the Hebrew word *kaphar*, is used with intention, as meaning “to make one”, “to reconcile”, and that instead of condemning the A.V. translators for introducing the word into Rom. v. 11, we should rather be grateful for the link that they have established between the O.T. types and the N.T. reality.

In our next article we must consider the idea the *kaphar* may mean merely a “covering”, and that the “covering” of sin is a conception far removed from N.T. reality.

**#2. The “Blessedness” of “Covered Sin” (Psa. xxxii. 1).
(With a note on the difference between the etymology
and the usage of words).
pp. 150 - 153**

We have examined Rom. v. 11 as translated by the A.V., we have weighed that translation in the balances of the sanctuary, and we have found it to be justified. Any needed adjustment or rectification must be regarded as necessitated by modern ignorance, the growth and change of language, and not to any failure or fault of those who, in their great work of translating the scriptures over three hundred years ago, used their mother tongue with understanding. We now come to the suggestions, that the word translated “To make atonement”, the Hebrew word *Kaphar*, should always be translated “make a covering”, that such an idea as the “covering” of sin must be kept exclusively to the O.T., that Christ did not “cover” sin, but, “put it away”; and that therefore it is wrong to use the word “atonement” of the one great offering of Christ; that He did something infinitely greater, and entirely different. Once again, the reader will be conscious that very vital issues are at stake. First, let us be factual. Putting aside all theories let us seek an answer to the question; is there a single example in the whole of the O.T. where *Kaphar* is translated “cover”? for it is maintained that

g, yet, somehow, throughout the whole range of the O.T. scriptures, the idea of “covering” anything never occurs. Every reader will know that this hypothetical statement is entirely false. So varied is the idea of “covering” in the O.T. that in the A.V. no less than twenty-three different words, besides their variants and derivations, are translated “cover”. It may nevertheless be objected, that the idea of covering dishes, or heads, or nakedness, or by outstretched wings, or by ashes, or by robes or with gold, etc., would not necessitate the use of *kaphar*; that only such an idea as “covering sin” would meet the case. This is untrue. The first occurrence of *kaphar* and *kopher* mean nothing else than coating planks of wood with pitch (Gen. vi. 14), and if the principle be true that this first occurrence in Genesis settles the sense in all other occurrences, we should naturally assume that the second and only other occurrence of

kaphar in this same book of Genesis, (and consequently before the giving of the law), would be employed in strict accord with this initial meaning.

Let us consider what such a principle of interpretation would lead to. Could we translate Gen. xxxii. 20—the only other occurrence of *kaphar* in the book—by “I will cover his face”, in the same sense in which it was used where covering with pitch was concerned? Surely it is patent to all that between the days of Noah, when *kaphar* was used in its primitive meaning, and the days of Jacob, the word had dropped its initial idea of a mere “covering” and taken upon itself the new meaning, “to appease”, as with a gift. At any rate to this modified meaning the whole of the subsequent books of the O.T. canon conform. The slightest acquaintance with the behaviour of language and the changes that come in the course of time, should have prevented so crude an idea as that a word must always rigidly retain its primary meaning. Many instances of this change in language will occur to every reader. One that has come before our notice at the time of writing will illustrate our meaning. A Dutch correspondent referred to Paul as the one who gave us “the *mere* doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ”. For the moment, this puzzled us, for it was evident from the context that our correspondent intended to convey the idea, that of all the writers in the Bible, Paul was the one who gave us the most complete statement of this doctrine. Yet, we use the word “mere” in a depreciatory sense, and say “a mere trifle” or a “mere covering”. Yet the fact is that the Dutch correspondent was using the word in its Dictionary and Etymological sense, whereas, to-day that is obsolete, its meaning, by usage, being the very reverse. The Oxford Dictionary gives the meaning of “mere” as “pure, unmixed, undiluted”, and “absolute, entire, sheer, perfect”, and only in the last definition does it give “barely” or “only”. Shakespeare uses the word in the primitive sense when he makes the herald announce that, upon the arrival of the tidings of “the *mere* perdition of the Turkish fleet”, bonfires, sports and revels should mark the welcome news. To-day the news of “the mere” perdition of an enemy fleet would lead to no such confidence. Thus it will be seen that the attempt to compel the word *kaphar* never to grow as other words grow; to confine its meaning to its primitive, etymological root, instead of allowing it the expansion of its usage and fruit, is just as unscientific and bad as to compel every modern Englishman to use the word “mere” as did the Dutchman, whose acquaintance with the language was after all at second-hand. In the next place, we must be aware of the fact that there is no aversion in the O.T. or N.T. Scriptures to using, with good intent, the expression “to cover sin”. The phrase does occur, and *kaphar* is avoided, an entirely different word, from an entirely different root, being used. In Lev. xvii. 11 the words “to make atonement” occur twice, and twice they are the rendering of the Hebrew *kaphar*. Now if “covering” be actually the meaning of this word, what an opportunity was missed in the thirteenth verse of the same chapter, to demonstrate the fact once and for ever.

“He shall even pour out the blood, and COVER it with dust, for it is the life of all flesh” (Lev. xviii. 13, 14).

Moses could have so interlinked this “covering” with the “atonement” of verse 11, as to establish, beyond dispute, the idea that “atonement” means a mere covering—yet *he did not do so*. We have said “Moses” did not do this; we have said “What an opportunity was lost”, but the reader will readily understand that we speak after the manner of men.

What we really affirm is, that the Holy Ghost, Who inspired Moses, avoided such a usage of set purpose. *And so must we.* If the very idea of “covering” sin is to be reckoned as an intrusion into Christian doctrine, how can we account for David’s pronouncement of blessing on such a fact and its endorsement by Paul? In Psalm xxxii. David is not limiting his remarks to the sacrifices of the Levitical law; he looks forward, as the companion Psalm (Psa. li.) reveals, to a cleansing that washes “whiter than snow”, yet he does not hesitate to speak of that greater Sacrifice as providing a covering for sin, and as there is no other sacrifice that is conceivably greater than the Levitical sacrifices, except the one offering of the Lord Himself, then David must be credited with ascribing to the Sacrifice of Christ this effect of covering sin.

“Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven
Whose sin is covered.
Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity
And in whose spirit there is no guile” (Psa. xxxii. 1, 2).

The genius of Hebrew poetry places “the forgiveness of transgressions” over against “the covering of sin”, and pronounces a blessing on both. It has been maintained that the O.T. word “atonement” means “to cover”, as over against the N.T. word “take away”. Unfortunately for this theory, but blessedly for us all, the very word “forgiven” in Psalm xxxii. 1 is the Hebrew *Nasa*, which is translated “Take (away or up)” 116 times in the A.V. of the O.T. Here, therefore, in the estimate of David, “lifted up” or “taken away” transgression, was the same as “covered” sin, and this is what we maintain is the teaching of scripture. If we continue in Psalm xxxii. we shall discover that he who could rejoice in the blessedness of “covered” sin, nevertheless declared, “mine iniquity have I NOT HID” (Psa. xxxii. 5), although, before the Psalm is finished, he says of the Lord “Thou art my hiding place”. This apparent contradiction is found in the Proverbs.

“He that covereth transgression, seeketh love” (Prov. xvii. 9).
“He that covereth his sins shall not prosper” (Prov. xxviii. 13).

The difference between Prov. xvii. 9 and xxviii. 13 is the difference between sins righteously dealt with by God, and the covering by the sinner of his own sins. So in Psalm xxxii. it was a blessed thing to have sins covered by God, but a wrong thing to attempt to hide them from God. All this, however, is still within the limits of the O.T. We must take the matter one stage further, and show that the Apostle Paul, knowingly and of purpose, introduced this passage into the N.T. Paul quotes Psalm xxxii. 1, 2 in Rom. iv. Now if Paul knew that the O.T. sacrifices simply atoned for and “covered” sin, in contrast with the offering of Christ, which “put away” sin, why did he introduce so disturbing a verse as Psalm xxxii. 1? Rom. iv. deals with the doctrine of imputation, and Paul could easily have passed over Psalm xxxii. 1 and quoted verse 2,

“Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity.”

Yet it will soon be evident, that this verse, as it stands, would not have served Paul’s purpose. He wrote:

“But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted (imputed) for righteousness, EVEN AS David also describeth the

blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying:"
(Rom. iv. 5, 6).

To quote Psalm xxxii. 2, saying, "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord IMPUTETH NOT iniquity", would not be sufficient proof of expiation. Paul therefore includes the reference to the "covering of sin" and in that "covering" he finds the equivalent of the positive imputation of righteousness.

From what we have seen, it is evident that except in Gen. vi. 14, *kaphar*, "to atone", is never used in its primitive sense. It is also evident that the idea of "covering" sin is abhorrent neither to the doctrine of the Old Testament nor the New. In our next article we must endeavour to show how *kaphar* is employed, and how the idea of a real, true covering, as distinct from a "mere covering", is imbedded in the instincts of man at the beginning, and endorsed by God Himself.

#3. Showing that, since the "confusion of tongues", Kaphar has no other meaning than "to propitiate". pp. 215 - 218

We have seen that the word Atonement is a synonym for Reconciliation, and that the Hebrew word *kaphar* is never translated "cover" in any of its forms. We have however seen that, instead of rejecting the idea of "covering" sin, both the Old Testament and the New acknowledge the blessedness of the man whose transgressions are forgiven, or taken away, and whose sins are "covered".

"By one man sin entered into the world", and the record of that fall is found in Gen. iii. While the word *kaphar* is not used in that chapter, and while the word "cover" is not found in the English translation, the *idea* is there in a double sense. In the first, and wrong, sense Adam and his wife sought to "cover" their transgressions by the aprons which they made of leaves, and by hiding from the presence of the Lord. We have scripture for it that the idea of "covering" is intended, for Job said "if I have covered my transgression as Adam" (Job xxxi. 33). This was the covering condemned in Prov. xxviii. 13. That the word "cover", used by Job, aptly applies to the attempt made by Adam, the use of the word in Gen. ix. 23 will show, for there, as in Gen. iii., the thought is the covering of "nakedness". Just as in Proverbs the covering by the sinner of his own sin is condemned, while the covering of sin by God is praised, so in Genesis, for while action of Adam there is rebuked, the principle that sin must be covered is maintained.

"And unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them" (Gen. iii. 21).

The sense of need expressed by the making of aprons was right, but the attempt to provide a covering of their own devising was wrong. Aprons made of leaves omitted the

essential element of shed blood. Coats made of skins cannot be provided apart from the death of animals, and so in the Garden of Eden the question of the right and wrong covering of sin was worked out in symbol and type. There is an allusion to this use of the skin in the law of the burnt offering, for the offering must be “flayed” i.e. skinned (Lev. i. 6). The tabernacle, too, with its cherubim and furniture, was “covered” with skins (Exod. xxv. 5). When Isaiah uses the figure of “clothing”, saying, “He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness”, he was but amplifying the significance of the act of the Lord in the Garden of Eden.

We have already indicated, in the last article, that in the next outstanding type of Redemption, the two words *kaphar* and *kopher* occur together in connection with the ark (Gen. vi. 14); and that when we next meet with the Hebrew *kaphar* it has acquired the meaning that is consistently adopted throughout the remainder of the O.T. Now this is too important a fact to pass by without further attention and we shall therefore observe this critical passage more closely. Jacob said,

“I will appease him with the present” (Gen. xxxii. 20). Esau, had been wronged by his brother, and felt it so deeply, that he comforted himself, “purposing to kill” Jacob upon Isaac’s death (Gen. xxvii. 41, 42). We must remember Esau’s “great and exceeding bitter cry” when he learned that Jacob’s subtilty had deprived him of his blessing (Gen. xxvii. 34).

Many years passed before Jacob again met his brother, and although, so far as we can gather, the early hatred had died down, Jacob may not have been aware of it, and, being apprehensive, arranged the circumstances of the reunion so that his brother’s hatred might be turned away, and reconciliation effected. Let us note his procedure.

First he sent messengers before him and, through them, addressed his brother as “My lord Esau”, calling himself “thy servant Jacob” (Gen. xxxii. 3). We learn next the purpose of this embassy: “I have sent to tell my lord, that I may find grace in thy sight” (Gen. xxxii. 5). Upon their return the messengers report that “he cometh to meet thee, and four hundred men with him” (Gen. xxxii. 6). “Greatly afraid and distressed”, Jacob at once proceeded to make provision for the safety of his family and possessions, and, at the same time, if possible, to avert the threatened wrath of Esau. First he divided his people, his flocks and his herds into two bands, saying, “If Esau come to the one company, and smite it, then the other company which is left shall escape” (Gen. xxxii. 8). He then turned to God in prayer, confessing his unworthiness and praying for deliverance from the hand of his brother Esau. Following this he took from his flocks and herds, two hundred she goats, and twenty he goats, two hundred ewes and twenty rams, thirty milch camels with their colts, forty kine, and twenty bulls, twenty she asses, and ten foals. These he divided into separate droves, instructing each servant to say to Esau, “They be thy servant Jacob’s; it is a present sent unto my lord Esau: and behold, also he is behind us” (Gen. xxxii. 20).

When at last Esau saw his brother Jacob, he “ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck, and kissed him; and they wept”, and Jacob said, “If now I have found

grace in thy sight, then receive my present at my hand: for therefore I have seen thy face as though I had seen the face of God, and thou wast pleased with me” (Gen. xxxiii. 8-11).

Here is the scriptural basis for interpreting the meaning of *kaphar* in the Levitical law.

Would any reader tolerate the argument that, because in the days of King Alfred the Great a certain word had a certain meaning, that that meaning must adhere to the word to-day? Could we ignore the revolution in language caused by the Norman Conquest, to say nothing of the changes that must naturally come with the passage of time?

The use of the word *kaphar* in the record of the flood is separated from the record of Gen. xxxii. by an interval of seven hundred years. Besides this, we have a revolution in language that puts that of the Norman Conquest into the shade,

“Because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth” (Gen. xi. 9).

The Semitic speaking people adopted the word *kaphar*, but evidently dropped its primitive meaning of “covering” as with pitch, for Moses was under no obligation to append a note of explanation to the record of the use of the word by Jacob, and his subsequent adherence to one meaning, and to this meaning only, throughout the whole of the books of the law, is sufficient proof of the established meaning of the word. Apart from the preservation of the book of the generations of Noah by Moses, no one either in Israel’s day or in our own would ever have had the slightest reason to speak of Atonement as other than a Propitiation. It is strange that we should use Moses (Gen. vi.) to confound Moses (Gen. xxxii.).

In everyone of its occurrences the word *kapporeth*, a feminine word formed from *kaphar*, is translated “Mercy Seat”. Seeing that *kaphar* originally meant “to cover” it has been assumed that the word “Mercy Seat” should be removed from our Bibles, and the more prosaic “cover”, or even “lid”, substituted. The Septuagint translate *kapporeth* by *exilasmos*, “a propitiatory”, (I Chron. xxviii. 11); *Thusiasterion*, (in some versions) “An altar”, “A place of Sacrifice”, and *hilasterion* “A propitiatory”.

In Exod. xxv. 17 *epithema* is added, a word which was in use amongst the Pagan Greeks to indicate the “lid” of a chest. It is no revelation to any reader acquainted with the story of the tabernacle to learn that, as to its material, the “Mercy-Seat” was made of gold, and as to its shape and purpose, a lid. But this fact has no reference to the word *hilasterion*, which in no possible circumstances can mean “a lid”. It can only mean “a propitiatory”, and this fact is recognized by the Septuagint translators by the *adding* of the word *epithema*, so that a true translation of that version would read, “a propitiatory lid”, leaving the word *hilasterion* untouched.

For the sake of clearness, and because the subject is so important, let us approach it afresh.

The ark was a chest, made of wood and covered with gold. A golden lid was made of exactly the same measurements, and this lid is, in the Greek, called *epithema*. It was

“placed above upon the ark”, *epitithemi anothēn*. Now this tells us the material of which the article was made, “gold”, the purpose it served, “a lid”, and where it was placed, “above upon” the ark. So far so good. We now enquire, Did this article of furniture have any spiritual significance? The answer is “Yes, the golden lid is explained to be ‘a propitiatory’, a place where atonement or propitiation could be made”. This “lid” is therefore explained in the Septuagint to be an “*hilasterion*”. But how from this data anyone can say that the term “Mercy-seat” should be removed and the word “lid” substituted passes comprehension. Further, the N.T. sets its seal upon the essential purpose of the Mercy Seat, for in Heb. ix. we read concerning the furniture of the tabernacle, “And over it the cherubim of glory shadowing”, not the *epithema*, the mere “lid”, but the “mercy seat”, *hilasterion* (Heb. ix. 5). The apostle could have selected from his Greek Bible the word *epithema*, enforcing upon us the fact that all we had here was a golden lid but he passes this word by, and enforces its symbolic purpose; it was a propitiatory. That he most certainly meant a propitiatory, or a propitiation, is proved by his one other use of *hilasterion* where he speaks of the sacrifice offered by Christ as “a propitiation through faith in His blood” (Rom. iii. 25).

Now it has been suggested that in Rom. iii. we could read, “set forth a mercy seat through faith in His blood”, and this would do no violence to faith or sense, but the possibility of suggesting that we could substitute the word “lid” in Rom. iii. 25 is beyond consideration.

Having thus said, the fact remains that the word *epithema*, used by the Greek translators, is *an addition* to the Hebrew they were translating, no equivalent Hebrew word being used in the original. It is therefore without authority, and must not be used as a basis for doctrinal teaching.

We have considered two aspects of the subject before us:

- (1) That the idea of “covering” for sin is scriptural; the only reservation being that *God* must provide the covering, and that by means of sacrifice.
- (2) That, apart from the ancient use of *kaphar*, preserved for us in Gen. vi. 14, and used *before* the confusion of tongues, the established use of *kaphar* by Moses and the Prophets upon every occasion that it is employed is “propitiation”. This also is the meaning of the word translated “mercy seat” and is entirely independent of whether it also be a “lid”, or made of “gold”, or whether it be of the same size as the ark, or not.

The Bearing of the Context on Well-Known Passages.

#2. “Light affliction” and the “Weight of glory”.

p. 40

“For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” (II Cor. iv. 17).

A deal of harm may be done if we lift this passage out of its context and press its teaching upon souls unprepared by truth to receive it. It is *not true* that “affliction”, considered in itself, is “light”. Paul had confessed earlier in this same epistle that he had been “pressed out of measure, above strength” by the trouble that came upon him in Asia (II Cor. i. 8). He later gives also a list of sufferings that neither he nor any sane person could call “light afflictions” (II Cor. xi. 23-28).

When we quote II Cor. iv. 17, we must remember the context, especially the condition that is made in verse 18. If we would speak truth with our neighbour, the word “while” is the qualifying word that must be included whenever we quote this passage. “While” the sufferer looks not at things seen but at things “not seen”, the affliction becomes, *by comparison*, “light”, and “while” he thus reacts to affliction it will “work” for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. But if the eye is on the visible, the self-same suffering will be by no means “light”, and its effects will be the very reverse of the triumph suggested by the words “weight of glory”.

The bearing of the context must never be forgotten, whether the subject be doctrine, practice, exhortation, consolation, or the whole range of dispensational truth.

#3. “We glory in tribulations” (Rom. v. 3).

pp. 119, 120

Inasmuch as there is no punctuation, or even division into sentences, or in the earliest Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, there is no mechanical safeguard against misquotation, the meaning, as demanded by the context, must always be considered.

For any healthy, happy and intelligent young man to say that “to die” was “gain”, or that he “gloried in tribulations”, would not sound like a genuine statement. Moreover, to take the opposite case, for anyone in unhappy circumstances to use the same words, would be indicative of despair, or at least of very morbid feelings. In Rom. v. 3 the Apostle does not simply say, “We glory in tribulations” as an isolated remark. He prefaces his statement by the phrase, “And not only so”, which clearly indicates a qualifying context, and he follows it up with the words “also” and “but”.

The Apostle's statement, seen in its context, is a note of triumph. It is healthy and sane, the very reverse of anything morbid:

“And rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, *and not only so, but* we glory in tribulations *also*, knowing that tribulation worketh patience” (Rom. v. 3).

Let us always remember that a consideration of the context invariably adds to the fullness and truth of a passage, and is essential to a true interpretation.

#4. “Concerning zeal, persecuting the church” (Phil. iii. 6). pp. 160, 161

When Paul wrote these words to the Philippians, it is just possible, taking the statement by itself, that he used the word translated “persecuting” in its primitive meaning of “pursuing”. If we adopt this view, the passage would mean that he sought most earnestly to reach the coveted position of membership of the church. There are contextual reasons, however, that make this translation impossible. Considering first the remote context we read in I Cor. xv.:

“I persecuted the church of God” (I Cor. xv. 9).

This is given as a reason why Paul considered himself “the least of the apostles” and “not meet to be called an apostle”. This would not make sense if he intended us to understand that he was anxiously desiring to reach the spiritual position of the church of God.

In Galatians we read:

“I persecuted the church of God AND WASTED IT” (Gal. i. 13).

The added words “and wasted it” settle the Apostle's meaning without any shadow of doubt. But this is not all. He gives this as an example of his zeal in the “Jew's religion” and makes the boast that he profited in that religion above many that were his equals (Gal. i. 14). It is in this epistle that the Apostle, the erstwhile zealot for Judaism, declares:

“I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing” (Gal. v. 2).

And again, in Chapter vi.:

“For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk by this rule, peace be on them” (Gal. vi. 15, 16).

Of these same Galatians Paul asks “Are ye so foolish? having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” and of himself he says:

“God forbid that I should glory (*kauchomai*) save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Gal. vi. 14).

The student of Scripture will need no argument to prove that these references in Galatians can all be matched in Philippians, of which indeed they form the spiritual background. The true circumcision, says the Apostle are they which “worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus (*kauchomai*), and have no confidence in the flesh” (Phil. iii. 3). Again Galatians and Philippians are the only epistles where the Apostle speaks of walking according to a “rule” (*Kanon*). So also the question of being made “perfect” raised in Galatians, recurs in Phil. iii. 15.

Coming to the near context and allowing the remote context to decide the Apostle’s meaning, we can see that the words “Concerning zeal, persecuting the church” represent an example of his “profiting in the Jew’s religion” just as much as it was in Gal. i. All this and more would have to be discredited or set aside before it would be possible to agree that in Phil. iii., Paul used the word *dioko* in a good sense.

No interpretation of Scripture can be accepted if it does not stand the test of being examined in the light of both the “near” and “remote” contexts.

Comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

(A series of comparisons between the epistles to the Hebrews and to the Ephesians in relation to their respective spheres and callings.)

#1. The presence and absence of the name “Paul” in the two epistles. pp. 77 - 80

In the course of our witness, the two great epistles Ephesians and Hebrews have been given a fairly comprehensive exposition. Readers who desire positive teaching concerning them are therefore referred to “The Berean Expositor”, Volume II/III - XIV for Ephesians and Volumes VIII - XX for Hebrews. Our object now, however, is not of the nature of what is *positive* but *comparative*. We desire to institute a comparison between the two epistles in order to demonstrate thereby the peculiar character of their separate callings, and so by this method allow them to speak for themselves. As the matter of authorship does not enter the present controversy, we could assume that Hebrews was written by the apostle Paul, but the very fact that such a matter is at all controversial causes us to halt, for here is a feature that, in itself, demands examination and challenges comparison. In the circumstances we shall make it a first point of investigation.

It is agreed by both sides in this controversy that Paul is the author of fourteen of the N.T. epistles, and in thirteen of them his name is found in the first verse of the first chapter. In nine the title “apostle” is found accompanying the name Paul, those which omit the title being Philippians, I and II Thessalonians and Philemon. The omission of the title from these four latter epistles is accounted for by the circumstance that they do not come from Paul alone, but bear the names of others with him, “Paul and Timotheus” (Phil. i. 1), “Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus” (I and II Thess. i. 1). Philemon is a private letter, consequently Paul omits his official title, calling himself “A prisoner of Jesus Christ” and “such an one as Paul the aged”, for he is *pleading* for compassion rather than *commanding* obedience as an apostle. Nevertheless, despite the absence of the title, it would be easy to demonstrate from these four epistles that Paul was nevertheless an apostle.

When we turn to the epistle to the Hebrews, no reference to Paul, by name, is found either in the salutation or in the body of the epistle, but that the Hebrews to whom the epistle was written knew the identity of the writer is evident, for, toward the close of the epistle, he said: “Pray for us that I may be restored to you the sooner” (Heb. xiii. 18, 19). “Timothy” is also closely associated with the writer (Heb. xiii. 23), and the epistle ends with the words “Grace be with you all. Amen.”, a salutation which constituted the token of Paul’s authorship in each of his epistles, as he states in II Thess. iii. 17, 18.

We can but conjecture the reasons that made Paul omit his *name*, but we have more positive ground to stand on when we consider the omission of the title “apostle”.

- (1) Paul was The Apostle of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13; Gal. ii. 8; I Tim. ii. 7; II Tim. i. 11).
- (2) He was about to write to the Hebrews concerning their calling and confession, and to urge them to consider the Lord Jesus Christ as “The Apostle and High Priest” of this calling and confession (Heb. iii. 1).

While keeping within the bounds of his commission to the Gentiles, Paul spoke with the full authority that apostleship brings, but when he addressed Hebrews he asked them to “suffer the word of exhortation” (Heb. xiii. 22), and omitted both his name and the credentials of his authority.

Peter was the Apostle of the Circumcision, and includes the title in the salutation of his two epistles. Towards the close of the second epistle he alludes to something that Paul had written, which must refer either to some writings now lost, and never heard of throughout the history of the church, or to this epistle to the Hebrews. Peter had addressed his first epistle “to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia” (I Pet. i. 1), and his second to the same scattered companies (II Pet. iii. 1). There are evidences that favour the idea that the epistle to the Galatians was a covering letter to the Hebrews, but this must await the completion of our studies in the comparison of Hebrews and Ephesians. For the present purpose attention must now be concentrated on the following facts:

- (1) Paul’s name, together with his apostolic office, appears in the salutation of Ephesians.
Paul’s name and office are omitted from the opening of the epistle to the Hebrews.
- (2) Paul’s name is repeated, together with the new title, “The prisoner of Jesus Christ”, in the body of the epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. iii. 1).
Paul’s name does not occur once in the whole of the epistle to the Hebrews.
It is therefore evident that Paul’s authority as an apostle did not cover this epistle to the Hebrews, and this evidence of the withholding of his authority goes to show that the calling and sphere of the Hebrews was outside of the dispensation entrusted to him.
- (3) Paul uses the personal pronoun, *ego*, three times in Ephesians: “I Paul, the prisoner”, “I therefore, the prisoner”, “I speak concerning the church” (Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1; v. 32).
Paul never uses *ego* of himself in the epistle to the Hebrews.
Paul uses *eme* once in Eph. vi. 21, “My affairs” (lit. the things as to me).
Paul never uses *eme* in the epistle to the Hebrews.
Paul uses *emoi* once in Eph. iii. 8, “Unto me, less than the least”, with special reference to his peculiar ministry.
Paul uses *emoi* once of himself in Hebrews, where he says “The Lord is my helper” (Heb. xiii. 6), which obviously has no special bearing upon the calling and sphere of the apostle.
Paul uses *emou* in Eph. vi. 19 where he asks prayer on his behalf in relation to his stewardship of the mystery.
Paul never uses *emou* of himself in the epistle to the Hebrews.
Paul uses *me* once in Ephesians, namely in vi. 20, where he says, “as I ought to speak”.

Paul uses *me* once of himself in Hebrews, namely in xi. 32, where he says, “the time would fail me to tell, etc.” which, once again, has no bearing upon the theme of the epistle.

Paul uses *moi* four times in Ephesians, each occasion having reference to the ministry of the mystery, which was his peculiar trust (Eph. iii. 2, 3, 7; vi. 19).

Paul uses *moi* of himself once in Hebrews, namely at xiii. 6, when he says that he would not fear “what man shall do unto me”, which has no ground for comparison with Eph. iii. 2, 3, 7, or vi. 19.

In Ephesians Paul uses *mou*, “my prayers”; “my knowledge”; “my tribulations for you”; “me knees”; “my brethren”; “my mouth” (Eph. i. 16; iii. 4, 13, 14; vi. 10 & 19).

Paul never uses *mou* of himself in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Here is internal evidence that Paul was personally and intentionally identified with the calling which we associate with Ephesians, but that he was not an apostle or a minister of the calling of the Hebrew Christians, to whom the epistle to the Hebrews was written.

To make this clear, and to feel the force of its evidence, the reader should not be satisfied merely to peruse the analysis set out above, but should turn to every reference which it contains. If he does, the one fact will emerge that constitutes the first fact that we note in this series of comparative studies, namely, that the inclusion of the name “Paul” and the inclusion of the title “apostle”, together with the claims asserted and confirmed by the use of the personal pronoun “I”, “to me”, etc., already listed, form an integral part of the testimony of the epistle to the Ephesians, proving beyond contradiction that Paul was the minister of the Church of the One Body, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles, and steward of the dispensation of the Mystery.

The intentional and inspired omission of both name and office from the epistle to the Hebrews, as surely indicates that Paul had no place in the calling covered by the epistle to the Hebrews, but that, by the grace of God, he had been permitted to write to his “kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. ix. 1-3) a word of exhortation, urging them to leave the elements of religion, and to go on unto perfection.

**#2. The testimony of such words as “Gentile”,
“Fathers”, “People” in the two epistles.
pp. 112 - 115**

We have seen the evidence which the absence both of the name and office of the writer provides regarding the dispensational place of the epistle to the Hebrews. We now turn from the question, *By* whom were these epistles written? to the question, *To* whom were they written?

The two epistles are alike in that the titles “Ephesians” and “Hebrews” may possibly form no part of the inspired work. In some MSS the words “at Ephesus” appear in verse 1, and in some they are omitted, a space being left instead, indicating that in some cases at least the epistle was designed as a circular letter rather than an epistle addressed specifically to one assembly. The title “to the Hebrews” also forms no part of the inspired text, being added afterwards, yet very early, for it not only occurs in the Greek MSS in our possession, but in very early versions, like the Syriac. (No such question arises as to the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, etc., as the place names are imbedded in the text.) It is therefore only by internal evidence that we can hope to ascertain to whom the two epistles we are comparing were originally addressed.

In our first comparison we found that it was by nothing the presence or absence of the name and office of Paul that something of the essential difference that exists between these two epistles could be discovered. This difference is emphasized by the choice made in the two epistles of *ethnos*, “Gentile”, and *laos*, “people”, to indicate the two companies addressed.

It takes no more than a cursory reading of the epistle to the Ephesians to see that it was addressed to Gentiles.

“Wherefore, remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands” (Eph. ii. 11).

Here is most definite distinction is drawn, “Gentiles Uncircumcision”.

Ethnos, the word translated “Gentile”, occurs five times in Ephesians, and each reference has a specific bearing upon the calling revealed in that epistle. *Ethnos* is never employed in writing of the Hebrews, no circumstance ever arising in which the Gentile has a place or share. This we must now set out before the reader as a second proof that Ephesians and Hebrews minister to two distinctly different callings.

Ethnos, “Gentile”, in Ephesians.

(1) In Eph. ii. 11, those who are addressed are reminded that they were Gentiles in the flesh, called Uncircumcision, and that they were “without Christ, being aliens from

the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. ii. 12).

The word “without” (*Choris*) occurs nowhere else in Ephesians, but is found thirteen times in the epistle to the Hebrews, and, while it deals with a variety of subjects, it is never once used to teach that the Hebrews were ever “without Christ”. In fact, a reference to Rom. ix. 1-5 will show how both the reference to Christ Himself and to the covenants and promises, provides a final means of distinguishing the Hebrews from the Gentiles, for the blessings indicated in Rom. ix. 1-5 were specifically enjoyed by Israel “according to the flesh” whereas the blessings indicated in Ephesians are all “spiritual”, the flesh having no place in them whatsoever.

A word that demands a study to itself is *diatheke*, “covenant”, which is one of the key words of Hebrews, occurring in that epistle no less than seventeen times. In Ephesians the word occurs but once and then in a negative sense. To remove it from Hebrews would be to eviscerate the epistle, even as the insertion of it into the calling and dispensation of the mystery would be to empty that calling of its essential characteristics.

The Ephesians Gentiles were originally in a state that could be described as that of persons “having no hope and without God in the world”, but the Hebrews, while they might lapse into that condition known as “*lo-ammi*”, were never abandoned by God, for His gifts and callings are without change of mind, and the New Covenant, which is enlarged upon in the eighth chapter of Hebrews, stresses that when that covenant comes into force the promise will apply that says, “I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people” (Heb. viii. 10).

(2) In Eph. iii. 1 the Apostle reveals that his very imprisonment was related to the distinctive ministry to which he had been called, declaring that it was “for you Gentiles”. He does not say “for both of you, whether Jew or Gentile”, as he could have done when speaking of the ministry he exercised during the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles up to his imprisonment in Rome. He insists upon the *Gentileward* direction of this new ministry, and associates it with “the dispensation of the grace of God given me *to you-ward*”.

(3) Eph. iii. 6 indicates the constitution of the calling of this epistle. It is a threefold equality, and addressed to the Gentiles. It is a misinterpretation to make this passage teach that the Gentiles were now being introduced to an existing calling, from which they had been previously “aliens”, or that the new calling envisaged two companies, the one Hebrew believers, the other Gentile believers, the two being jointly blessed as such. On the contrary, it is the threefold unity of the newly-created New Man.

(4) In Eph. iii. 8, 9 Paul makes the claim, that to himself—all unworthy though he be of the high privilege—it had been given that he should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and enlighten all as to what is the dispensation of the mystery. This ordination, with its clearly stated object, is a definite revelation and binding upon all who profess to acknowledge the inspiration of the Scriptures. No such

claims, or anything approaching it, is found in the epistle to the Hebrews where the only preaching of the gospel that is found takes us back to O.T. times, and is therefore at the extreme pole from that which is announced in Eph. iii. The reference to it is as follows:

“For unto us was the gospel preached (*euaggelizo*) as well as unto them they to whom it was first preached (*euaggelizo*) entered not in because of unbelief” (Heb. iv. 2-6).

This quotation exhausts the occurrences of *euaggelizo* in Hebrews, while the noun *euaggelion*, “The gospel”, does not occur at all. No system of interpretation worthy the name could therefore possibly confuse the gospel of Eph. iii. 8, 9 with the gospel of Heb. iv. 2-6.

(5) In Eph. iv. 17 is found the last occurrences of *ethnos* in the epistle, where the Apostle exhorts believers to a walk that shall be the very reverse of that which once characterized them “by nature” (Eph. ii. 1-3), the word “alienated” being reintroduced in a new connection, and confirming the state already described in Eph. ii. 11, 12.

Such is the internal evidence from Ephesians. Now let us turn to the epistle to the Hebrews.

First, as we have already observed, the word “Gentile” does not occur in it. The opening of the epistle addresses those who were intimately connected with “The fathers”. In Paul epistles, “The fathers” relates always and only to Israel.

“Whose are the fathers” (Rom. ix. 5).
“Beloved for the fathers’ sakes” (Rom. xi. 28).
“Promises made unto the fathers” (Rom. xv. 8).
“All our fathers were under the cloud” (I Cor. x. 1).

In each case the context supplies the words “Israelites”, “All Israel”, “The circumcision” and “Moses”, making it impossible, in any place, to include the Gentile, in any way.

“Spake in time past unto the fathers” (Heb. i. 1).
“Your fathers tempted Me” (Heb. iii. 9).
“The covenant that I made with the fathers” (Heb. viii. 9).

Here, once again, the Gentile is excluded. To Israel alone were entrusted the oracles of God; Israel tempted God in the wilderness, and with the fathers of this same people, and with no other, the covenant at Sinai was made.

When Paul uses the pronoun “us” in Heb. x. 15, “Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us”, the Gentile is ruled out by the context (see verses 16-18). And when he uses the pronoun “we” in Heb. x. 26 he speaks still of those addressed in Heb. vi. 1-6, where the conditions are entirely contrary to the grace revealed in the epistle to the Ephesians. The word that is set over against “Gentile” in Ephesians, in Hebrews is *laos*, “people”.

Paul contrasts the people of Israel with the Gentiles in Rom. xv. 10, and this word *laos* (which occurs thirteen times in the epistle to the Hebrews) is used there of Israel, even as the word *ethnos* is used in Ephesians of the Gentiles.

We bring this second study to a conclusion. Let us see what we have found:

- (1) That the absence of the name and office of Paul from the epistle to the Hebrews, is an indication that Paul is dealing with a calling that was outside his own distinctive ministry as an apostle, and that, consequently, this epistle must be kept distinct, so far as sphere and calling is concerned, from the epistle to the Ephesians.
- (2) That in close conformity with this finding, is the use of the terms "Gentile" and "People", supplemented by the references to "the Fathers". The two comparisons already instituted between these two epistles lead us to the conclusion that two different callings and spheres are in view in them. This conclusion will be strengthened, weakened, or confuted by further studies in this series, to which we direct the prayerful attention of every true "Berean".

#3. Angels (Hebrews), Principalities (Ephesians), Differences in rank indicated. pp. 154 - 156

The distinctive callings and spheres of the epistles to the Ephesians and to the Hebrews, have been indicated by the presence and absence of the authority of "Paul the apostle", and by the exclusive use of either "Gentile" or "People". We now continue our comparison by observing the difference between the exaltation indicated in Heb. i. 4 and that spoken of in Eph. i. 20-23. In both epistles Christ is spoken of as being "seated" at the right hand of God (Eph. i. 20; Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2), but in Hebrews His exaltation is emphasized by its superiority to that of angels, whereas in Ephesians it is said to be far above all principality and power. It may be that no difference is intended by those two sets of expressions, and as we know nothing about the heavenly host except what is revealed in Holy Scripture we must abide by what is there written. First of all, let us put the two sets of passages before the reader. We have already observed that the distinctive word *laos*, "people", is used in Hebrews thirteen times; we now find that *aggelos*, "angel", occurs thirteen times also.

The use of "angel" in Hebrews.

In chapter i. Christ in His exaltation to the right hand of the Majesty on high is said to be made "so much better than the angels" (Heb. i. 4).

"Unto which of the angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son?" (i. 5).

"Let all the angels of God worship Him" (i. 6).

"He maketh His angels spirits" (i. 7).

"To which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on My right hand?" (i. 13).

In chapter ii. angels are associated with the giving of the law and we are told that the age to come has not been put in subjection to angels. By the testimony of the prophetic eighth Psalm Adam, and Christ, are seen “for a little” lower than the angels, and, at the incarnation, Christ “took not on Him the nature of angels” (ii. 2, 5, 7, 9, 16). In xii. 22 the heavenly Jerusalem is associated with “an innumerable company of angels” and in xiii. 2 the believer is reminded that, in O.T. times, the ministry of angels was no uncommon experience. When writing to the Romans, Paul mentioned angels, together with “principalities” (Rom. viii. 38) and asked the Corinthians, “Know ye not that we shall judge angels?” (I Cor. vi. 3), but neither angelic ministry among men, nor the presence of angels at the exaltation of Christ, is mentioned in Ephesians. There, we read that when Christ was raised from the dead He was set at the right hand of God “in the heavenly places far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come” (Eph. i. 20, 21). These “principalities” are mentioned again in Eph. iii. 10 and vi. 12, each time in connection with “heavenly places”, but the Epistle to the Hebrews knows nothing of them. In Scripture angels have special reference to the people of Israel, and they are not mentioned in the O.T. until after the call of Abraham and the birth of Ishmael (Gen. xvi. 7). Angelic ministry is associated with the destruction of Sodom, the deliverance of Lot, the birth of Isaac, the quest for a wife for Isaac, and the blessing of Jacob in the book of Genesis. In the book of Exodus the angel of the Lord is intimately associated with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and with their guidance through the wilderness, and so, throughout the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, the whole course of Israel’s history is accompanied by angelic ministry. Nor does it cease with Malachi; it is prominent in the Gospels, being associated with the birth, the sufferings, the resurrection and the second coming of Christ. It is prominent in the Acts from Acts i. to xii., but, after the ministry of Paul, which commences with Acts xiii., there is but one reference in the Acts to angelic ministry, namely at Acts xxvii. 23. This must be considered in contrast with the seventeen references that fill Acts i.-xii. In the prison ministry of Paul, that is in the five “prison” epistles, angels are mentioned but to be set aside, i.e., “the worshipping of angels” (Col. ii. 18). In I Tim. iii. 16 angels are mentioned in connection with the mystery of godliness, namely “God manifest in the flesh”, and also in the charge of I Tim. v. 21, where “elect angels” are mentioned.

We have already drawn attention to the fact that the word “angel” occurs thirteen times in the epistle to the Hebrews. It is of interest to note that, taking Paul’s epistles together, (with the exception of Hebrews), the word “angel” occurs thirteen times, or, if we include the passage where it is translated “messenger”, fourteen times. It will be seen that where the word “angel” is used at the rate of one reference to an epistle in Paul’s epistles (other than Hebrews), in Hebrews it is used at the rate of one reference to a chapter. Then, if we include the number of times the word occurs in the epistle of Peter, Jude and the book of Revelation, we must add eighty-one more occurrences to the number, making in all, from Matthew to Acts xii. and Hebrews to the end of the N.T., 164 occurrences, as over against ten in Paul’s pre-prison epistles, two in I Timothy *and none in the “prison” epistles*. While we readily admit that doctrine cannot be proved by the mere number of occurrences of any particular word, yet the presence and the absence of such related terms as “angels” and “principalities” cannot easily be accounted for apart

from purpose and intention. “Angels” are ministering spirits, but, by the very nature of the word, “Principalities” hold precedence in rank, and if that difference be evident between these heavenly powers, it follows that there must be the same difference between the callings of the two epistles. The Hebrew believers are never said to be “far above” angels, but by virtue of the revelation of Eph. ii. 6, the Ephesian believer is seated potentially, “far above” even principalities.

We have now tested these two epistles and on three counts have shown that they differ in essential features.

- (1) The epistle to the Hebrews lies outside the apostolic authority of Paul, whose name does not therefore appear in it.
- (2) The authority of Paul was bounded by the word “Gentile”; a word that is employed with dispensational purpose in Ephesians and could not be spared from that epistle, but a word which is signally absent from Hebrews.
- (3) The heavenly host appears to be divided into two great groups:
 - a. Angels. These are the spiritual associates of the calling of the Hebrews, and of the heavenly city.
 - b. Principalities. These are the spiritual associates of the calling of the Ephesian believers, consequently the more we compare these two epistles the more the evidence grows of the differences that exist between their spheres and callings.

#4. The use of O.T. Scripture and of Redemption. pp. 200 - 205

The Scriptures come to us as a revelation from God, and dealing, as they do, with such mighty themes as the Purpose of the Ages, the Mysteries of Sin and Salvation, to say nothing of the deeper mysteries of the nature of the Godhead, it is to be expected there will be many things in them hard to be understood; yet, on the other hand, if the Scriptures be a “revelation” they are intended to “reveal” and therefore are intended to be understood.

The enquiry before us, while involving height and depth and a love that passeth knowledge, is, at basis, simple. We ask for evidence to prove that the callings of Ephesians and of Hebrews are either identical or different, and our consideration of the subject is from the following points of view: 1. Writer; 2. Reader; 3. Spiritual Associates. If the calling of Hebrews is a perfecting of the calling instituted under the Old Covenant, we shall expect to find a continuous appeal to O.T. Scriptures. If Ephesians is the revelation of a calling that is a “secret”, something never made known to the believers of O.T. times, and entirely different from the calling made known in Hebrews, we shall expect to find scanty reference to the O.T., especially in the doctrinal section.

In Ephesians, direct citation of the O.T. is limited to one passage in the doctrinal section (Eph. i.-iii.) and three in the practical section (Eph. iv.-vi.), namely Eph. i. 22; iv. 8; v. 31 and vi. 2. In Hebrews O.T. quotation and reference meet us at every turn. Instead therefore of attempting an examination of these—a task quite outside the scope of the present enquiry—we propose to limit our examination to the way in which both epistles treat an identical O.T. passage.

Both Ephesians and Hebrews quote from Psalm viii., Ephesians merely citing, in passing, the words “And hath put all things under His feet”, without in any way giving an indication that a quotation is being made, whereas Hebrews refers to “one who in a certain place testified saying” and follows with a fairly full quotation of the Psalm, and an exposition of some of its clauses. The writer of the Hebrews has told us why he introduced this Psalm, saying,

“For unto the angels hath He not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak” (Heb. ii. 5).

Peri hes laloumen, “whereof we speak” is explicit. *Peri* means “concerning”: it suggests the circumference of a circle, and includes the Psalm that is immediately quoted. All therefore that is said, until the subject changes, is bounded by the word *peri*: the quotation of Psalm viii. is entirely limited to “the world to come whereof we speak”. It is therefore important that we should know something about this “world to come”. The Greek word for “world” here is somewhat rare, it is the word *oikoumene*. It was used by the Greeks to indicate that portion of the earth inhabited by Greeks, as distinct from Barbarians; much as we to-day might speak of “The civilized portion of the earth”. It was used to designate the Roman Empire, as in Luke ii. 1, and it is the word employed by Luke when, in his description of the temptation in the wilderness, he says that the Devil showed the Saviour “all the kingdoms of the *world*” (Luke iv. 5). The word was well-known to the Hebrews as it is used in the LXX version of the O.T. and also in the Apocrypha. Something of the prophetic import of the word may be seen by referring to Psalm lxxii. 8 (Psalm lxxi. in the LXX).

“And He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth (*oikoumene*).”

In this passage the original Hebrew word translated “earth” is *eretz* which means either “earth” or “land”. The first occurrence of *oikoumene* in the LXX is significant, it is found in Exod. xvi. 35, where it speaks of the land of Canaan as “inhabited”, in contrast with the wilderness in which Israel had so long wandered, and so, the *oikoumene* of Heb. ii. 5, and the “rest” of chapter iv. 8-11 are placed on either side of the wilderness wandering of chapter iii. In this first occurrence the Greek word translates the Hebrews *yashab*, “to dwell”. In Psalm xlix. 1 the word translated “world” is *cheled*, which refers to the transitory character of this life. With the exception of these passages, and of eight references in Isaiah which translate the Hebrew word *eretz*, “earth”, the bulk of the occurrences of *oikoumene* in the LXX are translations of the Hebrew word *tebel*.

“The world to come” is, literally, “the inhabitable (world) about to be”. This word has occurred already in Hebrews, being used in i. 6.

“And again, when He bringeth in the first begotten into the world.”

which the R.V. corrects by reading “When He again bringeth”, consequently the *oikoumene* must be the sphere of the Lord’s dominion at His second coming. “The whole inhabitable”, *he oikoumene*, whole, of Isa. xiv. 7, 26 refers to the Babylonian Empire, even as the same word was employed to define the Empire of Alexander (Ælitan V. H. iii. 29), and indicates “the whole world” that forms the battlefield in the coming Day of the Lord (Rev. xvi. 14). This *oikoumene*, or “habitable world”, that Heb. ii. speaks of, is said to be the world “to come”, the Greek word being *mello*. A literal rendering of *mello* is, “about to be”. Hebrews speaks of those who were “about to be heirs of salvation” of “the world that was about to be”, “the powers of the age about to be” of Christ as “High Priest of good things about to be”; of the law as a “shadow of good things about to be” of a fire that is about to destroy the adversaries; of a land that Abraham was about to receive as an inheritance; of the blessing of Jacob and Esau concerning things about to be and of a city which the Hebrews were seeking which was about to be (Heb. i. 14; ii. 5; vi. 5; ix. 11; x. 1, 27; xi. 8, 20; xiii. 14).

We now observe that the epistle to the Ephesians employs this word *mello* once; the reference is Eph. i. 21. The context speaks of the exaltation of Christ “far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age (*aion*) but also in that which is about to be: and hath put all things under His feet”. Here therefore it is evident that the apostle when writing Ephesians, and even when quoting Psalm viii., has an entirely different sphere and calling in view. What connection is there between the *oikoumene*, with its recognized limitation, whereof the writer of the Hebrews assures us that he “speaks”, and the Church which is His body, over which Christ has been given to be Head over all things, and which is further defined as “The fullness of Him that filleth all in all”? (Eph. i. 22, 23). *The habitable world to come* was a subject of prophecy and of type, *the church of the one Body* is the subject of a mystery. In Hebrews we read that the words “He hath put all things under His feet” imply that He left nothing that is not put under Him. In Ephesians this universal subjection is enlarged and given in detail, but there is added a reference to that company which are not put under His feet, a company that occupy a position unshared even by “principalities and powers”, and form the Body of which Christ is the Head, a company that are destined to be the fullness of Him, Who, in His glorious day, will be manifesting the One that fills all in all. If these things are all one and the same with the teaching of Heb. ii., of what use is inspiration, to say nothing of logic and common sense? We submit that a comparison of the way in which Psalm viii. is used in Hebrews and in Ephesians is a further demonstration of the essential difference that must be maintained by all who would rightly divide the Word of Truth.

REDEMPTION AND FORGIVENESS, IN HEBREWS AND EPHESIANS.

No reader of the *Berean Expositor* will need a lengthy citation of passages from the epistle to the Hebrews to show that the great sacrificial system of the law is there set forth

as fulfilled by the offering of Christ. Taking this fact for granted, therefore, we turn to the epistle to the Ephesians to see how far the sacrifice of Christ is made an integral part of the teaching of that epistle.

“In whom we have redemption, through His blood, the forgiveness of sins” (Eph. i. 7).

Apolutrosis, the word translated “redemption” is found in Heb. ix. 15. This redemption is by “blood” and vitally associated with forgiveness, the word translated “forgiveness” being *aphesis*. So in Heb. ix. 22 we have the words, “without shedding of blood is no remission (*aphesis*)”, and in Heb. x. 18, “Where the remission (*aphesis*) of these is, no more offering for sin”. *Apolutrosis* is used once again in Heb. xi. 35, where it is translated “deliverance” but this passage has no bearing upon the present investigation.

Returning to Ephesians, we note that “redemption” is spoken of in Eph. i. 14 and iv. 30 as of a future “day of redemption”. In these references we have before us every occurrence of “redemption” (*apolutrosis*) and “forgiveness” (*aphesis*) in these two epistles.

Let us observe the context of the references in Hebrews a little more closely.

“And for this cause He is the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood And almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission” (Heb. ix. 15-22).

“Wherefore the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that He had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put My laws into their hearts, and in the minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin” (Heb. x. 15-18).

In these two citations from Hebrews we have every occurrence of *apolutrosis* and *aphesis*, “redemption” and “forgiveness”, in that epistle. The association here established with the new covenant cannot be broken. The redemption is specifically for “the transgressions that were under the first covenant”. The remission is for the sins associated with these two covenants, and redemption and remission are found in no other connection in Hebrews. What is there in Heb. ix. 15-22 and x. 15-18, which can be said to be in common with the passages which speak of redemption and forgiveness in Ephesians? The answer must be that there is “nothing at all”, save that the Redeemer of both companies and callings is the same Blessed One, the Saviour of all men and of all callings, the Lord Jesus Christ.

In Hebrews the Redeemer is given a title, He is “The Mediator of the New Covenant” (or testament). This is a title foreign to, and entirely unnecessary to Ephesians. The Ephesian saints were never under the Old Covenant, the Hebrews were; the Ephesian saints received no blessings from the New Covenant, the Hebrews did. To remove the New Covenant from Hebrews is to remove the very heart of the epistle. To intrude the New Covenant into Ephesians would be fatal to its glorious teaching. Who is there that

retains the faculty of clear thinking, of comparing spiritual things with spiritual, of trying the things that differ, of proving those things which are more excellent, that can hesitate in accepting, fully and without reserve, the fact revealed by the employment of these two words, that the callings and spheres of these two epistles are completely different? Let us leave redemption and forgiveness, and consider the closely allied subject of “access”.

“Access” in Ephesians.

“For through Him, we, the both, have access by one spirit unto the Father” (ii. 18).

“In Whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him” (iii. 12).

Entrance in Hebrews.

The word translated “access” in Ephesians is *prosagoge*. This Greek word does not occur in Hebrews, neither does the related word, *prosago*. In the place of “access” Hebrews reads:

“Having therefore brethren boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way; which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say His flesh; and having a high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering: for He is faithful that promised” (Heb. x. 19-23).

In both Ephesians and Hebrews the “access” and the “entering in” is said to be with boldness. In both Ephesians and Hebrews something in the form of a barrier is associated with “His flesh”; in Ephesians it is the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, and likened to “the middle wall of partition”, while in Hebrews it is likened to “the veil”, the ordinances already being spoken of in Heb. ix. 10. So far, there is a parallel, but the moment we begin to compare details, connections and consequences, the distinction of the calling and sphere of either epistle once more becomes manifest.

The exhortation “to draw near”, which is found in Heb. x., is bounded by the terms of the New Covenant. The word “therefore” of Heb. x. 19 indicates that the boldness to enter, there revealed, is a direct outcome of the work of Christ as Mediator of the New Covenant. What the reference to “bodies washed with pure water” may mean is a matter about which commentators are divided, some taking it to refer to the ordinance of baptism, others to the fulfillment of the prophecy of Ezek. xxxvi. 25, or the typical washing of the priests in the tabernacle service. For the moment the point is immaterial, no “sprinkling” of the conscience or “washing” of the body can have any place in Eph. ii., as we shall see upon examination. But we have not yet done with this passage for the writer continues:

“For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries” (Heb. x. 26, 27).

and instead of being able to argue, that such threats belong only to the Old Covenant, the passage goes on to declare that the punishment meted out to those who thus sin under terms of the New Covenant will be “much sorer”, and clinches the argument by quoting the law:

“Vengeance belongeth to me, I will recompense” (Heb. x. 30).

These strange and terrifying words arise naturally out of the calling and sphere of blessing to which the epistle to the Hebrews ministers, but not even the most ardent advocate of the position we refute would want to read them into Eph. ii. Do those who claim “Hebrews” as their own, accept Heb. x. 26-30 as dispensationally true for the Church of the Mystery, including themselves?

A superficial acquaintance with Ephesians and Hebrews might prompt the remark that, in both, believers are said to be “made nigh”. This, however, is not true for the word employed in Eph. ii. 13 and 17 is *eggus*, “nigh”, which word is never used in Hebrews, whereas *proserchomai*, “come” or “draw near”, is the word consistently used in Hebrews. In Eph. ii. the believer is not told “to draw near” but learns the blessed truth that he has been “made nigh” by the blood of Christ, an essential difference. In Hebrews, the “drawing near” is a direct result of the New Covenant; in Ephesians the “being made nigh” is the result of the creation of the New man, the Hebrews position being the subject of the Law and the Prophets, the Ephesian position being the subject of the Mystery which had been hid in God.

#5. In Hebrews Christ is set forth as “High Priest”; in Ephesians, as “Head”. pp. 219 - 221

In the calling and sphere of Hebrews, the outstanding office associated with Christ as He sits on the right hand of God, is that of High Priest. In the calling and sphere of Ephesians, His outstanding office as He sits on the right hand of God, is that of Head. Are these but two names for the same thing, or do they differ? No epistle, apart from Hebrews, uses the title “High Priest” or “Priest”, yet without the doctrine that revolves around these words, how could the teaching of Hebrews proceed? It will be remembered that the exhortation “to draw near” that occupied our attention in the previous article was based upon the fact that those thus exhorted had “an high priest over the house of God” (Heb. x. 21).

References to the necessity of a sacrifice for sin are not limited to any one epistle. Paul’s epistles, both before Acts xxviii. and after, contain many such precious references, yet, never, throughout the course of his ministry as *God’s appointed Preacher, Teacher and Apostle of the Gentiles*, does he ever use the word “Priest” or “High Priest”, either of the believer or of his Lord. And yet, when he came to write the epistle to the Hebrews, he breaks entirely new ground, using the word “Priest” thirteen

times—a number that we have already noticed earlier in this series—“Great Priest”, (*megan*), once (Heb. x. 21); and “High Priest” seventeen times, and so interwoven with the theme of Hebrews is this thought of “Priesthood” that the teaching of chapters v., vii., viii., ix. and x. demand continual reference to “priests”, while chapters ii., iii., iv., v., vi., vii., viii., ix. and xiii. necessitate continual reference to the “High Priest”.

Words are counters; they are index fingers; their inclusion or exclusion from any reasonable piece of writing indicates its general trend. Any treatise, letter or book dealing with such matters as War, Finance, Religion and Logic would of necessity include certain specific terms and exclude others, and if the treatise, letter or book were of the length of either Hebrews or Ephesians, the subject-matter of the title could be deduced from a collation of the distinctive words employed. If the theme of Hebrews necessitated the constant use of the words “Priest” and “High Priest”, that fact would go a long way to indicate the character of its teaching. If to this it be added that Ephesians contains neither of these words, that additional fact would go a long way to indicate that the essential theme of Ephesians differed from Hebrews. Further, if it be observed that in the whole of Paul’s writings (thirteen epistles) there is not one occurrence of the word “Priest” or “High Priest”, the evidence for the difference between his apostolic ministry as covered by the thirteen epistles and this letter to the Hebrews is still further increased, and when we remember that the same writer, Paul, is responsible for the use, or non use, of these words, and that the use, or non use, is controlled not only by Paul’s reasonableness, and Paul’s faithfulness, but by inspiration of God (II Tim. iii. 16; II Pet. iii. 16), then the evidence for the difference in calling and sphere of Hebrews and Ephesians becomes overwhelming.

Before we can appreciate the use or non use of the word “Priest” in these epistles, it will be necessary to consider the testimony of Scripture concerning the office of the Priest and its relation to Israel and the nations. The epistle to the Hebrews itself provides evidence that, long before Israel’s time, the idea of Priesthood was entertained by the nations, for Melchisedec was a “King-Priest” at the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 18-20). There is much to be said concerning the Melchisedec priesthood (Heb. v. 11), but the present is not the time of it. There were priests in Egypt in the days of Joseph (Gen. xlv. 20) and in Midian in the days of Moses (Exod. ii. 16) yet, out of the 725 occurrences where the word *kohen* is translated “priest”, at least 700 refer to the priesthood of Israel. If under the law of Moses the offering of sacrifice, and the building of an altar is the work of a priest, this was by no means the case before the introduction of the “law of commandments and carnal ordinances” introduced after the breaking of the stones of the covenant at Sinai.

Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice, yet he was no priest. Noah offered a burnt offering upon an altar, and distinguishes between clean and unclean animals (Gen. viii. 20). Job, too, as the head of his family “sent and sanctified his children” and “offered burnt offerings” on their behalf (Job i. 5). Upon his entry into the land of promise Abraham also “built an altar, and called upon the name of the Lord” (Gen. xii. 7, 8), and is seen arranging the sacrifices at the time of the great promise (Gen. xv. 9-21). Isaac built an altar (Gen. xxvi. 25), and Jacob built an altar at Shalem (Gen. xxxiii. 20),

and another at Bethel, by the command of God (Gen. xxxv. 1-7), and, last, but by no means least, *the great Sacrifice of the Passover* was offered by the head of each family, no priest being mentioned or necessary. In the Scriptures Priesthood is not introduced by Divine command until the consecration of Aaron and his sons, recorded in Exod. xxix. Before that consecration, priests are mentioned in Exod. xix. 22 and 24, but these seem to have occupied the same sort of position that was given to David's sons as recorded in II Sam. viii. 18, where the words "chief rulers" is the Hebrew word *kohen*, or to Zabud in I Kings iv. 5, where the words "principal officer" is the Hebrew word *kohen*. This unusual use of the word *kohen*, ordinarily translated "priest", appears to hark back to the primitive idea contained in the root meaning of the word, which signifies either "to present oneself, or to present something or someone else" (J. M. A. in the Comp. Bib. Dict.). It is a matter of scriptural testimony and not of inference or deduction, that only priesthood recognized in Israel under the law of Moses was the Levitical priesthood, of which the High Priest's office was given to the family of Aaron, and the Priesthood to the tribe of Levi (Heb. v. 4; vii. 5, 14).

When we turn to the epistle to the Ephesians, however, those belonging to the sphere and calling there administered are seen to *have been* "redeemed" and to *have been* "made nigh" by blood (Eph. i. 7; ii. 13). *They themselves* constitute a "holy temple in the Lord" and a "habitation of God in spirit" (Eph. ii. 21, 22). This company are "called saints" (Eph. i. 1), and find their inheritance "in the saints" and "of the saints" (Eph. i. 18; ii. 19), yet without the intervention of a priest. This company has access, yea, boldness of access, with confidence, *but no priest is found necessary to open the way*. In the practical section, Christ is said to have "given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2), and in the same practical section He is said to have sanctified and cleansed the church, and will present it unto Himself holy and without blemish (Eph. v. 26, 27). Yet in chapter i. Christ is set forth not as "High Priest" but as "Head" and the church is set forth as His "body". This two-fold title occurs again in chapter v., and the "one body" is prominent in chapter ii. The calling of the church of the mystery is not typified in the types and shadows of the law. The extraordinary insistence upon Priesthood found everywhere in the law of Moses finds its echo in but one epistle of Paul, namely in the epistle to the Hebrews. The earlier position, namely that of head of a family, set forth by Noah, Job, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob before the law, is more in line with the relationship that Christ holds to the church to-day. Instead of indicating an enrichment, the addition of the Levitical priesthood was a sure indication of failure. No perfection was possible or intended under the Levitical priesthood, which was made after the law of a carnal commandment (Heb. vii. 11, 16). In the case of Israel, Christ, by being a priest after the order of Melchisedec, fulfils the office foreshadowed with such frailty by Aaron's priesthood. No such order is needed by the Gentiles who come under the dispensation of the mystery; they find all, and more than Israel can find in the King-Priest, in their ascended Head.

As space is precious, we will leave recapitulation of the findings of the preceding articles until we reach the closing articles of the series, but the reader who is in any doubt is advised to re-read what has previously been advanced so that the cumulative force of the comparisons made may be felt.

Fundamentals of Christian Practice.

by Stuart Allen

#1. Prayer doctrinally and dispensationally considered. **pp. 171 - 177**

We are deeply conscious that, to have a share in the ministry of the “Berean Expositor”, is not only a great privilege, but at the same time a real responsibility. In the following series we intend to dwell upon practical truths which the Scripture indicates should be in the lives of all who love the Lord and the high calling He has so graciously given us. We have the young believer specially in mind, and while some aspects of the truth presented may be elementary to those who are more advanced along the Christian pathway, we ask such to bear with us so that those who are younger in the faith may grow in grace and that we may all not only be *rooted* in Him (Eph. iii. 17) but exhibit that *fruit* of the Spirit which is so well pleasing in His sight (Gal. v. 22).

To the believer who is going on to spiritual maturity, there can scarcely be a more important subject than that of prayer. Its importance can be gauged by considering the pattern given to us by the ascended Lord Jesus, viz. the great Apostle of the Gentiles and his ministry (I Tim. i. 16).

Even a casual reading of Paul’s epistles cannot fail to disclose the large place that prayer occupied in his life and witness. It is no overstatement of truth to say that these were literally steeped in prayer. No less than six times in his letters does the Apostle declare that he prayed “without ceasing”. On the surface this appears to be an exaggeration. How could a man write such a passage as II Cor. xi. 21-31 describing his sufferings for Christ, his tremendous responsibilities, his untiring work, that could have left little time for what we call leisure, yet declare that he never left off praying?

If we limit prayer to drawing aside in secret upon our knees, and pouring out our hearts to God, it is obvious that the Apostle could have had very little time so to do. But prayer, in its essence, is an attitude of the new nature and the renewed mind to God. It is one that is constantly in touch with Him in fellowship and communion and that, in spite of all external pressure of circumstances.

Paul could therefore declare in truth that his prayer life was continuous and uninterrupted, and those who follow him even as he followed Christ, will ever desire to know in daily experience, such a blessed spiritual condition.

In considering this vital subject, let us look at the words used by the Holy Spirit in the N.T. for prayer.

Deomai occurs 22 times and is rendered in the A.V. “pray” 12 times, “beseech” 9 times and “make request” once.

Its root meaning is *to be in want or need* and this expresses one of the basic conceptions of prayer, a consciousness, on the part of the believer, of his weakness and insufficiency, and a desire to come into living touch with the Almighty One Who declared, “All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth” (Matt. xxviii. 18).

Euchomai, to wish strongly, occurs 8 times and is translated both “pray” and “wish”. Its compound *proseuchomai* is of more frequent occurrence, 87 times to be exact, 83 of which are translated “pray”. Here prayer is the expression of a strong desire to the Lord, either personal or in respect of others.

Erotao to interrogate, to ask. Out of 58 occurrences in the N.T., 14 times the word is rendered “pray”.

“It implies familiarity if not equality; hence never used of our prayers to God, while it is used of Christ’s prayers to the Father” (John xiv. 16; xvi. 26; xvii. 9, 15, 20).
(Critical Lexicon Concordance to N.T., Bullinger).

Hence it is the word that is consistently used in the Gospel of John which stresses the Lord’s Deity.

Parakaleo, to call beside or near, in order that the person concerned may do something. The word is used 110 times in the N.T. Three times it is rendered “entreat”, six times “pray” and 43 times “beseech”. Here again the conception behind the word is one of *need* and the calling to our side of the Lord to help and strengthen. It comes over into our language as *paraclete* and is applied to the Holy Spirit (John xiv. 16 Comforter) and to the Lord Jesus Christ (I John ii. 1 Advocate).

To the foregoing words must be added the Greek word *enteuxis* = intercession. The word means a falling in with or coming together and then to intercede, specially with relation to the needs of others. This is perhaps the highest conception of prayer, where self is relegated to the background and the welfare of others is put first and foremost.

In I Tim. ii. 1 the Apostle says, “I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications (*deesis* from *deomai*) prayers (*proseuche* from *proseuchomai*) intercessions (*enteuxis*) and giving of thanks (*eucharistia*) be made for all men”. This covers prayer in a wide sense and gives us an indication what our prayer life should be like.

At this juncture we may well pause to ask ourselves, What is the purpose behind prayer? Is it a means of extracting something from God that He would otherwise be unwilling to give? Or is it its effect upon us in some way?

As we survey the evangelical world, we find a multitude of conceptions existing among believers. Some talk of “prayer warfare”. Are we justified in regarding prayer as an offensive weapon? The answer to these and all other spiritual problems is only found within the range of inspired Scripture. Ephesians chapter vi. is the passage generally

alluded to in connection with this idea. Here we have a description of the “whole armour (panoply) of God” which is for the believer with a view to the “evil day” (Eph. vi. 13).

A careful reading will show that this armour is sixfold, five pieces being for the *defensive*, and only one *offensive* weapon and that is *not prayer, but the Word of God, the Sword of the Spirit*. Prayer does not occur at all in the symbolism of the armour, but follows on in verse 18.

We do not deny that the believer who has taken to himself the whole armour of God, will also use to the utmost the privilege of prayer, but this does not of necessity turn it into an offensive weapon. Rather is it more protective than offensive.

Let us consider what prayer does for the believer and we may then appreciate something more of its supreme importance in our daily lives. We may remind ourselves to begin with that there is no such thing as *unanswered* prayer. If we have waited upon the Lord for a certain thing, and in His wisdom it is not granted the answer is “No”, and “No” is as much as answer from Him as “Yes”. Paul himself learnt this lesson. Three times he earnestly prayed and asked the Lord to remove his “thorn in the flesh” (II Cor. xii. 8). The Divine answer was “No” but the glorious experience of the added grace and strength imparted to him more than compensated for the negative answer to his prayer. Wise are we if we can take the Lord’s refusals without being offended, and have a complete trust in His matchless wisdom and love for each one of us, a love that will not allow Him to grant us things that would be to our harm.

1. *True prayer gives access to the Father*. To appreciate this properly, we should put ourselves back into Old Testament times. Do we realize that, prior to the all sufficient offering on Calvary, no believer ever enjoyed access to God? Jehovah surrounded Himself with barriers of sacrifice and priesthood to impress upon His people the fact that sin eternally separates Himself from fallen man and until the One offering for sin had been made and sin righteously put away, there could be no possibility of access to the Divine presence. Let us consider the following verses:

“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*” (Heb. ix. 8). “Having therefore, brethren, boldness *to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus*” (Heb. x. 19).

We may point out, in passing, that the right to *enter* into the holiest of all did not confer upon believers of the Acts period the tremendous privilege of *dwelling* there for ever. To *enter* there by prayer is one thing, but to be *seated* there in Christ Jesus, is quite another (Eph. ii. 6). This is the exclusive privilege of the One Body and it is revealed in all its fullness in the second chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians.

Every time we pray, we are able to draw near to God in a sense that no Old Testament saint was able to do, and this fact alone, should remind us of the inestimable privilege that prayer confers upon us. It should prevent us from thoughtlessly rushing into the Lord’s presence.

In praying we are coming into the audience chamber of the King of Kings, but lest this should daunt us, we remember that this glorious One is also our Saviour and our Head.

2. *True prayer gives fellowship and communion with God.*

When believers speak of fellowship, they usually mean spiritual intercourse with one another, and this is a beautiful feature of the Christian life. The Apostle John, however, reminds us of a far more important aspect of fellowship: “Truly our fellowship (*koinonia*) is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ” (I John i. 3).

The Greek *koinonia* means something that is *shared* or one has in *common* with someone else, so leading to the thought of *communion*. Thus, in a wonderful way, prayer brings us into communion with our Heavenly Father and we have the joy of talking with Him at any and all times. God forbid that we should ever regard prayer as a Christian act to be engaged in only when we *want* something, but rather learn, in a practical way, what day be day fellowship with the Father means.

Just as breathing is the natural expression of physical life, so should prayer be the normal and continuous expression of our spiritual life.

3. *True prayer puts God first, others second, and self last.*

In the prayer which our Lord taught His disciples, which is a model prayer for the subjects of the earthly kingdom, the Lord commences with: “*Our Father* which are in heaven, hallowed be *Thy* name, *Thy* kingdom come, *Thy* will be done” Thus we have four references to God before we reach “Give *us* this day our daily bread”. Likewise the recorded prayers of the Apostle Paul abound with concern for others. Rom. i. 9-12; I Cor. i. 4-7; Eph. i. 16-23; Phil. i. 4-11; Col. i. 3-6; I Thess. i. 2-4. These references not only make this clear, but also contain the element of *thanksgiving* which is most important. As long as we are conscious of the Lord’s abiding goodness to each one of us, we are not likely to stray from the path of His revealed will. It was when Israel of old ceased to be thankful that they forgot God’s lovingkindness and wonder working on their behalf and their heart turned back to Egypt (a type of the world) and its allurements.

It is also true of the nations at Babel. They knew God yet glorified Him not as God, *neither were they thankful* (Rom. i. 21), and thus started the terrible declension that the remainder of this chapter reveals. A thankful heart is a great preservative against evil and we are not ever likely to weary the Lord by including it continually in our prayers in a heartfelt manner.

4. *True prayer rests upon and claims God’s promises.*

It is a significant fact that all the outstanding characters in Scriptures have been men and women who knew how to pray and a careful study of their prayers will show that these are based upon the Word of God and the promises contained therein.

We may think of Elijah. James, in his epistle, brings forward Elijah as an example of effectual praying (v. 17). He prayed earnestly that it might not rain and it rained not on

the earth by the space of three years and six months. He prayed again and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit (verses 17, 18). Now this was remarkable indeed, and on the surface it looked as though the prophet had some extraordinary power to accomplish a miracle. But it should be remembered that this prayer was based upon the Word of God.

“And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto My commandments which I command you this day that I will give you the *rain of your land* in his due season Take heed to yourselves, that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside, and serve other gods and worship them; and then the Lord’s wrath be kindled against you, and *He shut up the heaven, that there be no rain* and that the land yield not her fruit” (Deut. xi. 13-17).

Elijah, in a time of Israel’s apostasy, was simply asking the Lord to carry out His written threats as well as His promises, in order to bring back the sinful nation to repentance.

Or let us take the case of David. After thanking God for all His gracious revelation of His purposes concerning himself he says, “Therefore now, Lord, let the thing that *Thou hast spoken* concerning Thy servant and concerning his house be established for ever, and *do as Thou hast said*” (I Chron. xvii. 23). God loves to be reminded of His promises.

If our praying is to be effective, it must be likewise based upon the unchanging Word, but to this we must add the injunction of II Tim. ii. 15. If we base our prayers upon Scripture or promises relating to a calling other than to which we belong, can we expect God to hear and answer? Most assuredly not. Right division is eminently practical in this respect as in every way. We must get to know our Divine calling before we can begin to pray properly. Many children of God are asking Him for all kinds of things pertaining to Scriptures that do not apply to them or which belong to another time period, and they are disappointed and frustrated because they have a silent heaven. Let us search our prayer life and make sure we are not perpetuating the same error.

5. *True prayer watches and waits for the Lord’s answer.*

The prophet Habakkuk not only prayed, but stood upon his watchtower to see what the Lord would say in reply (Hab. ii. 1). The Lord Jesus not only exhorted His disciples to pray, but to *watch* as well as pray (Luke xxi. 36; Mark xiii. 35-37).

In the last reference the word translated “watch” is *gregoreo*, which literally means to be sleepless or to keep wide awake. Can it be that we sometimes pray to the Lord and then, as it were, go to sleep and forget? Did not many of the Pentecostal Church do this very thing? They were concerned that Peter had been imprisoned by Herod.

“Peter was therefore kept in prison, but prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him” (Acts xii. 5). God was graciously pleased to answer this prayer and release His servant, who thereupon came to the house of Mary the mother of John where “many were gathered together praying” (verse 12) and knocked at the door of the gate. When the damsel Rhoda, who recognized Peter’s voice, ran to tell them, they said to her “thou art mad” (verse 15). “But Peter continued knocking: and when they had opened the door and saw him, *they were astonished*” (verse 16).

Now this was praying, but it was certainly not *watching* and praying, for when the answer came, they were unprepared for it. However, we have no stones to throw at these believers, for how many times in the experience of both the writer and reader has this not been repeated? May God keep us wide awake to recognize immediately His answers to our petitions.

“Continue in prayer, and *watch in the same* with thanksgiving” (Col. iv. 2).

6. *True prayer has an intensity and earnestness behind it.*

We know little of Epaphras and his ministry, but of two things we can be certain: his keenness and practical love for the saints at Colosse and Laodicea (Col. iv. 13) and his vital prayer life.

“Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, *always labouring fervently for you in prayers*, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God” (Col. iv. 12).

“Labouring fervently” is a translation of the Greek word *agonizo*. While it would be going too far to translate this word “agonize” as some have done, it has in its composition the word *agon* meaning a race or contest and it brings before our mind the fact that effective praying has behind it an intensity of effort compared to an athlete running a race. Does this characteristic truthfully describe our praying? An apathetic or spasmodic prayer life accomplished nothing and often we may be convinced of laxity in this respect.

7. *True prayer is offered to God the Father in Christ’s Name.*

In the N.T. prayer is always directed to God the Father (Eph. iii. 14) and offered in the Name of the Lord Jesus (Eph. iii. 21) and interpreted by the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 26). How often have we heard in public, prayer finished with the phrase “for Christ’s sake, Amen” and so rushed over as though it was of little importance and merely a formal or correct way of concluding. Do we realize that it is only because of the Lord Jesus Christ and His precious redemptive work that prayer is possible at all? If we do, then we shall be very conscious of this supreme fact as we pray and ask that all His fragrance should be cast over all our spiritual breathings to God.

8. *True prayer is protective.*

The Lord Jesus, looking ahead to Peter’s denial of Himself, says to him: “Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed *for thee* that thy faith fail not” (Luke xxii. 31, 32). Literally the words read, “I have prayed (*peri*) around thee”. Peter was, as it were, surrounded with a wall of protective prayer by the Lord. No wonder he was so soon to be smitten with remorse and turn back to Him, from his grievous fall, with true repentance.

The Lord uses the same expression in John xvii. 9, 20, “I pray for (*peri*) them, I pray not for (*peri*) the world” (verse 9). “Neither pray I for (*peri*) these alone, but also for (*peri*) those who shall believe through their word” (verse 20).

Paul, in his concern for the Thessalonian and Colossian saints uses the same thought (II Thess. i. 11; Col. i. 3). Do we uphold in prayer those who are in special need in this way? It may be that distance separates such from us, but prayer can annihilate the greatest distance and protect them from harm and danger.

9. *True prayer makes doctrine real and experimental.*

In Eph. i. 3-14 the Apostle Paul covers a tremendous sweep of doctrine, revealing the magnitude of the Father's will, the Son's redemptive work, and the Holy Spirit's present witness.

However, this did not exhaust what he had to teach the Ephesian saints, but before he proceeds further, he begins *to pray* that the truth so far given may become *real* and *experimental* to each of his readers (verses 15-23). Every public Bible reading and every private reading of the Scriptures should send us to our knees and make us realize the increasing responsibility that every revelation of Truth brings and the need that we should not only receive it as Truth (Eph. i. 17) but practically acknowledge it in our walk and witness day by day.

Reading about our inheritance in Christ, is like viewing it afar off. Prayer brings it near and makes it our own possession.

10. *True prayer will conform to the will of God.*

“And this is the confidence that we have in Him, that, if we ask anything *according to His will*, He heareth us” (I John v. 14).

On reaching this point, we have come to the centre of the purpose of all prayer, that is, to bring each one of us into conformity to the Lord's will, whatever that may involve. Alas so many of us journey such a long way along the road of Christian experience before we reach this point. When we can honestly and truthfully say we long for nothing so much as His will in our lives, whatever that may cost, and when our wills are completely submerged in His, we have progressed far towards the goal of spiritual maturity. We shall not reach this stage until we know something of the deception, frailty and sinfulness of our own hearts, and, at the same time, the boundless love and infinite concern for our eternal happiness that exists in the heart of our Heavenly Father towards each one of us. Then, and not till then, can we say as the Saviour did, “Thy will, not mine, be done” (Luke xxii. 42).

#2. Conditions that govern the answering of prayer. pp. 207 - 212

At this point it may be good to realize afresh from God's Word what are the conditions for obtaining affirmative answers to our prayers.

1. *There must be an abandonment of all known sin in our lives.*

The O.T. saints had to learn this lesson.

"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (Psa. lxvi. 18),

"Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save: neither is His ear heavy, that it cannot hear, but your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you, *that He will not hear*" (Isa. lix. 1, 2).

"Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination to Me your new moons and your appointed feasts My soul hateth and when ye spread forth your hands *I will hide mine eyes from you*: yea, when ye make many prayers, *I will not hear*. Your hands are full of blood" (Isa. i. 13-15).

Both John and James, in their epistles, stress the same truth:

"Whatsoever we ask, we receive of Him, *because we keep His commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in His sight*" (I John iii. 22).

"The effectual fervent prayer of a *righteous* man availeth much" (James v. 16).

Members of the Body of Christ are warned against giving place to the Devil, thus grieving the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv. 27, 30), and causing prayer to be disregarded by God.

2. *There must be a practical realization of the truth of Sanctification.*

The root meaning of sanctification is *separation*, with its twofold aspect of being separated *from* the world and separated *to* the Lord, for the fulfillment of His will in daily service.

When the judgment upon the cities of the plain was impending, there were two believers who figure largely in the story. One was *inside* the city of Sodom, namely Lot, and one was *outside* the city, namely Abraham. Although Lot was vexed every day by the sin which surrounded him (II Pet. ii. 7) we have no record of any prayer on his part on behalf of Sodom and finally we know that God had to drag him out that he might not be involved in its doom. He is a type of the believer who is not only *in* the world, but *of* the world and knows little of sanctification in practice. It was left to Abraham, the separated one, to intercede for these wicked cities (Gen. xviii. 16-33).

It is impossible for a believer who has too close a contact with a world which is under the domination of Satan (Eph. ii. 2, 3) to pray effectively. We must, in practice, be

outside the enemy's camp if we wish to accomplish anything for those who are still inside it.

3. *There must be no self motive in prayer.*

“Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts” (James iv. 3).

The Greek word *hedone* translated lust is elsewhere rendered “pleasure” and is used in the parable of the Sower to describe those who fall among thorns and are choked with cares, and riches and *pleasures* of this life and bring no fruit to perfection (Luke viii. 14). Sometimes it is a good thing to take stock of ourselves, searching our hearts and asking whether the things we constantly ask of God are for His glory, the blessing of others, or are they for the gratification of *our* desires?

Is He and His service first and last and self excluded?

4. *Undispensational praying.*

We have before commented on this very prevalent source of denied petitions. If dispensational truth means anything at all it will have a *practical* bearing upon every phase of our life including our praying. We must learn to pray *in harmony with our calling*. It is not sufficient basis for the Lord to answer our requests. How many believers have claimed such promises as Matt. xxi. 20-22. “And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall received”, only to reap disappointment which has staggered them! It is easy to explain the failure by reading into the promise conditions which are not there. The answer to the problem is to be found, not in tampering with the Lord's words, but in rightly dividing the Word of Truth. Again, if instead of a slavish adherence to the “Lord's prayer”, the magnificent prayers of Eph. i. and iii. were used by God's people more frequently, would there not be a greater growth in grace and a deeper appreciation of His will?

5. *There must be perseverance with our praying.*

The Apostle Paul exhorted the saints at Colosse to *continue* in prayer (iv. 2). The word here is *proskartereo*. It occurs in Mark iii. 9, “And He spake to His disciples that a small ship should *wait on* Him because of the multitudes lest they should throng Him”. Just as the purpose of this little ship was to be put at the Lord's disposal and wait for Him to use as He willed, so the believer, when he reaches the point in his spiritual growth where he earnestly longs for God's will, will likewise wait upon Him by continued prayer and watch for every indication of His hand to this end.

However, we must utter a word of warning. Persevering prayer to know our heavenly Father's will is one thing, but persistent praying that is outside His will may bring an answer that is terrible in the extreme. We think back on Israel's experience when, not satisfied with the gracious provision of the manna—“angel's food” as Scripture terms it—they longed for flesh such as they had in Egypt. The whole of Numbers chapter xi.

should be studied in this connection. Did God answer their prayer? Yes, indeed He did, but with dreadful consequences as the context indicates.

The Psalmist's comment is:--

“They lusted exceedingly in the wilderness and tempted God in the desert. *And he gave them their request, but sent leanness into their soul*” (Psa. cvi. 14, 15).

Here was a terrible answer, consequent upon their determination to get something that was outside the will of God. Let us ever remember that He is always more ready to answer than we are to pray, and that persevering prayer is necessary, not because He is aloof and unwilling, needing constant worrying that the answer may be wrung out of Him, but rather that the waiting time is for our spiritual growth, discipline and appreciation of His goodness. Let us not interpret beseeching as though it were besieging. Just as a wise and loving parent makes every provision for the needs of his child, yet he trains that child, to *ask* for these things and say “please” and “thank you” when they are granted. Likewise our Heavenly Father deals in His grace and lovingkindness with us and teaches the true reason for prayer, to realize our utter dependence upon Him for all things necessary to Christian life and service and a desire to be filled with a knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding (Col. i. 9).

This lesson is not peculiar to the dispensation of the Mystery. Through the prophet Ezekiel God had made known His will to Israel and showed what He was willing to do for them in restoration and blessing (Ezek. xxxvi. 24-36). But, although this was true, the earthly people had to learn the lesson of prayer:

“I will yet for this *be enquired of* by the house of Israel to do it for them” (verse 27).

There are two opposing schools of thought among believers regarding prayer. One stresses the fact that God is sovereign and is working all things after the counsel of His own will (Eph. i. 11) and that nothing can hinder the fulfillment of His plans. To such, prayer cannot forward or retard His purposes. The other lays stress upon the responsibility of the believer and the fact that unbelief limits the Holy One of Israel (Matt. xiii. 58). Such will talk of God being unable to work because of prayerlessness and of true prayer “moving the Hand that moves the world”. It is very much like the arguments for free will set up against election. The truth lies, as it so often does, midway between these two extremes. It is important to realize that God has a glorious plan for both the heavens and the earth, and that, finally, this plan cannot possibly miscarry. Not to realize this would cause utter despair and make mockery of all Christian effort.

At the same time, if redemption means anything at all, it signifies that the believer is not only *alive* spiritually, but *free*; free to choose the way of the flesh and self gratification as well as the will of the Lord. And it is here that the supreme importance of prayer becomes manifest. If God is working to a plan and chooses to use redeemed human lives to carry it out, then the question arises as to what part each one of us is going to play in its unfolding. The importance of this can hardly be over emphasized. Does it

not mean that we must go to the Throne of Grace constantly and ask “Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?” (Acts xi. 6). We are assured by the apostle Paul that it is according to the “effectual working in the measure of *every part*”, that the Body grows (Eph. iv. 16) and this will only happen when every member of the Church is doing just the work intended by our Heavenly Father and none other. This can only be *discovered by prayer and waiting upon God*.

As there are no useless members in the physical body—so there should be none in the spiritual Body.

That prayer *does* make a difference, the following Scriptures make abundantly clear.

“Finally, brethren, *pray for us*, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men” (II Thess. iii. 1, 2).

Now it could be argued that it was obviously the Lord’s will that His Word should run unhindered and be glorified. If so, then why the need of prayer? But the Apostle knew how easily the human factor could enter in and the flesh and the Devil intrude, and so hinder God’s work.

“Withal *praying also for us*, that God would open unto us a door of utterance to speak the mystery of Christ for which I am also in bonds” (Col. iv. 3).

The same thought occurs here, but this time Paul is thinking of himself and any possible failure on his part to make known the great secret.

“For I know this shall turn to my salvation *through your prayer*, and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ” (Phil. i. 19).

Whether we take salvation to mean Paul’s deliverance from prison or in a much deeper sense, his salvation with age abiding glory (II Tim. ii. 10) is not our concern at the moment. It is clear that the suffering he was undergoing in his Roman prison was for the Lord’s gain and the furtherance of the truth, and the prayers of the Philippian saints contributed a vital part to this great end.

Whether this would have happened if the church at Philippi had *not* constantly remembered the Apostle in prayer, it is idle to speculate, but it is quite evident that Paul took them as a factor to be reckoned with in the outworking of the Lord’s will for himself.

“But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that *through your prayers* I shall be given unto you” (Philemon 22).

There, quite obviously, the Apostle is contemplating the possibility of his being set free from prison and being able to visit Philemon; and this possibility is inextricably woven with Philemon’s intercession for his release. If prayer makes no difference to the daily happenings in our lives, why should Paul say “I trust that through or on account of (*dia*) your prayers, I shall be given to you”?

“Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together (*sunagonizomai*) with me in your prayers to God for me, and that I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judaea and that my service, which I have for Jerusalem, may be accepted of the saints; that I may come unto you with joy by the will of God and may with you be refreshed” (Rom./ xv. 30-32).

Here Paul asks prayer for four important things concerning himself and mentions God’s will regarding them. If the fulfillment of this will was automatic, there would be no need of prayer, but it is evident that the Apostle did not so regard it, but rather that the petitions of the Church at Rome could materially help forward the fulfillment of his desires.

We trust that careful consideration of these passages will impress upon the mind of both writer and reader how vastly important our daily prayer life is and how it can very practically affect not only our own Christian service but also the service of others.

From time to time we come across believers who are exercised about their sphere of service and witness for the Lord. They are rightly concerned about these things. It is not our province to direct the conscience of such, but this we can say that here is a supreme ministry we can all engage in, namely that of intercession. It will cost us something in time and perhaps in other ways and we shall get no human commendation for it as it is a thing only known to us and our Saviour.

Just as in our physical bodies there are organs like the heart and lungs doing vital work, yet are never seen like the external members as the hands and feet, so believers who engage in this vital activity behind the scenes may be doing as much in the Lord’s sight as those whose service is in the open and manifest to all.

The reader will remember the wonderful type given in Exod. xvii. 8-13. Joshua and his men may fight strenuously with Amalek in the valley, but it was *the man unseen at the hill top who controlled the battle*, namely Moses.

“When Moses held up his hand Israel prevailed and when he let down his hand Amalek prevailed. But Moses’ hands were heavy; and they took a stone and put it under him and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the other side, and *his hands were steady* until the going down of the sun” (verses 11, 12).

Do we who value dispensational truth and the glories of the dispensation of the Mystery, uphold our leaders like this in prayer? Oh the need to-day for many like Aaron and Hur! As we look around us we see a growing apathy to spiritual things in general and to our calling in particular. Christian walk and witness is getting more difficult as the weeks and months pass. We may put this down to the increasing apostasy and declension which marks the end of the age and we may be right in so doing. But can it be that we have not yet fully realized the possibilities latent in a vital prayer life and that the lack of results which we deplore may be due to the fact that we have sown the seed of the written and spoken word and then forgotten to water it by the ministry of prayer? Only then can we expect the increase or growth that God alone can give (I Cor. iii. 6, 7).

When John in his Apocalyptic vision sees the twenty-four elders before the Throne, he tells us that each one had a golden vial “*full of odours which are the prayers of the saints*” (Rev. v. 8). So in symbol the prayers of God’s people ascend to Him as something inexpressibly precious and fragrant. What encouragement we have then to come constantly to the Throne of grace and share in this wonderful ministry of intercession!

Persevering prayer along the lines of the will of God *does* make a difference and if our studies in this subject come as a challenge to each of us as we consider the poverty of our prayer life, may God give us grace to use, as we have never done before, this matchless privilege and so be blessed of Him increasingly in making known His transcendent riches of grace and glory in the saving, calling out, and upbuilding of those chosen in Christ before the overthrow of the world, to inherit the Heavenly holiest of all for all eternity.

“Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving” (Col. iv. 2).

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth. (Second Series).

ISAIAH.

#24. Isaiah xl. 12 - xlii. 17.

The theme of the two “Servants” introduced. pp. 9 - 11

The reader will have observed that Isaiah introduces, in direct contrast with idolatry, the subject of “service”.

“But thou, Israel, art My servant” (Isa. xli. 8).

“Behold My Servant” (Isa. xlii. 1).

The etymology of the Greek word idolatry (*eidololatreia*) is suggestive of its essential meaning. It is compounded of *eidolon*, “an image”, from *eidos*, “a form” (which in its turn is from *eido* “to see”), and *latreia*, “service”, from *latreito*, “to serve”. Idolatry is “the service of that which is seen”. Hence in the N.T. “covetousness” is called idolatry (Eph. v. 5)—a connection which, although not expressly stated in the O.T., is implied in the Law:

First commandment.—“Thou shalt have no other gods.”

Tenth commandment.—“Thou shalt not covet.”

The reader will doubtless call to mind many passages where idolatry and the worship of graven images is spoken of as “service”:

“Thou shalt not *bow down* nor *serve* them” (Exod. xx. 5).

“Driven to *worship* them, and *serve* them” (Deut. iv. 19).

“*Walk after* other gods, and *serve* them” (Deut. viii. 19).

“*Following* other gods to *serve* them” (Judges ii. 19).

“Whom they have *loved*, and whom they have *served*” (Jer. viii. 2).

Such acts of veneration and esteem as “bowing down”, “worshipping”, “walking after”, “following”, and “loving”, find their complement here in “serving”. It is not therefore strange—it is indeed of the very essence of the subject—that the section before us places “Image worship” over against true “Service”.

The first of the two servants referred to is named:

“But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend. Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art My servant: I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away” (Isa. xli. 8, 9).

The second is unnamed, but His character and mission are defined:

“Behold My Servant, Whom I uphold; Mine elect, in whom My soul delighteth; I have put My spirit upon Him; He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles” (Isa. xlii. 1).

We must now acquaint ourselves with the teaching that underlies these references to the Lord's "Servant". We must first, however, have the structure of the section as a whole before us, so that, even though we do not attempt a detailed exposition of every section, the relation of each part to the whole may be observed, and the light thus received illuminate the passages chosen for expansion.

Isaiah xli. 8 - xlii. 17.

The Two Servants, Israel and the Messiah.

- A | xli. 8, 9. ISRAEL MY SERVANT. |
 - a1 | Thou Israel, My Servant.
 - b1 | Chosen.
 - c1 | My friend.
 - a1 | Thou art My Servant.
 - b1 | Chosen.
 - c1 | Not cast away.
- B | xli. 10-20. I UPHOLD. |
 - d1 | I am I am.
 - e1 | I will will will.
 - f1 | They shall shall.
 - g1 | I will will will will.
 - f1 | They shalt shalt shalt.
 - e1 | I will will will will will.
 - d1 | The Lord the Holy One.
- C | xli. 21-29. YE ARE GODS. |
 - h1 | Show what shall happen.
 - i1 | Ye are gods.
 - j1 | Ye are nothing nought.
 - h1 | Declare from beginning.
 - i1 | He is righteous.
 - j1 | Wind, Confusion.
- A | xlii. 1. BEHOLD MY SERVANT. | Messiah. Israel a type.
- B | xlii. 1-7. I UPHOLD. |
 - d2 | Judgment to Gentiles.
 - e2 | He shall not cry, bruise, quench.
 - d2 | Judgment unto Truth.
 - e2 | He shall not fail, be discouraged.
 - f2 | Called, hold, keep, give.
 - g2 | Covenant. Light.
 - f2 | Open eyes. Release prisoners.
- C | xlii. 8-17. YE ARE OUR GODS. |
 - h2 | Graven images. No praise.
 - i2 | Former things. New things.
 - j2 | Call to sing.
 - j2 | Purpose to destroy.
 - i2 | Darkness—light. Crooked—straight.
 - h2 | Graven images—shame.

“Israel, My servant” (Isa. xli. 8, 9).—Three names occur in this section, which must be considered together: “Israel”, “Jacob”, and “Abraham”. Israel is the “servant”; Jacob was “chosen”; but both names would have remained empty titles, did they not belong to “seed of Abraham”, the friend of God. “Covenant” relationship is implied in Isa. xli. 8; and expressed in Isa. xlii. 6.

In the section that follows (Isa. xli. 10-20), Jacob is referred to as “a worm”, Israel as “man” and the Lord as their “Redeemer”.

In Isa. xliv. 1 we find once again the double title: “Jacob My servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen”, which is modified in verse 2 to read: “Fear not, O Jacob, My servant; and Jesurun, whom I have chosen.” In verse 21 of the same chapter both titles are used together: “Remember these, O Jacob and Israel; for thou art My servant”, a proof, if it were needed, that both titles refer to the one chosen people.

“Jacob, the servant”, and “Israel, the chosen” figure once more in Isa. xlv. 4, while in the last reference to “Israel” as the “servant”, the title is assumed by Messiah in His work of restoring and preserving (Isa. xlix. 3). These different passages will come before us in their turn; we have merely mentioned the references here in passing.

God’s purpose in the earth, so clearly indicated at the call of Abraham (Gen. xii.), is the reason for the “service” of Israel and the “choice” of Jacob. Its unconditional character is made evident by the references to Abraham, and the assurances that the Lord would not “cast away” nor “forsake” His people (Isa. xli. 9, 17). This purpose receives further confirmation in the promise that “they that strive against thee shall perish” (Isa. xli. 11, 12), and the positive declaration that Israel shall be a sharp threshing-instrument and a fan in the hand of the Lord.

Israel, however, cannot stand alone. As we have already seen from the last reference to Israel as the servant (Isa. xlix. 3), all finally depends upon Israel’s Messiah. We pass, therefore, from chapter xli., with its references to Israel, the servant, to chapter xlii. with its glorious prophecy of Israel’s Messiah, Redeemer and King.

The main purpose of this article has been “to prepare the way of the Lord”. This we have done chiefly by placing before the reader the structure of the section as a whole, with some insistence on the corresponding passages that speak of the Lord’s “Servant”. In our next article we hope to take up the blessed prophecy concerning the Lord Jesus Christ that occupies the first eight verses of chapter xlii. Meanwhile, even though we to-day are neither Israel nor the seed of Abraham, we may nevertheless lay hold upon and rejoice in the precious promise of Isa. xli. 10 as being true for us also in Christ:

“Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed; for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness” (Isa. xli. 10).

ISAIAH.

#25. Isaiah xl. 12 - xlii. 17.

**“Judgment unto TRUTH”; “Judgment unto VICTORY” (xlii. 1-4).
pp. 42 - 46**

Without risk of contradiction, it may be said that whatever office Israel are destined to fulfil, they will enter it only through the mediation of Christ, and that most, if not all, of the responsibilities attached to their calling have been, or will be, fulfilled by Christ.

As an instance of the first proposition, we cite the office that is peculiar to Israel, “A kingdom of priests”. We meet with this description of the nation in Exod. xix. where the foot of Mount Sinai is reached and the First Covenant instituted. Israel utterly failed to observe the condition of this covenant, and will become a “kingdom of priests” only by virtue of the blood of the New Covenant; in other words, through the mediation of Christ (Rev. i. 6).

As an instance of the second proposition we may cite Isa. xliii. 10, “Ye are My witnesses”, which refers to Israel, and Rev. i. 5 which speaks of Christ as “The faithful Witness”. So it is with the subject immediately before us. We have seen that the section divides into two, the first part falling under “*Israel*, the Servant”, and the second under “*Messiah*, the Servant”.

If the reader will consult the structure on page 10, he will observe that Isa. xlii. 1-17, is divided into three parts.

- (1) BEHOLD MY SERVANT. (Isa. xlii. 1-.).
- (2) WHOM I UPHOLD. (Isa. xlii. -1-8-.).
- (3) THE CONTRAST—IDOLS—“Ye are gods” (Isa. xlii. -8-17).

Our immediate concern is with the first two parts, and we will consider the briefer part 1 before going on to the expansion in part 2, which is very full.

“BEHOLD MY SERVANT” (Isa. xlii. 1).

In the opening words of “comfort”, with which chapter xl. opens, the prophets had said: “Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!” (Isa. xl. 9). Here, in Isa. xlii. 1, he writes, “Behold My Servant”. Both passages refer to the same blessed Person, none other than:

“Christ Jesus, Who being in the form of God made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant” (Phil. ii. 5-7).

Of this One, Isaiah had already spoken:

“Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Immanuel
(God with us) a Child is born His name shall be the Mighty God . . .”
(Isa. vii. 14; ix. 6).

The word translated “servant” is the Hebrew *ebed*, and although it may not be capable of proof, the idea is at least suggestive that the Latin *obedio* and the English *obedience* are derived from the same root. *Abad*, the verb, means “to labour”, and, in certain forms, “to till” (Gen. ii. 5); “to dress” (Gen. ii. 15). To be destined to become “A servant of servants” was to be placed under a curse (Gen. ix. 25).

Of this “Servant” the Lord said: “Whom I uphold; Mine elect, in Whom My soul delighteth: I have put My spirit upon Him” (Isa. xlii. 1). A reference to Matt. xii. 18-21 shows beyond a shadow of doubt that the “Servant” of Isa. xlii. is the Lord Jesus Christ, but upon reading Matthew’s quotation of Isa. xlii. 1-4, certain changes are observable which demand attention before we can proceed.

To economize space we will not print the passage in full as it occurs in the A.V. of Isaiah, the Greek of the Septuagint and of Matthew, but bring out the divergences by the following analysis:

Isaiah xlii. 1-4. (Hebrew).	Isaiah xlii. 1-4. (Greek).	Matthew xii. 18-21. (Greek).
“Behold My servant, Whom I uphold; mine elect in Whom my soul delighteth.”	“Jacob is My servant, I will help him; Israel is mine elect, my soul has accepted him.”	“Behold My servant; Whom I have chosen; My beloved, in Whom my soul is well pleased.”
“Smoking flax shall He not quench; He shall bring forth judgment unto truth.”	“Smoking flax shall He not quench; but He shall bring forth judgment unto truth.”	“Smoking flax shall He not quench, till He send forth judgment unto victory.”
“The isles shall wait for His law.”	“And in His name shall the Gentiles trust.”	“And in His name shall the Gentiles trust.”

The careful reader will discover a number of other, minor, differences in these three presentations, but in the present study those cited are all that need be considered.

Seeing that both names have already occurred in connection with the title “servant” in the preceding chapter, the introduction of the names “Jacob” and “Israel” into the Septuagint version of Isa. xlii. 1 was perhaps natural, but the testimony of Matthew and the general trend of the prophecy of Isaiah leave no room for doubt but that the Messiah alone is intended in the passage before us.

The second passage cited is of a different nature and not so easily disposed of. Isaiah says “He shall bring forth judgment unto TRUTH”, a translation followed by the Septuagint. Matthew however departs from this and uses the word “victory” instead of “truth”.

Jenour has a note saying, “All translators, misled by the Septuagint, render the passage something in the same manner as in our English Bibles”, and he would render the

disputed words as “to the people”. After careful examination we find no grounds for the amended translation, and only mention it for the benefit of any reader who may think it has not been seen and weighed. *Emeth* is “truth” and *am* “people”, but there the likeness ceases. Matthew is evidently inspired to give the word used by Isaiah its full meaning, and guided by the underlying principles that are observable in all the ways of God, we ultimately arrive at the same conclusion.

The Devil’s doctrine is that “MIGHT is RIGHT”.

The doctrine of the Lord is that “RIGHT ALONE IS MIGHT”.

By the very nature of the case, however, this involves the possibility that “right” will suffer before the ultimate victory, whereas brute force can crash its way to immediate triumph. So it is that the gentleness of the mighty Victor is intimately associated with His triumph.

In all the annals of the nations is there on record one who attained victory by manifesting such consideration for weakness and lowliness as is indicated by the words: “A bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax shall He not quench”?

The structure of the passage (Isa. xlii. 1-4) reveals that the subject is twofold:

- (1) The work which Messiah came to accomplish, “JUDGMENT”.
- (2) The character of the Messiah in its accomplishment, “GENTLENESS”.

This has been set out in the complete structure (page 10), but it will not be out of place to reproduce it here.

Isaiah xlii. 1-4.

<i>B</i>		<i>d2</i>		<i>Judgment</i> to the Gentiles.
		<i>e2</i>		He shall not cry, bruise, quench.
		<i>d2</i>		<i>Judgment</i> unto Truth.
		<i>e2</i>		He shall not fail, nor be discouraged.
		<i>d3</i>		<i>Judgment</i> in the earth.

The theme here is “Judgment”, and it is subdivided into three aspects. This “Judgment” is *to* the Gentiles, it is *unto* truth, it is *in* the earth.

It is imperative that we should not misunderstand the meaning of the word “Judgment”. Most certainly it does not mean “condemnation” here. That is but one of its meanings and only so when put into exercise in the face of evil. Judgment may be a great blessing, a coveted boon. The Hebrew word *mishpat* is from *shaphat*, “To judge”. This is the word used for those who “judged” Israel (Judges iii. 10; I Sam. vii. 6). This is the word so frequently used in the prophecies and prayers of the oppressed, who looked for deliverance.

“To *judge* the fatherless” (Psa. x. 18).

“*Judge* me, O Lord” (Psa. xxvi. 1).

“*Judge* me, O God, and plead my cause” (Psa. xliii. 1).

David's prayer reached its consummation in Psalm lxxii. in which he says of his greater Son, "He shall judge the poor of the people" (Psa. lxxii. 4).

While Isaiah sometimes uses the word *mishpat* in its condemnatory meaning, the bulk of the occurrences are in line with the usage already indicated.

"Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isa. i. 17).

Here it is evident that reference to the exhortation to seek judgment involves "relieving the oppressed" and "pleading for the widow".

"How is the faithful city become an harlot! it was full of judgment; righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers" (Isa. i. 21).

One has but to read on in verses 22 and 23, to see, by contrast, what is implied by "full of judgment".

The manner of the restoration of Israel when that day comes is thus described:

"And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counselors as at the beginning; afterward thou shalt be called, The city of righteousness, The faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment" (Isa. i. 26-27).

The opening chapter of Isaiah speaks primarily of Israel, but in the closing section the "Gentiles" are given a place.

"It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be My Servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth" (xlix. 6).

But judgment is not only "to the Gentiles"; it is also "unto Truth". An investigation of the meaning of *emeth*, the Hebrew word translated "Truth", and which gives us our word "Amen", cannot be undertaken now, but it is not without interest to discover that the word is used by Isaiah exactly twelve times, six occurrences coming in i.-xxxix. and six in xl.-lxvi.

Victory by aggression may be swift, but it is short-lived. Truth will and must prevail, but it is slower in achievement, even as the characteristics of *the* Conqueror are essentially different from those of brute aggression.

"The smoking flax shall He not quench; He shall bring forth judgment unto truth."

Finally, this judgment shall be set "in the earth". We remember the prophetic cry of the Seraphim: "The fullness of the whole earth is His glory" (Isa. vi. 3, Margin), and the assurance of the millennial hope: "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Isa. xi. 9).

The references to the “earth” in Isaiah are far too many to consider here, even as a list, and the study of its meaning and prophetic import must be reserved for a future article. In the passage before us the reference to “judgment in the earth” is balanced by the words, “and the isles shall wait for His law” (Isa. xlii. 4).

The Hebrew “isle” is not necessarily “a piece of land entirely surrounded by water”. Jeremiah speaks of “The isles which are beyond the sea”, which the margin renders “region by the sea side”. The word “isles” indicates the lands inhabited by the Gentiles, without limiting those lands to the physical character of an “island”.

Here, with the promise that judgment in the earth shall at last be established, we must close our present study, reserving for our next article the second part of this prophecy which comes under the heading, “WHOM I UPHOLD”.

ISAIAH.
#26. Isaiah xl. 12 - xlii. 17.
The Covenant for Israel. The Light for the Gentiles.
pp. 83 - 87

The section of Isa. xlii. which is embraced by the words “I uphold”, falls into two parts:

- (1) I UPHOLD. RESULT. JUDGMENT (Isa. xlii. 1-4).
- (2) I UPHOLD. RESULT. COVENANT (Isa. xlii. 5-8).

We have considered some of the teaching of the first part; let us now give attention to the second.

In an earlier study we have set out the distribution of the word “Covenant” in Isaiah, and have observed that in the former part, chapters i.-xxxix., the breaking of the covenant is prominent, while in the latter part, chapters xl.-lxvi., the making and keeping of the covenant is prominent.

The first occurrence reads: “They have broken the everlasting covenant” (Isa. xxiv. 5) and the consequent misery is described:

“The curse devoured the earth.”
“They that dwell therein are desolate.”
“The inhabitants of the earth are burned.”
“Few men are left” (Isa. xxiv. 6).

The last occurrence reverses all this: “I will make an everlasting covenant with them” (Isa. lxi. 8), and the consequences are expressed in such terms as:

“Beauty for ashes.”
“Oil of joy for mourning.”
“A garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.”
“Former desolation raised up.”
“Everlasting joy shall be upon them” (Isa. lxi. 3-8).

Between these two references we find the utter failure of Israel and the glorious triumph of Christ, and it is the first of these Messianic references to the covenant that must now occupy our attention.

The passage, Isa. xlii. 5-8, falls into two parts. The first part announces the glorious power of the One Who has appointed this covenant; “He that created the heavens” (Isa. xlii. 5). He it is Who upholds His Servant, giving Him for “a covenant of the people” and for “a light of the Gentiles” (Isa. xlii. 6). The second part describes the blessedness of this Servant’s work: “To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house” (Isa. xlii. 7).

The first and last references to the “covenant” in Isa. i.-xxxix. speak of it as having been broken:

“They have broken the everlasting covenant” (Isa. xxiv. 5).
“He hath broken the covenant” (Isa. xxxiii. 8).

The first and last references to the “covenant” in Isa. xl.-lxvi., speak of its establishment:

“I the Lord will give Thee for a covenant of the people” (Isa. xlii. 6).
“I will make an everlasting covenant with them” (Isa. lxi. 8).

Moreover, we discover that there is an intended correspondence between Isa. xlii. and lxi. Let us read again xlii. 7, quoted above, and then read Isa. lxi. 1.

“The Spirit of the Lord God is upon Me; because He hath anointed Me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent Me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.”

If Matthew, by his quotation in the twelfth chapter, establishes beyond dispute that Isa. xlii. 1-4 is fulfilled in the Person and work of Christ, Luke, in his fourth chapter, also establishes the same of Isa. lxi. 1.

Behind the Gospel is the Law, and behind the Law is the sovereign Creator of heaven and earth, Who not only “spread forth the earth” but “that which cometh out of it”. Not only does this almighty Creator supply all things necessary for the sustenance of His creatures, but He is the source of life itself, “He giveth *breath* unto the people upon it, and *spirit* to them that walk therein” (Isa. xlii. 5). It is this One, Whose might and Whose right are beyond question, Who called the Messiah and gave Him to the world in His twofold capacity as: “A covenant of the people” and “A light of the Gentiles”.

The word translated “covenant” is the Hebrew *berith*. The origin of this word is obscure, although there are many (as Gesenius) who teach that it is derived from an obsolete root, meaning “to cut”, since, in making solemn covenants, it was the custom to pass between the divided parts of the victim (*see* Gen. xv. 10, 17). Gesenius however contains the following note, in the edition edited by Tregelles:

“But the idea suggested by Lee deserves attention, viz., that *berith* is strictly nothing more than *eating together*, from barah No.2, since among orientals, *to eat together* is almost the same as to make a covenant of friendship in this way we obtain an explanation of the covenant (*or eating?*) of salt.”

As a matter of dispensational truth, observe the distinction between the relationship of Messiah with Israel and with the Gentiles:

“A *covenant* of the people,
A *light* of the Gentiles” (Isa. xlii. 6).

Since the call of Abraham, there is no record in Scripture of any covenant ever being made by God with a Gentile nation, company or individual. Even the admission of the Gentile to New Covenant blessings during the early ministry of Paul, which at first may appear to be the very essence of the gospel to-day, is, upon examination, found to be hedged about with limitations. It was not so much because the time for Gentile blessing had fully come, but in order, if possible, “to provoke to jealousy” the failing people of Israel, to “provoke to emulation” the true beneficiaries of the New Covenant. Old Testament prophecy and promise never visualize the Gentile coming into full blessing independently of a restored Israel. Consequently, while in the dispensation of the mystery the most glorious figure of the Body, with its equality of members, is used to set forth the relationship of believing Jew and Gentile to one another and to the Lord, the Head, during the period covered by the Acts, the union of Jewish and Gentile believer is likened to the ingrafting of a wild olive into a true olive tree, with admonitions concerning possible consequential Gentile “conceit”, and admonitory foreshadowings of the ultimate restoration of the “natural branches” to their place in their own olive tree.

Here, in Isa. xlii., it will be observed that God’s intentional order is maintained:

First, Christ is given for a covenant of the *People*.
Secondly, Christ is given for a light of the *Gentiles*.

But by the time chapter xlix. is reached a change has come over the face of things. Soon will come that great prophetic utterance which declares that “He is despised and rejected of men” (Isa. liii. 3), and the rejection of the Messiah by Israel brought the Gentile into favour before their, originally, allotted time. This can be seen in Isa. xlix.:

“And now, saith the Lord that formed Me from the womb to be His Servant, to bring Jacob again to Him: Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength: And He said, It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be my Servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth” (Isa. xlix. 5, 6).

We may learn a very profitable lesson in “Dispensational Truth” and the value of “Right Division” if we will observe how three writers of the New Testament handle the passages referred to in Isa. xlii. and xlix.

(1) *The quotation of Matt. xii.*—Matt. xii. approaches the first great crisis of the New Testament, the rejection by Israel of their Messiah and King. In the immediately following chapter “mystery” occurs for the first time in the phrase, “The mysteries of the kingdom of heaven”, where parable is employed to hide rather than reveal truth (Matt. xiii. 10-12), and where Israel’s rejection, as foretold in Isa. vi. 9, 10, now begins to take place. *It is in such a context* that Matthew introduces the blessing of the Gentile into his gospel.

According to Matthew’s account the Saviour was named “Jesus, for He shall save HIS PEOPLE from their sins” (Matt. i. 21). He was born, to “rule MY PEOPLE Israel” (Matt. ii. 6). It was eventually “This PEOPLE’s heart” that waxed gross (Matt. xiii. 15). The Gentiles are not introduced by Matthew in a favourable sense until the citation from Isa. xlii. in Matt. xii. 18, 21. “Not in a favourable sense” is in fact understating the truth, for in Matt. x. there is a definite exclusion of the Gentile: “Go not into the way of the Gentiles” (Matt. x. 5). With Matthew’s testimony before us we can therefore safely say that, not until the rejection of Christ by Israel became quite evident, did the Gentile have any part or lot assigned to him in the scheme of salvation.

(3) *The quotation of Luke ii.*—The designed intentions of two writers is nowhere more clearly evident to the enquirer than in the case of Matthew and Luke. Where Matthew says “kingdom” Luke says “forgiveness of sins” (Matt. iii. 2; Luke iii. 3); where Matthew says “King” Luke says “Saviour” (Matt. ii. 2; Luke ii. 11). Matthew makes no reference to the prophetic utterance of old Simeon. To do so would not further his intention of presenting Christ as “King of the Jews”. But Luke inserts it because it does most definitely further his intention to present Christ as Saviour, not only of the people of Israel, but of the Gentiles.

“A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel” (Luke ii. 32).

Here, it will be observed, Simeon, who was waiting for the consolation of *Israel* (Luke ii. 25), is inspired to place the Gentile before Israel. This would have outraged the feelings of the Jewish reader, as may be seen by consulting the effect of “this word”, “Gentiles”, in Acts xxii. 22; yet in the Gospel of Luke, the companion of Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, this order of blessing is in harmony with its message.

(3) *The quotation of Acts xiii.*—The two halves of the Acts of the Apostles, Acts i.-xii., Peter’s ministry, and Acts xiii.-xxviii., Paul’s twofold ministry, may be compared with the two presentations of truth by Matthew and Luke just noted.

Acts xiii. corresponds somewhat with Matt. xii., xiii., for there the Apostle says:

“It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, *lo, we turn*

to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth” (46, 47).

The reader will need no more persuasive argument than that already provided by these three passages, to lead him to see that “dispensational” truth, that “rightly divided” truth, is really the only presentation of truth that is whole, complete, and that does not mislead by misapplication.

Returning to Isa. xlii., we observe that this “covenant” for the people, this “light” for the Gentiles, is expanded in the verse that follows:--

“To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house” (Isa. xlii. 7).

This twofold figure of “the blind” and “the prisoner” is found in other parts of Isaiah, but for the time, its study must be postponed.

There awaits us one section which is indicated in the structure, *C | xlii. 8-17. Ye are gods,* which is an exposition of the words that link the two parts of the structure together, namely, those contained in verse 8:

“I am the Lord: that is My name: and My glory will I not give to another, neither My praise to graven images” (Isa. xlii. 8).

The prophet repeats and amplifies what he has already said concerning the futility of image worship, once more concluding on a note of wondrous grace:

“I will bring the blind by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them, and not forsake them” (Isa. xlii. 16).

We are now approaching the further unfolding of the Divine purpose contained in the chapters that still await us, and to the blessed task of studying and understanding this we must devote ourselves in the subsequent articles of this series.

ISAIAH.
#27. Isaiah xlii. 12 - xlv. 15.
Restoration Promised, Conditioned, Foreshadowed.
Restoration Promised (xlii. 18 - xliii. 9).
pp. 123 - 126

The preceding section of Isaiah, which we have just completed, dealt particularly with Israel and the Messiah under the common appellation of "My Servant". The section now before us considers Israel and their Messiah under the title of "My Witnesses". We found, as a severe and awful contrast, that the worship of graven images was placed over against true service, and, once again, we shall find that idolatry is the black background against which true witness is depicted. Moreover, in connection both with Witness and Idolatry, Isaiah reiterates the glorious fact that God is One, and that there is none else. This constitutes the positive witness of Israel, which is definitely assailed by the introduction of false gods.

If we left the matter there, however, it would both misrepresent Isaiah's prophecy and manifest an ignorance of his great purpose. While positive witness to the fact that there is one God is of itself an essential element in all worship and service, we are nevertheless reminded by James that demons believe the fact yet tremble (James ii. 19). In Isaiah's prophecy Israel's witness and the doctrine of the unique supremacy of the Deity, are a means to an end. The end before Isaiah and before the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; the end to which Israel themselves are witnesses, is "Restoration", the key-note of which has already been sounded in our meditation upon the opening words of Isa. xl., and we shall find a three-fold recurrence of it in the section now before us, viz., Isa. xlii. 18 - xlv. 15, each division of which is introduced by the subject of Restoration.

First we have a lament, that although Israel have been robbed and spoiled, "none saith, Restore" but, where man fails, God, in His mercy, triumphs, as is shown by the immediately following sweeping promise of Isa. xliii. 5, 6. But whether He deals with Man (Adam), Men (the individual), Nations (generally spoken of as Gentiles) or the Nation, Israel, God deals with them as with responsible, moral agents. Israel are not to be taken by sheer force; dragged unwillingly from the East, the West, the North and the South, and dumped into the land of Palestine regardless of their sins or of their desires. They are called upon to "Return", and Israel have been "Redeemed", and it is upon the basis that Restoration proceeds (Isa. xliii. 9 - xlv. 27). The third section of the prophecy differs from the bulk of the book, and introduces an historic character, Cyrus, the king of Persia. He takes his place in the foreshadowing of Israel's final restoration under their true King and Shepherd, as Sennacherib's fate foreshadowed the ultimate overthrow of the last world conqueror, the Beast of the Apocalypse.

Isaiah xlii. 18 - xlv. 15.

RESTORATION: Promised, Conditioned and Foreshadowed.

A1 | xlii. 18 - xliii. 9. RESTORATION Promised. |

“This is a people robbed and spoiled . . . and none saith, Restore (xlii. 22).

“Fear not: for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west. I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth” (xliii. 5, 6).

A2 | xliii. 9 - xlv. 27. RESTORATION Conditioned. |

“Return unto Me; for I have redeemed thee” (xlv. 22).

“That saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof” (xlv. 26).

A1 | xlv. 28 - xlv. 15. RESTORATION Foreshadowed. |

“That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid” (xlv. 28).

“He shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives” (xlv. 13).

We must devote the remainder of our limited space to the consideration of the first of these three sections, namely “Restoration promised”, and it will be well if the structure of this section is before us from the start.

Isaiah xlii. 18 - xliii. 9.

RESTORATION Promised.

A | xlii. 18-20. | a | Call to deaf and blind.

b | Perfect.

B | xlii. 21-25. | c | A people robbed and spoiled.

d | The law magnified and disobeyed.

e | Set on fire . . . burned.

B | xliii. 1-7. | c | Israel, created for His glory.

d | Redeemed.

e | Not be burned . . . flame not kindle.

A | xliii. 8, 9. | a | Call to deaf and blind.

b | Justified.

The chief interest is found in the central members, where Israel under law is contrasted with Israel under grace. But before we reach this portion the peculiar difficulty of verses 18-20 must be faced. Who are the “deaf and the blind” in these verses? Do they refer alone to Israel, as some teach? Do they refer alone to the Messiah, as other teach? or do they refer to both Israel and their Messiah, as yet others teach? Upon first reading, it is perhaps excusable to think of Israel’s Messiah, rather than of Israel the nation, as being implied in the words, “Who is blind as he that is perfect?” (Isa. xlii. 19). Yet, if *Meshullam* (Perfect) must of necessity refer only to the Messiah and not to Israel, the same argument would apply in the case of the title *Jeshuran* (the Darling Upright One) of Isa. xlv. 2. Nevertheless we have the warrant of the law of Moses that *Jeshuran* was a title of Israel, and that even *Jeshuran* “waxed fat and kicked”. If the “Darling Upright One” of the Lord could thus respond there is no insuperable obstacle to believing that the same people under the title of *Meshullam* (Perfect) should

fail to see or hear. The title “Perfect” is given to Israel much in the same way that it has been adopted by the follower of Mahomet, who is called a “Musselman” or “Moslem”, that is, one who is “complete”. It was Israel’s boast that they were *Meshullam*, but it was Paul’s accusation that, while he conceded the claim to superior understanding, it revealed the utter darkness of their hearts.

“Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast in God, and knowest His will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide to the blind, a light of them that are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law” (Rom. ii. 17-20).

Here Paul recognizes the right that Israel has to the title “*Meshullam*” but he continues:--

“Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written” (Rom. ii. 21-24).

It is evident that though Israel is *Meshullam*, or Perfect, yet in deed and in attitude they were they very reverse, thus the paradox of Isa. xlii. 18-20 finds its solution in them. Israel dishonoured their God by their disobedience to the law,

“The Lord is well pleased for His righteousness sake; He will magnify the law and make it honourable” (Isa. xlii. 21).

What Israel failed to accomplish, Christ has done. The blindness and deafness which is here charged against Israel is a frequently recurring indictment. As a result of their blindness and deafness Israel had become the prey and spoil of other nations, yet they do not seem to have “considered” this matter (Isa. i. 3).

“Who gave Jacob for a spoil and Israel to the robbers? Did not the Lord, He against Whom we have sinned?” (Isa. xlii. 24).

So blind were they that “none saith, Restore” (Isa. xlii. 22). Consequently upon this people came the fury and anger of the Lord, manifested in “the strength of battle”, but though the nation was “set on fire round about, yet he knew it not; and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart” (Isa. xlii. 25). Under the law, Israel failed, and failed utterly. Restoration was impossible. Blind, dear, blunted, hardened, they laid not these things to heart. The structure of this dark section is as follows. Its central note is, “No restoration”, which indeed is the doleful prospect of all under law.

Isaiah xlii. 21-25.

B | xlii. 21-25. | a | The Lord is well pleased.
b | The law, magnified.
c | A people robbed and spoiled.
d | None saith RESTORE.
c | Jacob a spoil. Israel robbed.
b | The law, not obeyed.
a | The fury of His anger.

“But now” (Isa. xliii. 1). Isaiah introduces the change from law to grace, as, years afterward, Paul did. Israel is now viewed from the Divine standpoint. The purpose of the ages must be considered quite as much as the exhibition of justice and retribution. Israel has been “created” and “formed” for a specific purpose, and if law-keeping and the flesh failed, God, out of the treasures of His grace, would provide redemption.

“I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by name, thou art Mine.”

The structure places the obdurate insensibility to “fire” and “burning” in Isa. xlii. 25, in correspondence with the blessed immunity to such devouring agencies under grace. The punishment permitted against Israel in the ordinary course of events, would have ended in the utter extinction of them as a people. But there were other factors at work. Side by side with retributive justice went restoring and redeeming love, and it is the triumph of redeeming love that Isaiah celebrates in his glorious prophecy. So it is that, to the same people that are addressed in Isa. xlii. 18-25, come the promises of Isa. xliii. 1-7. To save space we omit the structure of Isa. xliii. 1-7 here, but it will be found in “The Companion Bible”. When we read the blessed words:--

“Fear not for I have redeemed thee” (Isa. xliii. 1), or “I am the Lord thy God, the Holy one of Israel, thy Saviour” (Isa. xliii. 3);

it is very natural for us, in the light of the New Testament, to invest the words “redeemed” and “Saviour” with their full evangelical meaning. While, at that time, this could only be in purpose we have but to read on to the end of the third verse, to find the precious word “ransom” (Heb. *kopher*, “atonement”) used in connection with Israel’s deliverance from the Persian captivity.

“I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee” (Isa. xliii. 3).

We have already learned, that in the eyes of the Lord

“The nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance” (Isa. xl. 15).

Egypt, Ethiopia and Seba were not too big a ransom to compensate for the deliverance of Israel, “since”, as the Lord said to them,

“Thou was precious in My sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee, therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life” (Isa. xliii. 4).

Though Israel are at present blind, they “have eyes”. Though this favoured people are at present deaf, they “have ears”, and they shall yet, by redeeming love, see and hear and fulfil their appointed role as the Lord’s witness (Isa. xliii. 9, 10). We must conclude our present study at this point and look forward to pursuing the theme of Israel’s restoration when we come to deal with Isa. xliii. 9 - xlv. 27.

ISAIAH.

#28. The Lamb of God (Isa. lii. 13 - lvi. 8).

The Material sorted and the Structure of Isa. lii. 13 - liii. 12 discovered. pp. 185 - 188

Isa. xl. opens with the words “Comfort ye” and the section before us provides the only solid basis for true comfort. To Israel, and indeed to us all, are addressed the words

“O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted” (Isa. liv. 11);

and where shall the “afflicted” look for comfort, but away to Him Who was “afflicted” as their substitute? (Isa. liii. 7). This portion of Scripture includes Isa. liii., the “holy of holies” of all the prophets. Whenever we open the sacred page we are on holy ground; whenever we read the Law and the Prophets we read the scriptures that speak of Christ, but there are some passages that stand out prominently in this blessed particular, and the chapter before us was written in the foreknowledge of Calvary, of its suffering and of its triumph.

The section we are to study is lii. 13 - lvi. 8 and it divides into four parts.

- A | lii. 13 - liii. 12. He bare the sin of many. His soul an offering.
- B | liv. Restoration. Seed inherit Gentiles. No weapon shall prosper.
- A | lv. 1-7. He will abundantly pardon. Your soul—fatness.
- B | lv. 8 - lvi. 8. Gathering “others” “all people”. Word shall prosper.

The subject is so vast and our means so small that we will concentrate all our attention for the time being on the first section lii. 13 - liii. 12, leaving the remainder to be considered in due course.

Before studying any passage in detail we seek the literary structure, for by so doing we discover the scope and the argument of the passage, and without either structure, scope or argument, our comments must degenerate to a mere list of unconnected notes on individual words. The *desire* to present to the reader the structure of this great passage, and our ability to satisfy that desire are, however, two widely differing propositions. We do not propose asking the reader to share with us in this arduous task, neither can we expect any who have not pursued this path, to be able to enter into the joy of its discovery. We give a few indications as to how the structure grew, and leave it with the

earnest reader to test, to use and to enjoy as grace may be given. In the first place, we noted the passage opens with the words, “Behold My Servant” (Isa. lii. 13) and we remembered that after the record is given of His substitutionary sufferings, this blessed Servant is again brought before us.

“By His knowledge shall *My righteous Servant* justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities” (Isa. liii. 11).

A moment’s meditation brought another feature to light. The Hebrew word translated “To bear” is *Nasa* and means primarily “To lift up”. The word “extolled” is also a translation of *Nasa*. Concerning these and other Hebrew words we do not offer any explanation, we are but noting the beginnings of the structural arrangement of material, and record our first note.

“My Servant.” “Extolled.” *Nasa*.
“My Righteous Servant.” “Bear.” *Nasa*.

We now observe that nations and kings are referred to in lii. 15, and we read of them being astonished at something totally unexpected. We find something equally unexpected after the sorrow, the humiliation and the meekness in Isa. liii. 4-10 Division of the Spoil with the Great and the Strong, Isa. liii. 12. These features however we kept in reserve, while examining the remaining verses. We knew that the words “The Lord *hath laid on* Him the iniquity of us all” (liii. 6), and “He *made intercession* for the transgressors” (Isa. liii. 12) employed the same Hebrew word *paga*, and this is noted in the first volume of the *Berean Expositor* in an article entitled “Wondrous meeting places”, where these passages are retranslated:

“The Lord hath *made to meet* on Him the iniquity of us all” and
“He bare the sin of many, and *made a meeting place* for transgressors.”

We have now two focal pairs of correspondences.

- A Servant—extolled *Nasa*.
- B Meeting place—*Paga*.
- A Servant—bear *Nasa*.
- B Meeting place—*Paga*.

We observed that both the sinner and the Saviour are likened to “sheep” which, together with the most evident emphasis upon His sufferings for the people, filled the remainder of the space with the wonder of His “Substitutionary sufferings”. Returning to lii. 14, 15 and liii. 1-3 we discovered that the word “Visage” and the word “Beauty” were translations of the same Hebrew word, as also are the two words “Heard” (lii. 15) and “Report” (liii. 1). We therefore set before the reader and commend to his prayerful study and service the following structure of this glorious passage.

Isaiah lii. 13 - liii. 12.

- A | lii. 13 - liii. 11-. MY SERVANT. EXTOLLED (*Nasa*).
MANY STARTLED. |
- B | lii. 14 - liii. 3. NATIONS AND KINGS. |
c | Visage (*Mareh*).
d | Form (*Toar*).
e | Heard (*Shamea*).
e | Report (*Shamuah*).
d | Form (*Toar*).
c | Beauty (*Mareh*).
- C | liii. 4-11-. SUBSTITUTIONARY SUFFERINGS. |
f | Grief (*Choli*, noun).
g | Stricken (*Naga*, verb).
h | Bruised (*Daka*).
i | Like Sheep \ The
j | Astray / Sinner.
k | Made to meet (*paga*).
l | Iniquity.
i | As Sheep \ The
j | Dumb / Saviour.
g | Stricken (*Naga*, noun).
h | Bruised (*Daka*).
f | Grief (*Chalah*, verb).
- A | liii. 11, 12. MY SERVANT. HE BARE (*Nasa*).
MANY JUSTIFIED. |
- B | liii. 12. GREAT AND STRONG. |
c | Divide portion.
d | With the great.
c | Divide spoil.
d | With the strong.
- C | liii. 12. SUBSTITUTIONARY SUFFERINGS. |
f | He poured out His soul.
g | Unto death.
f | He was numbered.
g | With transgressors.
k | He made to meeting place (*paga*).
l | Transgressors.

As may have been expected, a number of quotations are made in the New Testament from Isa. lii. & liii., and we will conclude this opening survey of the material before us by indicating the passages quoted.

Isa. lii. 15. "For that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider."

This verse is quoted in Rom. xv. 21, in connection with the desire of the apostle to “preach the gospel, not where Christ was named lest I should build upon another man’s foundation” (Rom. xv. 20).

Isa. liii. 1. “Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?”

This passage is quoted by John, in his Gospel, xii. 38; and the first sentence is quoted by Paul in Rom. x. 16. John xii. is the chapter which closes the witness of Christ in the world as man, and reveals His rejection.

Isa. liii. 4. “Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.”

This passage is quoted in Matt. viii. 17 where it reads:--

“Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.”

Isa. liii. 5. “And with His stripes we are healed?”

This is quoted in I Pet. ii. 24 “By Whose stripes ye were healed”. It is useful to note that Peter, by reason of the fact that he was writing an epistle changes the “we” of Isa. liii. to “ye” in order to apply the passage to his immediate hearers.

Isa. liii. 7, 8. This rather lengthy passage is quoted in Acts viii. 32, 33. A number of most important questions are raised upon comparing the O.T. original with the N.T. quotations, which will be considered in their place. The one and most important contribution which we would emphasize here is in the sequel

“Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and PREACHED UNTO HIM JESUS” (Acts viii. 35).

Isa. liii. 9. “Because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth.”

The Hebrew word translated “violence” is translated *hamartian* by the LXX, and this is adopted by Peter. He also adds the verb “was found” which makes no material difference.

Isa. liii. 12. “And He was numbered with the transgressors.”

This is quoted in Mark xv. 28 and Luke xxii. 37. These seven passages are quoted by different writers of the N.T. and reveal the importance that this chapter holds in their estimate, for although at first sight seven quotations do not seem many—yet no other chapter in Isaiah nor in the Old Testament is quoted so many times.

We are now ready to give this majestic chapter something of the attention that is its due. May we never forget that its greatest glory is to lead our hearts upward from the contemplation of the letter, to Him “The Word made flesh”, “The Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me”.

ISAIAH.

#29. “Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him” (lii. 13). pp. 227 - 229

“Behold My Servant shall deal prudently, He shall be exalted and extolled and be very high.”

With these words, the great sacrificial chapter of Isaiah opens. Not with sorrow or grief, not with humiliation, not with references to death and the grave, but with exaltation, with being extolled, and with being very high. In earlier chapters we have read of this Servant of the Lord (Isa. xlii. 1, 19; xlix. 3, 6), and the prophecies have gathered strength and clarity as this climax drew near. Our attention is drawn first to what this Servant of the Lord does, “He shall deal prudently”, and then what shall be done to Him “He shall be exalted”. The word translated “deal prudently” is given in the A.V. margin an alternative meaning “prosper”. This, however, must not be understood in the same sense as the word “prosper” in Isa. liii. 10 where a different Hebrew word is employed. *Sakal*, is rendered in most of its occurrences by the words “wise” or “understanding” but in the *Hiphe*l or causative, it is translated eight times “prosper”. Jeremiah uses this word in a prophetic utterance that looks to the same glorious day of the Messiah as does Isa. lii. 13.

“Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is His name whereby He shall be called ‘THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS’.” (Jer. xxiii. 5, 6).

It is moreover written of both Joshua and Hoshea (names that foreshadowed the “Saviour” “Jesus”) that they “prospered” (Josh. i. 7; II Kings xviii. 7). He Who is the Wisdom of God is also the Power of God (I Cor. i. 24), His Wisdom is dynamic, it “prosper” and prevails.

So Isa. lii. 13 opens “My Servant shall prosper”, and the seal was set upon His glorious “success” (as this word is translated in Josh. i. 8) by His resurrection and ascension.

“He shall be exalted, and extolled and be very high.”

The Prophet has no intention here of making three different phases in this exaltation, it is the overflowing joy of the prophetic vision, using a well known figure of speech *Anabasis* or “gradual ascent” whereby an increase of emphasis is made by a rising series of successive words, phrases and sentences. We must nevertheless acquaint ourselves with all three words, in order that the Divine intention in their use may be perceived.

“Exalted”, Hebrew *Rum*. It will be remembered that Abraham before his name was changed (Gen. xvii. 5), was Abram made up of *Ab* “Father” and *Rum* or *Ram* “High” and “Exalted”. So also the place names, *Ramah* and *Ramoth* “A lofty place” (I Sam. xix. 18;

Deut. iv. 43). Some of its usages in Isaiah alone will indicate sufficiently its distinctive meaning. Exalted as a “highway” (Isa. xlix. 11); as one of the cedars of Lebanon (Isa. ii. 13); as the Lord sitting upon a throne “high” and lifted up (Isa. vi. 1), or as “The High” and lofty One that inhabiteth Eternity (Isa. lvii. 15). Something of what is involved in the exaltation of the term in the blasphemous words of Lucifer, Son of the Morning.

“I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God I will ascend above the heights of the clouds: I will be like the Most High” (Isa. xiv. 12-14).

The LXX translates this by the Greek verb *Hupsoo* which is fourteen times rendered “exalted” and six times “lift up” in the N.T.

“Being by the right hand of God exalted” (Acts ii. 33).

“The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins” (Acts v. 30-31).

“Extolled”, Hebrew *Nasa*. This is a most extensive root, signifying “To bear, take or lift up”. It is found in Isaiah in combination with the previous word *Rum*, several times.

Cedars of Lebanon “High and lifted up” *Rum* and *Nasa* (Isa. ii. 13).

I saw also the Lord “High” and “lifted up” (Isa. vi. 1).

Thus saith the “High” and “lofty One” (Isa. lvii. 15).

Another suggestive passage in Isaiah is “every valley shall be exalted”. These are passages in which the verb *Nasa* is used in its reflexive form. In the simple active form, this word is used in Isa. liii. 4 and 12 “He hath *borne* our griefs”, “He *bare* the sin of many”, where instead of Himself being lifted up or “extolled” He is seen “lifting up” the burden of our sins. The LXX here uses the word *doxazo* “to glorify”. Those readers who are acquainted with the Gospel of John, and especially John xiii.-xvii. will realize how fully the Saviour entered into these prophetic utterances concerning Himself.

“Now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in Him” (John xiii. 31).

“Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee” (John xvii. 1).

It will be seen how fully also Peter entered into these prophetic words. In Acts ii. 33 and v. 31, he used, as we have seen the word “exalted”, but in Acts iii. 13 in a similar context he uses this word “glorify”:

“The God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus, Whom ye delivered up and denied in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let Him go.”

“And be very high.” Here the words used in the original are the verb *Gabah* and the adverb *Meod*. Just as we found Lucifer using the word “exalted” so we find written of the Prince of Tyre

“Thine hearts is lifted up thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God”
(Ezek. xxviii. 5, 6).

and further to reveal the parallel intended between the Usurper and the Rightful Lord, we find the word “astonied” or “astonished” used of each (Isa. lii. 14; Ezek. xxviii. 19). *Gabah* is used of the “heart” II Chron. xxvi. 16; “the heavens” (Isa. lv. 9); “the Lord of hosts” (Isa. v. 16), and of Saul who was higher than any of the people (I Sam. x. 23).

“Behold, said the Lord, “Behold My Servant, He shall be exalted, and extolled and be very high.”

The LXX recognizes that these are not to be considered as three separate statements, positions or degrees, but an intensive way of speaking of His exceeding exaltation, it reads “He shall be exalted and glorified exceedingly”.

We must not look upon the exaltation of the Servant of the Lord here, as though it were the effect of the prospering of the first part of the verse. Rather is the second clause to be read as an expansion, a parallel, with the first. In this verse the suffering and humiliation are passed, the glory fills the vision. Here, in Isa. lii. 13 - liii. 12 we have Exaltation, followed by a review of past humiliation, succeeded once again by exaltation, this time manifested by dividing the spoil.

We turn to the N.T. and discover another passage which sets before us the blessed sequel to His condescension. It will enable us to appreciate the antichristian blasphemy of Lucifer or the Cherub that fell; it will enable us to understand that the words “*The high and lofty One*” Who inhabiteth Eternity, were perfectly fitting to Him Who was on earth known as the Man of Sorrows, for He was more than mere man, He was the God-Man. “Behold My Servant” said the Lord, not only in Isa. lii., but in Phil. ii.

“Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, But made Himself of no reputation the form of a servant He humbled Himself (see Isa. liii. 8 LXX, ‘In His humiliation His judgment was taken away’) unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him (*hyperupsoo*) and given Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow” (Phil. ii. 6-10).

Stress is laid in the N.T. on the exceedingly exalted position now occupied by the Ascended Lord.

“He ascended up far above all heavens” (Eph. iv. 10) so far above that He might “fill all things”. He has “passed through” (*dierchomai*) the heavens (Heb. iv. 14); He is “made higher than the heavens” *hupsiloteros* “more exalted” (Heb. vii. 26).

Thus does prophet and apostle delight to honour Him, Who for our sakes stooped so low. It is good that at the opening of this chapter of unprecedented suffering we should be taken as it were with Peter, James and John to the Mount of Transfiguration, and there with Moses and Elijah become “eye-witnesses” of His majesty, before we descend with Him into the vale of tears that led to Calvary’s Cross.

The Gospel of JOHN.

#29. The link between the third and fourth sign (v. 16 - 47). The Sabbath and Sabbatarianism. pp. 21 - 25

The conflict that arose over the healing of the impotent man arose, not in connection with the nature of the cure, but entirely in connection with the Pharisees' attitude to the Sabbath:

“And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay Him, because He had done these things *on the sabbath day*” (John v. 16).

The Lord's defence is brief but full: “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work” (John v. 17). This outrages the Jews more than ever, and we read that:

“Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the sabbath, but said also the God was His Father, making Himself equal with God” (John v. 18).

This double charge is met by a longer explanatory defence given in verses 19-30, in which the equality of the Son is demonstrated and proved. This appeal to the evidence of His Own works and appointment is supplemented by an appeal to the witness of John the Baptist, the Father, the Scriptures generally, and the writings of Moses. The Lord also speaks of the blinding power of the Jews' self-seeking spirit, a spirit in marked contrast to His Own (John v. 19 and 30). An appeal to the evidence of the Scriptures brings the section to an end (John v. 31-47).

The subject-matter of this section lies very near the heart of all truth, and we must spare no pains in our endeavour to understand its teaching. Let us first seek, by grace, to discover the structure of this great controversy, for if we can once perceive the underlying structure, an examination of the details can then be pursued with less risk of confusion. Following our usual custom, a custom justified by results over many years, let us consider first the large outline, and then the subdivisions later:

John v. 16 - 47.

A | 16-30. WORKS. |

Opposition arising out of the Lord's attitude to the sabbath day and His claim to equality with the Father, met by the evidence of His works.

A | 31-47. WORD. |

This evidence of His works is supplemented by the witness of John the Baptist and the Scriptures with a comment on the reason for Jewish blindness.

Taking now each of these large sections separately, we find the progress of the argument marked by the following subdivisions:

- A | 16. Jewish opposition.
The Sabbath.
- B | 17. The defence. “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.”
- A | 18. Jewish opposition intensified.
The Sabbath and the claim to equality with God.
- B | 19-30. The defence. An expansion of the defence given in verse 17,
with special reference to the question of equality with God.

In the second section we find the following subdivision of the subject:

- A | 31. Witness concerning Myself. True.
- A | 32-47. The witness of others. True.

The Witness of Others (John v. 32-47).

- A1 | 33-36. The witness of John the Baptist
“concerning Me” (*ho marturon peri emou*).
- B1 | 36-38. The Sent One. “Ye believe not.”
- A2 | 39, 40. The witness of the Scriptures
“concerning Me” (*hai marturousai peri emou*).
- B2 | 41-44. The one in his own name. “How can ye believe?”
- A3 | 45-47. The witness of Moses
“concerning Me” (*peri emou egrapsen*).

Here we have a threefold witness “concerning Me”, but the witness was not received. The witness of John the Baptist was only received “for a season”. The witness of the Scriptures was nullified because even though the Scriptures were “searched”, those who searched them never came to the Lord of Whom these Scriptures testified. And thirdly, the Jews were actually persecuting the Lord out of zeal for “Moses” in whom they trusted, and yet Moses was one of those who wrote of Him.

In the two sections marked B1 and B2 the Lord reveals the reason for Israel’s blindness: (1) they had not the word of God abiding in them and (2) they received honour from man, and did not seek that honour which comes from God only—and this blinded their eyes to the value of the evidences before them.

The most important subdivision of this great section is the defence that occupies verses 19-30. This has a most wonderful structure which we will reserve until we have considered those passages that lead up to it. The detailed analysis of the second great division (31-47) must also await the time when we arrive at it in the course of our studies. Let us now turn our attention to the opposition indicated in verses 16 and 18, so that the way may be cleared for the consideration of the great defence found in verses 19-30.

The words *sabbata*, *sabbaton* and *prosabbaton*, translated “sabbath day”, “sabbath” and “day before the sabbath”, occur in the Gospels 49 times (7*7). Not only is there evidence of intention here in the multiple of seven, but we also find that the expression “the first day of the week”, *sabbata* (the exact translation of the original we do not now

question) occurs seven times in the N.T. John, also, uses the word *sabbaton* seven times in connection with the healing of the impotent man (John v. 9, 10, 16, 18; vii. 22, 23).

We shall never understand the bitter animosity created over the observance or non-observance of the Sabbath, if we do not know something of the teaching of the Rabbis, and the dominant place the Sabbath occupied in the life and heart of every orthodox Jew.

“It had become the most distinctive and the most passionately revered of all ordinances which separated the Jew from the Gentile as a peculiar people. It was at once the sign of their exclusive privileges, and the centre of their barren formalism. Their traditions, their patriotism, even their obstinacy, were all enlisted in its scrupulous maintenance Their devotion to it was only deepened by the universal ridicule, inconvenience and loss which it entailed upon them in the heathen world” (*Farrar*).

Turning now to the first reference to the Sabbath in the Gospels, we read, in Matt. xii.:

“And at that time Jesus went on the sabbath day through the corn; and His disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto Him, Behold, Thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day” (Matt. xii. 1, 2).

The Rabbis by no means taught that on the Sabbath men should fast or practice self-denial over their food; on the contrary, they interpreted the words “Thou shalt call the sabbath a delight” to mean that extra food, and daintier food should be eaten:

“He that feasts thrice on the sabbath, shall be delivered from the calamities of the Messiah, from the judgment of hell, and from the war of God and Magog” (*Maimon*).

The disciples were satisfying their hunger with a few ears of barley. The Pharisees could not object to the nature of their food, except that it was poor and coarse, and the fact that the disciples were hungry shows that they had observed the custom of abstaining from food on the Sabbath day until the morning prayers of the synagogue were over. Moreover, the Pharisees were not raising any legal objection to the disciples taking a few ears of corn, for that was a lawful act:

“When thou comest into standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thy hand; but thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy neighbour’s standing corn” (Deut. xxiii. 25).

The whole question was the lawfulness or otherwise of plucking ears of corn *on the Sabbath*. The tradition reads:

“He that reaps on the Sabbath, though never so little, is guilty” (*Maimon*).

It may well be objected that plucking a few ears of corn is not “reaping”. But, in the Rabbinical tradition the two things were classed together:

“And to pluck the ears of corn is a kind of reaping” (*Maimon*).

As the Saviour well knew, this simple act was punishable by death; hence His intervention on His disciples' behalf.

"The works whereby a man is guilty of stoning and cutting off are either primitive or derivative" (*Maimon*).

There were 39 "primitive" kinds of work, which if done presumptuously on the Sabbath rendered a man liable to death—including ploughing, sowing and reaping. The "derivative" works were, for example, "digging"—for that was a sort of ploughing, and "plucking" ears of corn—for that was a sort of reaping. Knowing that death by stoning was the punishment for this action, if done presumptuously, the Saviour interposes to show that they had been moved by the necessity of hunger, and not by contempt for the Law or Jewish scruples. He then cites the example of David and the priests (Matt. xii. 3-5).

In verse 5 the Lord refers to the fact that "the priests in the temple profane the sabbath and are blameless". The traditional law concerning the working of the priests on the sabbath reads:

"The servile work, which is done in the holy things, is not servile" (*Hieros. Schab*).
"There is no sabbatism at all in the temple" (*Maimon*).

In verse 6-8 we have the Lord's first great claim recorded in Matthew:

"But I say unto you, That in this place is One greater than the temple For the son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day" (Matt. xii. 6-8).

And Mark, in his Gospel, adds the significant words: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mark ii. 27).

Here then were two related claims, stupendous in their sublimity, and far-reaching in their effect upon subsequent doctrine. The Son of man was Lord of the sabbath day, and the sabbath day was made for the sons of men. No wonder such words were offensive in the ears of those whose teaching bound heavy burdens upon men, and who made void the law by their traditions.

Immediately following this incident, and as though to confirm His claim, comes the record of the healing of the man with a withered hand. The Lord's attention is drawn to this man by the Pharisees themselves, "that they might accuse Him" (Matt. xii. 10). He replies to their question by referring to their own laws. A sheep, if fallen into a pit, could be released on the sabbath, and the Lord knew only too well the kind of subterfuge that enabled the Pharisees to evade even his own laws, e.g., "He that hath a sore throat, let him not gargle it with oil"—but he was permitted to "swallow down the oil", and so on, through a whole series of laws and their evasion. Rejecting their pettifogging scruples, the Lord continues:

"How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days" (Matt. xii. 12).

And, suiting the action to the word, the Lord commands the man with the withered hand to stretch it forth.

In contrast with this beneficent act, the Pharisees hold a council “how they might destroy Him”. And so the enmity that bore the bitter fruit of the cross was sown in the soil of a perverted sabbatarianism.

It is no accident that the man’s hand was “withered”. The word is used again in Matt. xiii. 6 and xxi. 19, 20. The Pharisees’ whole conception of the law was dry and withered. They had never learned the “meaning” of the words: “I will have mercy, and not sacrifice” (Matt. xii. 7).

In view of the Jews’ attitude towards the sabbath day, there may have been more in the Lord’s question to the impotent man than at first appears. The words “Wilt thou be made whole?” may have implied the unspoken thought, Wilt thou be made whole on the sabbath, with all that it may bring with it? The command to the man to take up his bed and walk was a further example of the Lord’s dominion over the sabbath, and His disregard for the scruples of the Pharisees. According to their traditions:

“Whoever on the sabbath carries out anything either from a private place to a public, or from a public place to a private, he is bound to offer a sacrifice for his sin, but if presumptuously, he is punished by cutting off, and being stoned” (*Schabb*).

We must give fuller consideration to the corresponding sabbath day controversy in John ix. when we come to the sign of the healing of the man born blind. Sufficient, we trust, has been said to enable the reader to understand the great difference between the Divine intention of the sabbath as taught by the Lord in word and deed, and the barren, lifeless, merciless imposition of the tradition of the elders. This exclusive, withered, merciless sabbatarian spirit still lingers among some Christians even to-day. Such believers no doubt mean well, but they have never entered into the spirit of Him Who is Lord even of the sabbath.

Time will not permit us to deal here with Paul’s attitude towards the observance of “days” and “sabbaths”. We must be content with the suggestion that the reader should study for himself, as a supplement to the present article, the Apostle’s words in Rom. xiv., Gal. iv., and Col. ii.

**#30. The link between the third and fourth sign (v. 16 - 47).
The relationship of the “Son” and what it entails.
pp. 65 - 70**

Instead of acknowledging that He had in any way transgressed the law by bidding the healed man carry his bed on the sabbath day, the Lord went further and associated Himself and His actions with God Himself.

“But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work” (John v. 17).

When dealing with Divine truth there is a great need to realize and distinguish the relative from the absolute. For example, holiness is expressed by the Hebrew word *qodesh*, which primarily means “separation”. From the point of view of man, this idea of “separation” is most important, for he is surrounded by so much evil that one of the first elements in practical sanctification is separateness. We must however avoid the error of transferring this idea to the full conception of holiness when applied to God. Was God not holy before sin entered into the universe? Most surely. Were not the angels holy? They were. Would this primal holiness know anything of “separation”? Most certainly not. Would this primal holiness therefore be lower than the present manifestation? Surely no. So, from man’s point of view, the great feature that marks off the sabbath day from the remaining six is that on that day man should do no work. This, however, is because man needs to recuperate; needs to have time to think on work and ways that are higher than those which occupy the greater part of his time. Can we conceive, however, that there is any essential moral or spiritual difference in the work that God does on Monday as compared with that done on Sunday or Saturday? To ask the question is to expose its folly.

The Pharisees had fastened upon the necessary observation of rest from toil that man’s nature demanded, if the sabbath were to be enjoyed, and made it contradict the very purpose of its institution. If all were as holy, as good, as merciful as the Son of man, all could go on working without cessation from one week’s end to another. A moment’s thought would convince anyone open to argument, that were God to withdraw from His creation for a single moment, to say nothing of twenty-four hours, creation would cease to exist. Our breath is in His hand (Dan. v. 23), He upholds all things by the word of His power (Heb. i. 3), by Him all things consists (Col. i. 17). Do we not breathe on the sabbath day? Does not the sun shine on the sabbath day? Does the whole composite labour of creation, generation, growth, decomposition, life and death, stand still on the sabbath day?

“My Father worketh hitherto.”

In the second miracle wrought on the sabbath day that John records, the Lord emphasized this great, but misunderstood truth: “I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day” (John ix. 4). In Matthew, Mark and Luke there are but nine occurrences of *ergon*, “work”, but in John there are no less than twenty-seven

occurrences. The words of John iv. 34, “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work”, is the opening reference to the Lord’s works, while the words of John xvii. 4, “I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do”, closes the references.

Every intervening link between the eight signs, namely, John ii. 13 - iv. 42; iv. 53, 54; v. 16-47; vi. - viii.; x. 1-42 and xi. 47 - xx. 31 is marked by the inter-relation of *ergon*, “work”, and *pisteuo*, “believe”, except iv. 53, 54, where the Lord’s statement, “except ye see signs and wonders” (verse 48) indicates what the reference to “works” is.

Instead of subduing the anger of the Jews the Lord’s answer increased it.

“Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God” (John v. 18).

No Jew could really object to another Jew calling God His Father, but the Saviour did not say, “Our Father” but “My Father”. He never did say “Our Father”, as we are taught to do. When He instructed His disciples to pray He taught them to say “Our Father”, but when He prayed He never said “Our Father”. On the resurrection morning this distinction is emphasized:

“I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God” (John xx. 17).

The R.V. corrects the A.V. in John v. 18, by translating the word *idios*, “own”, “but also called God His *Own* Father”.

We do not go to the angry Jews to find a ground for the deity of Christ, and the words, “made himself equal with God”, arise out of the claim that the Saviour made that God was His own Father. He did not claim to be the Father, but he did claim equality with the Father. *Isos* means “equal”, and is quite distinct from “identity”. There is here no confusion of the Persons of the Father and the Son. When the labourers who had worked all day complained, “Thou has made them equal unto us” (Matt. xx. 12), the equality was not of nature or person but of wages. When Peter said of the Gentiles that God had given them the “like” gift to that already bestowed upon the Jews at Pentecost, the equality was of gift, not nationality; Cornelius was not made a Jew. The truth concerning the relation of the Father and the Son is the great theme of the Lord’s reply to these words. He does not deny the equality which the Jews accused Him of claiming, but demonstrates and enforces it. While He readily admitted that the Son could do nothing of Himself, yet He not only claimed to “see” what the Father did, but also that He, the Son, did “likewise”. Is this not equality? He twice uses the familiar figure of simile—“For *as* *so*”—and does not simile imply equality? This simile is used of two tremendous statements. The first, that as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, “even so the Son quickeneth whom He will” (John v. 21); the second, that as the Father hath life in Himself “even so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself” (John v. 26). We are not however left to our own failing powers of logic; the Lord definitely states the case,

“That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father” (John v. 23).

Before we proceed, we must seek the structure of this passage, for this will set the course of our investigation and prevent us from mistaking an incidental remark for one of first magnitude. In other words, the structure provides the Lord’s own emphasis, as though He had actually underlined the Bible for us. Here is the structure of this great defence.

John v. 19 - 30.

“My Father worketh hitherto, and I work” expanded from verse 17.

- A | 19. Nothing of Self. “*What He seeth.*” |
 - a1 | The Son can do nothing of Himself.
 - b1 | What He seeth the Father do.
 - b1 | Whatsoever He do.
 - a1 | These also doeth the Son likewise.
- B | 20. Greater works, that ye may marvel.
- C | 21-23. Equality of the Son. |
 - c | For as . . . so . . . raiseth and quickeneth.
 - d | *Krino, krisis*: Judgment.
 - e | The Son sent.
- D | 24, 25. The hour and the voice.
 - No condemnation (*krisis*). |
 - f | Verily, verily.
 - g1 | Hear my Word.
 - h1 | Hath everlasting life.
 - i | The hour cometh and now is.
 - f | Verily, verily.
 - g2 | Hear the voice of the Son of God.
 - h2 | They that hear shall live.
- C | 26, 27. Equality of the Son. |
 - c | For as . . . so life in Himself.
 - d | *Krisis*: Judgment.
 - e | The Son of man.
- B | 28-. Marvel not at this, for something greater follows.
- D | -28, 29. The hour and the voice.
 - Some come to condemnation (*krisis*). |
 - i | The hour cometh.
 - g3 | Hear His voice.
 - h3 | Resurrection of life or judgment.
- A | 30. Nothing of Self. “*As I hear.*” |
 - a2 | I can of Mine own self do nothing.
 - b2 | As I hear I judge.
 - b2 | My judgment is just.
 - a2 | Not My own will, but His.

This corresponding members of the structure must therefore be the object of our investigation. We shall devote what space we now have left to the members “A | v. 19” and “A | v. 30”, “What he seeth” and “As I hear”.

In John iii. 34 the testimony is given, “He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God”, and we shall have occasion to consider this statement more fully when we arrive at chapter vii. 16, where the Lord says, “My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me”. Here, in chapter v., it is not “words” or “doctrine” but “works” that are in view.

The Lord claimed that He both “saw” and “heard” the Father. In this He stands apart from all other men. In the prologue it is written, “No man hath seen God at any time” (John i. 18), and in the very passage where the Lord’s great claim is asserted, He said “He have neither *heard* His voice at any time, nor *seen* His shape” (John v. 37). This unique claim is repeated in John vi., “Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is of God, He hath *seen* the Father” (John vi. 46). Yet again, in the chapter where He claims the title “I AM” (John viii. 58), this unique vision of the Father is repeated, “I speak that which I have seen with My Father” (John viii. 38).

On the other hand, Who so dependent as the Son of God?

“The Son can do nothing of Himself” (John v. 19).

“I can of Mine own self do nothing” (John v. 30).

Similarly, the Lord said later to His disciples concerning the other Comforter, even the Spirit of truth, “He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak” (John xvi. 13).

A superficial reading of these statements might lead to the conclusion that, of themselves, the Son and the Spirit were powerless, not even possessing the abilities common to man, yet we have but to consider the reasons put forward in this Gospel for this very limitation to see that they reveal not only the true relationship of the Son with the Father, but magnify the Son Himself.

Here then are the reasons given why the Son did nothing and said nothing “of” (*apo*, from) “Himself”.

- (1) The Son spoke not “from Himself” because one sent by another who so acted would evidently be seeking “His own glory: but He that seeketh His glory that sent Him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is found in Him” (John vii. 18).
- (2) The Son spoke not “from Himself”, because, not only had He been “sent” and found His meat and drink in finishing the work He had been sent to do, but He had the further reason and further joy that, “My Father hath not left Me alone; for I do always those things that please Him” (John viii. 29).
- (3) And He added (verse 42), “neither came I of Myself”. The Son was not self-commissioned. It is the glory of the gospel that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son; consequently, as the Sent One, He spoke and wrought only those things that pertained to His blessed commission.

- (4) Both His “words” and His “works” partook of this character, but another and deeper reason was given why He did not speak or act “from Himself”; it was, “I am in the Father, and the Father in Me” (John xiv. 10, 11).

It took a long time; it took the working of many signs; it took the patient teaching of well-nigh another three years, before the claim of John v. was recognized by His disciples, but, in chapter xvi., they made this confession,

“Now we are sure that Thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask Thee: by this we believe that Thou camest forth from God” (John xvi. 30).

We may learn what “speaking of Himself” means by turning to John xi. 51, “And this spake He not of Himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation”. If a sinful man like Caiaphas could not say anything “of himself” when the glory and purpose of God so demanded, how much more may we not expect it of the Son of God when He was in the position of willingly and joyfully limiting Himself to the execution of that work for which He had been sent by the Father. Moreover, on another occasion, He said, “I and My Father are One” (John x. 30), so that the truth of His equality is not a matter of inference but of revelation.

It may be said that every child of God “sees” and “hears” something of the words and works of the Father, and this would be true. In the Lord’s claim, however, there is a plenitude that does not belong to men: “For *whatever* He may do, *these things also* doeth the Son, *in like manner*” (John v. 19). In the same verse the Lord had taught that the Son *cannot* work of Himself, because *He is* the Son. Other creatures standing on a lower level may abuse their freedom and do things contrary, but this would empty the title of THE SON of its essential meaning, namely, that of perfect unity with the Father. The same argument is also put in another form, “For it is the very nature of the Son to do whatever the Father doeth”. Moreover, His works are “in like manner” (*homoios*).

The question of the deity of Christ is not in view. It has already been taught that “The Word was God”. We are now learning about “The Word Who became flesh”, and His relationship not with “God”, as such, but with God revealed as “The Father”. These are important distinctions. Both the Father and the Son bear the same title, “God”, and the question of equality *there*, can never arise. If the Word, Who was God, became flesh, and was seen as the only begotten of the Father, then the question does arise, Is He subordinate or is He equal with the Father? This chapter of John which we are considering opens the question and, step by step, the subject is developed until we reach the definite assertion, “I and My Father are One”, and the ultimate confession of Thomas, “My Lord and My God”.

As we follow the lead given by the structure, the succeeding signs, and their intermediate links, these further steps in the argument await us. We must therefore devote further articles to the examination of this most important teaching, for there is no question so crucial as that which He Himself asked, “What think ye of Christ?”

**#31. The link between the third and fourth sign (v. 16 - 47).
Equality of honour of the Father and the Son established.
pp. 115 - 119**

The charge laid against the Saviour in this chapter of John's Gospel is twofold. (1) That He had broken the Sabbath day, and (2) that He called God His Own Father, making Himself equal with God.

The opening and closing words of the Lord's great defence, have occupied our attention in the preceding article. There we found that He claimed several vital and exclusive things.

- (1) He saw and He heard what the Father did.
- (2) He did whatever He saw the Father do.

A possible objection is now met by the Lord's subsequent words. True, a Pharisee may interpose, you do those things which you "see" the Father do; but what you actually see may be but a remnant of His ways and deeds; therefore your answer does not justify your claiming equality with God. To this the Lord gives a conclusive reply, leaving no loophole for further objection on the score of the possible limitation of His Own vision: "For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him *all things* that Himself doeth" (John v. 20). Here are three most conclusive elements in the argument:

- (1) The great actuating principle of love.
- (2) Not only did Christ "see", but the Father "showed".
- (3) Not only did the Father show, but He showed "all things".

This is not the first time that the love of the Father to the Son has been given as the great reason why "all things" were committed into His hands.

"He that cometh from above is above all: He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth; He that cometh from heaven is above all. And what He hath *seen and heard* that He testifieth; and no man receiveth His testimony. He that hath received His testimony, hath set His seal to this that God is true. For He Whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand*" (John iii. 31-35).

Here the Lord's ministry is compared and contrasted with that of John the Baptist. He came from above; He came from heaven; He both heard and saw. He was sent; the Spirit was given to Him without measure, and, being loved of the Father, all things were given into His hands.

"*All things.*"—Let us acquaint ourselves with the way in which this expression is used of the Lord in John's Gospel:

- (1) All things were made by Him (i. 3).
- (2) All things were known by Him (ii. 24; iv. 25, 29, 39; xvi. 30; xviii. 4; xix. 28; xxi. 17).
- (3) All things were committed to Him (iii. 35; v. 22, 28; xiii. 3; xvii. 2).
- (4) All things that the Father had were His (xvi. 15; xvii. 10).

These four sets include the whole creation, all things whatever that the Father does or has, all flesh, all judgments, all that are in the graves. In the face of this testimony, the question as to the Son's equality with the Father dies before it can be uttered. If these things do not mean equality, then there is no possibility of demonstrating the meaning of the word. He, for our sakes, left the glory which He had before the world was (John xvii. 5); He left the riches that He had (II Cor. viii. 9); He divested Himself of the form of God, wherein His equality with God was evident (Phil. ii. 6, 7) and took upon Him the form of a servant, wherein that equality was veiled (Phil. ii. 7) and it is in the gradual unfolding of His glory as "the Son", with special reference to His words and works, that the revelation is made that this "Sent One", though, according to the flesh, of Israel and Man, is nevertheless "over all, God blessed for ever" (Rom. ix. 5).

The Father "showed" all things that He did to the Son.

This word *deiknuo*, shewed, occurs seven times in John's Gospel. It is used of a sign (John ii. 18); of good works (John x. 32); and of the Lord's pierced hands (John xx. 20). It presupposes vision in the beholder that corresponds with the vision granted. When the disciples said "Shew us the Father" (John xiv. 8), they were asking for something which could not be granted to them without mediation, but there is no suggestion that any mediation was necessary when the Father "shewed" the Son whatever He was doing, for the Son declared that He "saw" all things.

Man can see the things of man:

"For what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man which is in him?
even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God" (I Cor. ii. 11).
"No man hath seen God at any time" (John i. 18).

He therefore that could "see" all things, "know" all things, "possess" all things, "make" all things, must be God:

"For every house is builded by some one; but He that hath built all things is God"
(Heb. iii. 4 R.V.).

The works which had commenced with the miraculous signs wrought by Christ, were to go on with increasing greatness until the evidence was complete that "Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God".

"*Marvel* not", said Christ to Nicodemus, "that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John iii. 7).

"And He will show Him greater works than these, that ye may *marvel*" (John v. 20).

"*Marvel* not", said Christ, at the fact that "All judgment hath been given unto the Son"
(John v. 22, 28 and 29).

“The Jews *marveled*” when they heard the words of Christ, saying, “How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?” (John vii. 15).

“Ye all *marvel*”, said Christ, because “I have done one work” (John vii. 21).

Greater and more marvelous things were to be accomplished by the Son of God before His work was done, and among them the Saviour specifies:

- (1) The resurrection and quickening of the dead.
- (2) The judgment of all men.

And this with the avowed object, “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father” (John v. 21-23).

It is the abundant testimony of the Scriptures, that it is God that raiseth the dead, and that it was He Who raised Christ up from the dead.

“God Which raiseth the dead” (II Cor. i. 9).

“If we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead” (Rom. iv. 24).

Yet we observe that in the verse where the word *egeiro*, “raise”, first occurs in John’s Gospel, the Lord says:

“In three days *I will raise* it up” (John ii. 19).

“I lay down My life, *that I might take it again*. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father” (John x. 17, 18).

The Lord’s resurrection was, therefore, not accomplished without His Own co-operation. How this could be may be beyond the power of mortal mind to know, but that it is so is revealed, and revealed for the express purpose that all men should give honour to the Son equal to that which they give to the Father: “The Son quickeneth whom *He will*” (John v. 21). With this impressive claim, read the prayer: “Father, *I will* that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am” (John xvii. 24). The holiest saint that ever breathed would be condemned the moment such a “prayer” escaped his lips. He Who can say, “I will”, and the dead are quickened, and Who can say, “I will”, in addressing the Father, is certainly an equal.

There is a transition in John v. 21 and 22 from resurrection to the sequel of resurrection, namely “judgment” (*see* verse 29).

“For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.”

The solemn passages which speak of God the Judge of all; the awful grandeur of the day of judgment; the tremendous responsibility that rests in the hands of that Judge Whose verdict is eternal; all speak of Christ, and Christ as the Son of man (John v. 27).

“He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man Whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead” (Acts xvii. 31).

We must not allow ourselves to lose the main line of argument because, in themselves, the side issues are so great. The matter before us, as it was before the Lord, His disciples and the Jews, was His claim to equality with God, a claim resident in His Sonship, and by the fact that He declared that the works which He did were the self-same that the Father did. We resist therefore the temptation to explore the doctrines of resurrection, of quickening, of judgment; each theme demanding a study to itself; and pass on, with the Lord, to His conclusion

“That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father Which hath sent Him” (John v. 23).

How should men honour the Father? They must worship Him in spirit and in truth (John iv. 23).

“All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.”

“The Father raiseth the dead, and quickeneth them” (John v. 21).

“Jesus said, I am the *resurrection*, and the *life*” (John xi. 25).

“All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.”

“Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us” (John xiv. 8).

“He that hath seen ME hath seen the FATHER believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me?” (John xiv. 9, 10).

“All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.”

“Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee” (John xvii. 1).

“I have glorified Thee glorify Thou Me with Thine Own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was” (John xvii. 4, 5).

“All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.”

Let us not miss the second part of John v. 23. A man may say that he honours the Father, for He indeed is God, but that he cannot bring himself to honour the Son in the same way, because that appears to be honouring One Who was subordinate. Let not such think that it is possible thus to honour the Father. It is impossible. Any who withhold equal honour to the Son, render themselves unable to honour the Father at all.

“I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me” (John xiv. 6).

To think that the Person and Character of the Father is less understandable than the Person and Character of the Son, betrays a dangerous ignorance.

“All things are delivered unto me of My Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him” (Matt. xi. 27).

a statement parallel with those already considered in John’s Gospel.

Let us note with worship and wonder, the claim here made by the Lord in the hour of His rejection. The Father is revealed by the Son, but no such revelation is given of the Son Himself. The Son knows the Father in the same measure of fullness that the Father knows the Son, and this alone would be sufficient proof that the Son was equal with the Father, and must receive equal honour. But, added to this is the fact that, whereas the Fatherhood of God is a matter of revelation through the Son, the Sonship of Christ is not so revealed. The latter is evidently a more complete mystery than the former, and should for ever close all argument that would reason from the relationship of Father and Son to the belittling of the Son. None of the admitted facts, namely that Christ was “sent” or that He said “My Father is greater than I”, can possibly alter the explicit testimony of Matt. xi. 27 or John v. 23.

A glance at the structure given on page 68 shows that at verse 24, a new section opens, governed by the words, “The hour and the voice”, and as this new section continues the argument, we will devote the next article to its examination. Meanwhile, let us not, in the eagerness of our study, forget that the subject-matter which occupies our attention, must, if it be rightly understood, lead to the full confession of Thomas when he said, “My Lord and My God”.

#32. The link between the third and fourth sign (v. 16 - 47). The Quickening or the Raising of the dead. pp. 156 - 160

The structure of verses 24 and 25 and of verses 28 and 29 have already been given, but to facilitate reference we reproduce it here.

D		24, 25.	The hour and the Voice.
			No condemnation (<i>krisis</i>).
f		Verily, verily.	
g1		Hear my Word.	
h1		Hath everlasting life.	
i		The hour cometh and now is.	
f		Verily, verily.	
g2		Hear the Voice.	
h2		They that hear . . . live.	
D		-28, 29.	The hour and the Voice.
			Some come to condemnation, <i>Krisis</i> .
i		The hour cometh.	
g3		Hear His Voice.	
h3		Resurrection of life and judgment.	

The solemn “Verily, verily” ushers in the truth of verse 24, and again of verse 25 (For a complete list of the occurrences of this expression see Volume XXXI, pages 173, 174).

“He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life” (John v. 24).

Much is made of “hearing” in his gospel. The Samaritans said,

“Now we believe for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world” (John iv. 42).

Hearing is a characteristic of His sheep:

“The sheep hear His voice.” “The sheep did not hear them” (the thieves and robbers).
“Other sheep I have they shall hear My voice.”
“My sheep hear My voice” (John x. 3, 8, 16, 27).

Moreover, hearing is a characteristic of

they that be “of God” (John viii. 47), and they that be “of the truth” (John xviii. 37).

Some, by their very nature, cannot, and will not, hear.

“Ye have neither heard His voice, nor seen His shape” (John v. 37).

Hearing is a test of discipleship.

“This is an hard saying, who can hear it?” (John vi. 60).
“From that time many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him” (John vi. 66).

Inability to hear God’s word is a mark of evil.

“Why do ye not understand My speech? even because ye cannot hear My word. Ye are of your father the devil when he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own he that is of God heareth God’s words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God” (John viii. 43-47).

In John v. 24, 25, “hearing” His “word”, and “hearing” His “voice”, are intentional parallels, and both are ways of speaking of him that “believe”.

The “believing” here has a specific object:
“And believeth on Him that sent Me” (John v. 24).

It is the insistent testimony of this gospel that Christ is the Sent One, this is intertwined with all the truth that is revealed in it. There are twenty-eight occurrences of *pempo* and seventeen of *apostello* (forty-five in all) that speak of Christ being “Sent”. Space is lacking here to list these and exhibit in any degree their message. We can only say that the faith that receives everlasting life, comprehends the Father in the capacity of the One Who sent the Son, a statement that is not only the legitimate inference of John v. 24, but the inspired declaration of I John iv. 14:

“The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.”

We must now give attention to the special feature of this section, which is placed in correspondence with verses 28, 29 in the structure.

“The hour is coming and now is” (John v. 25).

“The hour is coming” (John v. 28).

The additional words “and now is”, found in the first occurrence, are absent from the second. In the first passage, “the dead” are said to hear the voice of the Son of God, whereas in the second “all that are in the graves” hear His voice. In the first, they that hear “shall live”, in the second, they that hear “shall come forth” (v. 29). In the earlier passage they that live are those that do not come into condemnation (John v. 24), whereas in the later passages they that hear are those who are raised from the dead.

“They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (*krisis*).

It is evident that the former passage refers to those who are spiritually dead, but who, upon hearing the gospel, live; whereas, the later passage refers to the physically dead, all of whom must hear His voice; but all these are not necessarily saved, neither does the hearing of the voice imply any element of faith on their part for while some come forth to a resurrection of life the rest come forth to a resurrection of judgment. There is little or no satisfaction to be discovered in the commentaries as to the precise meaning of the added words “and now is”. Let us conduct an investigation for ourselves and see whether we can learn enough from the Word itself to help us to appreciate what is intended. We remember, of course, that similar expressions are found in chapter iv.; and it is fatal to ignore these when examining chapter v. In chapter iv., the question is one of worship; in chapter v., one of life.

1. The hour was coming, (an hour future to the time when the Saviour sat and talked at the well), when men would neither at Jerusalem, nor at Samaria, worship the Father. This “hour” had not “come” when Peter and John went up to the temple at the hour of prayer (Acts iii. 1), and the type of worship that was offered and conducted at Jerusalem at the moment that Christ uttered the words in John iv. 21, continued until the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D.70.
2. “The hour cometh, and now is”, looks to a day when the true worshipper should worship the Father in spirit and in truth. No time need elapse before that took place; even while the temple still stood at Jerusalem, “true” worshippers could and did “worship the Father in spirit and in truth”.

There is, however, a possibility that John, writing his gospel long after A.D.70, brought the Lord’s testimony to the Samaritan woman up to date, saying, the hour the Lord had said *was coming, is now* here, the words “and now is” referring to the dispensation that had been instituted upon the setting aside of Israel, which in this gospel John particularly ministered to “the world”. Parallels for this practice can be found in the O.T. In Gen. vi. 4, the record reads:

“There were giants in the earth in those days.”

to which Moses added the words that referred to his own times, “and after that”. In a similar manner Moses brings up to date the narrative of several other passages, as in Gen. xxvi. 33; xxxv. 20; and xlvii. 26, where the name of Beer-sheba, the grave of Rachel, and the law made by Joseph, are related by Moses to his own day.

In our Lord’s own day it was blessedly true that whoever believed Him received life, but the words “and now is” were specially true when John wrote the record, for the very purpose for which he selected his material had in view “life through His name”. John v. 24, 25 is most emphatically true for the day in which we live. Quite independent of, and outside the dispensation of the mystery, “the hour now is” that whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, whoever hears His voice and believes in Him that sent Him, hath everlasting life. For instance, no opposition or objection can override the blessed fact that the words

“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life”

were used by God to bring the present writer out of nature’s darkness and death into the light of life, subsequent realization of a place in the glorious calling of the mystery, in no sense mitigating, canceling or altering this simple issue. To-day John’s ministry and Paul’s ministry are both running together, John having “the world” for his parish, and “life” for his great object. Paul the prisoner, has the “Gentile”, as distinct from the “Jew”, as his charge, and the message of Paul pre-supposes the hearer to have “life” and leads him on to the heights of that calling which finds its sphere in the heavenlies, and its inception “before the overthrow of the world”.*

[* - See chart which sets out the relationship of John and Paul during the present time in Volume XXVIII, pages 126, 127.]

In John v. 28, literal resurrection is in view, and “all”, not “some”, that are in the graves shall hear.

The reader of “The Berean Expositor” needs no lengthy argument to prove that Scripture teaches the resurrection of the dead and that each will then be clothed with a body suitable to the sphere of blessing he is to enter. There may be, however, a need to discover why the Lord divided, as He did, the two classes who shall be raised.

It is emphatic testimony of the Scriptures, that

“There is none righteous, no not one there is none that doeth good, no not one”
(Rom. iii. 10-12).

If this passage is all that has been revealed on the subject, then our Lord could not have spoken of any who could be called “They that have done good”. There would simply be the resurrection of but one class, the condemned; they who had done evil. Paul, on one occasion, spoke in the following words of the resurrection, and divided those thus raised into two companies:

“And have hope toward God that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust” (Acts xxiv. 15).

If one may object to John v. that there is none that doeth good, one may object to Acts xxiv. that there is none righteous, and that there can no more be a resurrection of the just, than there can be a resurrection of those that have done good. But such sweeping statements cannot be allowed. There is a scriptural meaning and justification for all that is stated in John v. and Acts xxiv. Does not the same epistle that teaches “there is none righteous no not one”, say “The just by faith shall live”? It does, and so, though a man can never be accounted “just” through any merit of his own, he can still be called “the just” even though he be just “by faith”. So, also, with regard to “doing good”. Eph. ii. 8-10, not only says that salvation is “not of works”; it, as surely, says that it is “unto good works”. The apostle has hardly written the words “Not by works” in Titus iii. 5, than he is writing,

“Constantly affirm, that they which have believed in God, might be careful to maintain good works” (Titus iii. 8).

Into John v. and Acts xxiv., the question as to how those in view become “good” or “just” does not enter; resurrection there is rather the time of harvest, when men shall be known by their fruits. If, throughout his life, a man has said that he has “believed”, but throughout that life he has “practiced evil”, that man’s “faith” is an empty profession, and in the resurrection he will find himself raised to judgment. While it would not be true to say that the N.T. draws a distinct line between the usage of *poieo*, “to do”, and *prasso*, “to practice”, it is nevertheless true that *poieo* is used in John v. twelve times of the Father and the Son, and once of those that “have done good”. *Prasso* is used in John but twice, both passages referring to “doing evil” (John iii. 20; v. 29), and *prasso* differs from *poieo* in that, whereas *poieo* means “to make”, “to build”, “to do”, *prasso* is used only of actions, a line of conduct, a practice.

We must defer examination of the references to “judgment” and “damnation” as this great subject comes not only in verses 24 and 29, but in 22, 27 and 30, where all judgment is given into the hands of the Son of God as the Son of Man, this we hope to do in the next article.

**#33. The link between the third and fourth sign (v. 16 - 47).
 “Life in Himself.” “All Judgment.”
 The Equality of the Son with the Father.
 pp. 222 - 226**

Having deferred examination of the different passages that spoke of “judgment”, “condemnation” or “damnation”, we now examine the remaining subdivisions of this section, John v. 26, 27 and John v. 30. The latter reference closes the section, and is in direct correspondence with the opening member verse 19.

- A | 19. Nothing of Self. “*What He seeth.*” |
 a1 | The Son can do nothing of Himself.
 b1 | What He seeth the Father do.
 b1 | Whatsoever He do.
 a1 | These also doeth the Son likewise.
- * * * * * * *
- A | 30. Nothing of Self. “*As I hear.*” |
 a2 | I can of Mine own self do nothing.
 b2 | As I hear I judge.
 b2 | My judgment is just.
 a2 | Not My own will, but His.

John v. 26, 27 is in direct correspondence with John v. 21-23.

- C | 21-23. Equality of the Son. |
 c | For as . . . so . . . raise and quicken.
 d | *Krino . . . Krisis*: Judgment.
 e | The Son sent.
- * * * * * * *
- C | 26, 27. Equality of the Son. |
 c | For as . . . so . . . life in Himself.
 d | *Krisis*: Judgment.
 e | The Son of Man.

Three important items claim our attention in these sections,

1. The double title “The Son of God” and “The Son of Man” (John v. 25, 27).
2. The claim that the Son had been given “life in Himself”.
3. The emphasis that is placed upon “judgment”.

Summing up the chief purpose which he had in view John says,

“These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His Name” (John xx. 31).

It is therefore of the very essence of the teaching of this gospel that we should grasp the implication of this title "Son of God". Firstly let us examine the way in which John speaks of Christ under the title "Son". The first reference is critical, in that it sets the limit to the title, and governs every other reference.

"The only begotten Son" (John i. 18).

What is meant by "only begotten" is made clear in verse 14, for it is only when "the Word" became "flesh" and tabernacled among us that the peculiar glory which belonged to Him as the Only begotten of the Father could be seen. *Monogenes* is used of ordinary men and women in Luke vii. 12 "The *only* son"; viii. 42 "one *only* daughter" "mine *only* child" ix. 38. It is used of Isaac, Abraham's "only begotten son" (Heb. xi. 17). Thus while Luke and Paul use the word *monogenes* of natural sonship, John is the only writer who uses the word of Christ (John i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18; I John iv. 9), and it is evident he did so, in order to enforce upon us the true meaning that is intended in John xx. 31.

The title "Son of God" occurs in John's gospel eleven times, but in one or two references, some addition is made, which we will note as we proceed.

"I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John i. 34).

"Thou art the Son of God" (John i. 49).

"The name of the only begotten Son of God" (John iii. 18).

The last reference gives us the first occurrence with an addition, and the first occurrence of John's own testimony. It is the apostle's endeavour to make sure that we do not separate the title "Son of God" from "the only begotten". John the Baptist and Nathaniel have given theirs, and now John adds his. We shall observe the importance of this addition as we proceed.

"The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God" (John v. 25).

"Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" (John vi. 69).

Here is the testimony of the disciples, and two additional titles are found. "*That Christ*", so the disciples recognize the Saviour as the Messiah, moreover they recognized Him as the Son of the "living" God, a statement that must await examination.

"Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" (John ix. 35).

"Because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John x. 36).

"That the Son of God might be glorified" (John xi. 4).

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John xi. 27).

This last is Martha's confession following the Lord's claim to the title "I am the Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25).

"The Jews answered Him, we have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God" (John xix. 7).

"That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (John xx. 31).

The title “Son of Man” occurs in John’s Gospel twelve times (i. 51; iii. 13, 14; v. 27; vi. 27, 53, 62; viii. 28; xii. 23, 24; xiii. 31).

The Lord’s statement concerning angels ascending and descending on the Son of Man, evidently relates to the future Mediation of Christ, linking heaven and earth by His Own dual nature as the God Man. In an earlier article we discussed the statement made in John iii. 13 “the Son of Man which is in heaven”; its claim to Deity cannot be lightly set aside. As the Son of Man, He could be “lifted up”, “judge all men”, “give everlasting life”, give His “flesh and blood”, “ascend up where He was before” and “be glorified”.

Two acts of very great disservice have been committed by some orthodox Christians, who, by putting out their hands to save the ark of God, have severed from its scriptural associations of “only begotten”, “Word made flesh”, the title “Son of God” and where the Scriptures use “The Word” or “The Image” made it read as if it were a title belonging to pre-incarnation times. This has produced the meaningless expression “The eternal generation of the Son” to which John xx. 31 gives no support. On the other hand the title “Son of Man” has been relegated to the realm of the flesh, despite the facts that it was an O.T. prophetic title, and that the Lord’s claim to be *the Son of Man* in answer to the question “tell us whether Thou be the Christ *the Son of God*” instead of tempering the animosity of the Jews, raised it to the highest pitch.

“He hath spoken blasphemy He is guilty of death” (Matt. xxvi. 63-66).

The title Son of God, has much affinity with the Saviour’s manhood and the title Son of Man, has much that emphasizes His Deity. Such would be an anomaly if the Lord were “such an one as ourselves”. But confessedly great is the mystery of godliness, “God was manifest in the flesh”, and if at the same time He be the Child born, the Son given, yet also the mighty God (Isa. ix. 6) the mystery is not too much for faith, however, much it transcends our ability to comprehend. Further more, this is not a matter of purposeful mystifying, or cloaking of ignorance by the use of high sounding words, but in complete agreement with and full recognition of the limitations imposed by Matt. xi. 27, a passage demanding the same implicit acceptance as any other part of Holy Writ. There remains the title without definition other than the article “The Son”. This occurs in John’s gospel eighteen times, (John iii. 17, 35, 36; v. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26; vi. 40; viii. 35, 36; xiv. 13; xvii. 1) and must be considered as all embracing. It refers to the Saviour viewed as “The Only begotten of the Father”, “The Son of God” and “The Son of Man”. This survey of the distinction of these filial titles reveals the intention of the writer of this gospel, but we must here note the way in which these titles are used. The references to “The Son” are bounded by verses 19 and 26. The first statement says:

“The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do” (John v. 19).

The last says:

“As the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself” (John v. 26).

“Of Himself”; “In Himself”. There are depths here that lie beyond the reach of man. In the former, we have the most blessed self abnegation that forms the theme of Phil. ii.

“He made Himself of no reputation (emptied Himself, R.V.) by taking the form of a servant” (Phil. ii. 7).

This corresponds with the statement that the Son can do nothing of Himself. The very fact that the Scripture says “He emptied” Himself reveals that He had somewhat which He voluntarily relinquished when He became “flesh” and was “found in fashion as a man”. As the “*Word*” in the beginning, He had “life in Himself” (John i. 4) “In Him was life”. When therefore we read that the Father had given the Son life in Himself, or that He had power to lay down His life, and power to take it up again, He was but receiving in His new sphere, that which was His own. In the beginning He had life in Himself. Before the world was He had shared the glory with the Father, and when He spoke of His ascension, it was but to go up “where He was before”. It was “the living Father” that had sent Him (John vi. 57). He was the Son of the “living God” (John vi. 69). He came to dispense “living water” (John iv. 10); He Himself was “the living bread” (John vi. 51), and “life through His name” is the purpose of the gospel. Moreover, His glorious titles include this life in many ways. He is “the bread of life” (John vi. 35, 48), He is “the resurrection and the life” (John xi. 25); He is “the way, the truth and the life” (John xiv. 6); “I am come that they might have life” was the Lord’s own summary of His commission (John x. 10). The life that is here offered is the fundamental need of all men, whether Jew, Gentile or Church of God, whether belonging to the earthly calling, the heavenly country, or the position of the One body “Far above all”. “*Life through His name*” and that name “The Christ, the Son of God” belongs to all callings and dispensations. Any attempt to limit John’s Gospel to “the Kingdom” is contrary to the express testimony of the book itself.

We now turn our attention to the references to “judgment” that are a feature of this section. The following is the disposition of *krino* and *krisis* in this section. In order that it may be easily followed, we retain the A.V. translation.

- A | a | v. 22. The Father judgeth no man. *Krino*.
- b | 22. All judgment committed unto the Son. *Krisis*.
- B | c | 24. No condemnation for those who believe. *Krisis*.
- d | 27. As Son of Man, execute judgment. *Krisis*.
- c | 29. Resurrection of damnation. *Krisis*.
- A | a | 30. As I hear I judge. *Krino*.
- b | v. 30. Judgment, just. Not seek own will. *Krisis*.

Krisis means judgment, not necessarily a judgment that condemns, as can be proved from many a passage (Matt. xxiii. 23). But *krisis* can and does mean damnation too, as another passage in Matt. xxiii. makes clear “the damnation of hell” (Matt. xxiii. 33), not permitting any softening down; the believer is exempted from *Krisis*.

“Shall not come into condemnation” (John v. 24).

And this is in correspondence with the fate of those who have “done evil”, for they shall be raised to a “resurrection of condemnation” not merely a resurrection for the judgment of their service. It surely calls forth praise, to learn that all judgment is committed into the hands of Christ *because He is the Son of Man!* The judgment of the Invisible God, must and would be just; had the Father reserved all judgment to Himself, or had it been committed to the Holy Spirit who is he that dare protest? Yet the great God condescends to man and his estate. For the seeking sinner, there is the One Mediator, “The Man Christ Jesus”; for the praying believer, there sits at the right hand on high, One Who is not untouched with the feeling of our infirmities; for the very condemned, is provided a Judge Who has walked this vale of tears, Who knows what temptation means, who suffered at the hands of men, and whose judgment is just. How inadequate are our words to explain or even point the way of truth. We have sought to deal with the first half of this great section in this series, yet how much awaits the patient study of the believer? Though only too conscious of our limitations, we must press on. In our next series we hope to deal with the second part of this section, which brings to the fore the threefold evidence of the Lord’s claims.

Mitsrach

“Toward the Sunrising.”

(A motto for all Bereans, for the year 1947).

pp. 1 - 3

In the home of any orthodox Jew one will find, to this day, a strange device hanging upon the east wall of the house. It is called a *Mitsrach*. Often it takes the form of the ten commandments. Any who have access to Volume IV of *The Berean Expositor* will find on page 62 (or Volume IV/V, page 51) a description and illustration of articles used in the synagogue and Jewish home. The articles numbered 5 and 6, give some idea of what a *Mitsrach* looks like. This word means “From the rising”, and is hung upon the east wall so that prayer can be directed toward Jerusalem. Now we have no intention of hanging a *Mitsrach* on any wall of our house, nor of advising any of our readers to adopt this Jewish custom, but we mention it here because of the lesson it may enforce.

The full expression is *Mitsrach Shemesh*. “From the rising of the sun”, “Toward the sunrising” (Numb. xxi. 11). In Numb. xxi. we have the record of Israel’s transgression, the lifting up of the brazen serpent and the healing of all who “looked”. The concluding words are.

“And the children of Israel set forward toward the sunrising” (Numb. xxi. 10, 11).

We believe every redeemed child of God is expected to follow this course. First to “set forward”. Redemption is a deliverance “out of”, therefore Egypt must be left behind. It is however more than that; it has an inheritance in view, and this must be entered and possessed. Consequently we discover that from the moment the Passover had been offered Israel were on the move, and though they wandered forty years in the wilderness, the word translated “set forward” (Heb. *nasa*) is used of that period forty-two times in the record of the itinerary of Numb. xxxiii., where it is variously rendered “depart”, “remove” or “journey”.

Among the earliest commands given to the redeemed people under Moses is that found in Exod. xiv. 15, “Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward”. If the typical teaching of Israel’s deliverance be acknowledged, it appears that Christian witness also must be a “setting forward”. There can be no turning back. There is however a great difference between setting forward along the Divinely appointed path, and merely blundering onward without guide or goal. Consequently we must add to our statement taken from Exod. xiv. further words of guidance from subsequent passages.

In Numb. x. 33, for example, we read, “And they departed from the mount of the Lord”, and the word translated “departed” is *nasa*. But this statement is followed immediately by another, “and the ark of the covenant of the Lord went before them”. Here once again the word “went” is a translation of *nasa*. Further, in Numb. x. 34, we read, “And the cloud of the Lord was upon them by day, when they went (*nasa*) out of the camp”, and yet once more in verse 35 we read the words, “When the ark set forward”,

where the Hebrew *nasa* is used for the fourth time in this context. A redeemed people must “go forward”, but they go forward at the command of the Lord and in close association with the symbols of His presence as set forth in the ark and the cloud. If we are a redeemed people we must “set forward”, but we set forward with a guide.

Secondly, our goal is prefigured in the statement that “They pitched toward the sunrising” (Numb. xxi. 11). Here we have two related references. The children of Israel were not expected to be on the move day and night; they “pitched” their camp regularly, and the word conveys the thought of unburdening, of relaxing; this is good to remember as we press onward. But on the other hand this did not imply settling down; consequently, when they did pitch their camp it was always “toward the sunrising”, for they were pilgrims and strangers in the wilderness. The Christian hymn well expresses the sentiment in the refrain:

“I nightly pitch my moving tent
A day’s march nearer home.”

It is without significance that, after Jacob’s all-night wrestle with the angel, his change of name, and his blessing, we read, “And as he passed over Penueel *the sun rose* upon him” (Gen. xxxii. 31). The climax of prophetic vision is expressed also in this glorious figure:

“Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord IS RISEN upon thee the Lord shall ARISE upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy RISING” (Isa. lx. 1-3).
“But unto you that fear My name shall the Sun of righteousness ARISE with healing in His wings” (Mal. iv. 2).

Nearly forty years ago those responsible for the testimony of *The Berean Expositor* and for *The Berean Forward Movement* heard the command, “Go forward”. They have faced their “Red seas”, their “Marahs” and their “Amaleks”, but they have found a way opened through seas of difficulty, have had bitter experiences rendered sweet, and enemies routed, without recourse to carnal weapons. The witness has been sustained through the fury of two world wars, and the nature of its testimony has compelled those who have the work at heart to suffer isolation and loneliness to a marked degree. Our consolation and strength has been the conviction that we were entrusted with precious truth, and had the assurance of the Lord’s continual presence with us. After crying like a voice in the wilderness for the life-time of a generation, the precious truth of our high calling has at length found acceptance, and in every continent there are those who can say with meaning and discrimination:

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places” (Eph. i. 3).

For this we thank God and take courage. We still “press toward the mark”; we still “set forward”. Our faces are “toward the sunrising”, for we are enjoined to “set our affection on things above where Christ sits at the right hand of God”. We are under no illusions. Much as we hope and labour with the desire that many may be blessed by our

testimony, we are warned by the infallible Word that, as the end of the age approaches, the times will be “perilous”; that they will be marked with a turning away from the truth, and a being turned to fables (II Tim. iii., iv.).

If this were all, we should become unnerved, and our efforts would die. But we look beyond earth’s long, dark, night and hail the coming day. Here, therefore, in the opening pages of yet another year’s witness, we “*Set forward toward the sunrising*”.

N e h e m i a h.

#1. Foreword.

pp. 143 - 146

These notes and comments on Nehemiah were written at a time when the witness connected with the Berean Expositor was in a state of transition. Like Nehemiah, we, too, have had “open letters”; we, too, have experienced the wearisome effect of “much rubbish”; we, too, have received invitations to occupy a “broader” platform, to come down into the wide open “plain” and not cramp ourselves within the prescribed limits of a “prison ministry”. We were particularly attracted to the thought that the goal of Nehemiah’s efforts namely, “The Pulpit of the Opened Book” (Neh. viii. 4, 5), was similar to our own. Because of this, we expected to find much in the experiences of Nehemiah that would prove a word in season to ourselves. On many critical occasions, when the policy of the work hung in the balance, we have taken heed to the counsel of Nehemiah and have never yet been disappointed, and we shall have to return to this book again and again.

The chronology of Ezra-Nehemiah has been discussed in the closing chapters of the series entitled “Time and Place”* (* - A series which commenced in Volume XXXIII), and the reader is advised to acquaint himself with the arguments there put forward to establish the interrelationship of these two books. The book opens with a statement concerning the writer, “Nehemiah”, a date, “the month Chisleu, in the twentieth year”, a reference to the state of the “Jews”, the “captivity” and “Jerusalem”, which is followed by a prayer of some length and fullness, and concludes with the information that Nehemiah was “the King’s cup-bearer”. The subject of chapter ii. follows a similar pattern, the prayer this time, however, being the briefest on record. Before considering these passages in detail let us set out this arrangement.

Nehemiah i. 1 - ii. 4.

- A | i. 1. *Date.* Month Chisleu.
- B | i. 2-11-. Weeping, mourning, fasting, and prayer
because of condition of Jerusalem.
- C | i. -11. The King’s cup-bearer. Office stated.
- A | ii. 1-. *Date.* Month Nisan (four months later).
- C | ii. -1. I took wine to the King. Office used.
- B | ii. 2-4. Sadness, sorrow of heart, and prayer
because of condition of Jerusalem.

We shall find that structurally the remainder of chapter ii. belongs to the next great division of the subject matter, and it will be considered in its place and relation to the theme.

“The words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah” (Neh. i. 1).

It is evident that the intention of this opening statement is to intimate that Nehemiah himself made this record, just as we understand that the expression “The words of Amos” (Amos i. 1), or “The words of Jeremiah” indicates that the prophet recorded the prophetic utterances attributed to him. The name Nehemiah is of prophetic import; it means “The Comforter (appointed by) the Lord”, and contains the word translated “comfort” in Isa. xl. 1, which verse stands at the head of a prophecy that speaks of the restoration of Jerusalem in two aspects.

- (1) The restoration carried out under the command of Cyrus (Isa. xlvi. 28; xlv. 1-5), and
- (2) The complete restoration yet to take place under the benign sway of the Messiah.

To those who sighed concerning the desolations of Jerusalem, and hoped for its restoration, the very name of this man would give courage and cheer—“The Comforter (appointed by) Jehovah”.

From Neh. x. 1, we gather that Nehemiah was one of the Princes of Israel, for chapter ix. 38 tells us that “princes” as well as Levites and priests sealed the covenant there made. Moreover, he is called “The Tirshatha”, a title indicating “fear” or “reverence” (compare the Persian *torsh*, severe, austere). In Neh. xii. 26 he is called “the governor”, where the word so translated is *pechah*, a foreign word common to the Arabians and Persians. The note in the Companion Bible, “Governor-Pasha”, must not be taken to indicate that Pasha is derived from *Pechah*, as that would be false etymology. A further reason for the supposition that Nehemiah was probably a prince of Judah, is the fact that “the King’s seed” and “princes” were taken prisoners to Babylon. The character of this man of God shows him to be of fearless integrity, a firm believer in the promises of his God, a fervent patriot, a man of prayer, and a splendid leader of the people, being especially proof against intimidation or corruption. The need to-day is much the same, and if the study of this book but manifests both the activities of the enemy and the way in which these activities are to be met and overcome, it will be a blessing indeed.

“And it came to pass in the month Chisleu” (Neh. i. 1).

Let us take this opportunity of recording the months of the Jewish year, commencing with Abib, as indicated in Exod. xii. 1.

- i. Abib or Nisan (April). Abib means “The ear month” Exod. ix. 31; xiii. 4.
(In the books of Nehemiah and Esther, the name Abib is exchanged for the Babylonian name of the god of “spring”, Neh. ii. 1. Est. iii. 7).
- ii. Zif (May). Chaldee. “Brightness”.
- iii. Sivan (June). Uncertain.
- iv. Tammuz (July).
- v. Ab (August). In later Jewish writings.
- vi. Elul (September). “Gleaning”.
- vii. Tisri or Ethanim (October). Tisri is found in later writings. Ethanim means “perennial”.
- viii. Bul (November). “Rain”.

- ix. Chisleu (December). Orion.
- x. Tebeth (January). "Winter".
- xi. Shebat (February).
- xii. Adar (March).

One or two points of interest are brought to light by an examination of this list of names. During the time of Moses, the first month of the year was called Abib; the name occurs in Exodus and Deuteronomy. In the days of, and after, the captivity, the old name of the month is dropped and Nisan, a Babylonian name, takes its place. The testimony of these two names is valuable evidence for the historicity of the books of the Bible. In the days of Solomon, the names of the month had to be explained thus:--

"In the month Zif, which is the second month" (I Kings. vi. 1).

Later, after the captivity, the explanation takes the opposite form, the names being added to explain the number, thus "In the tenth month, which is the month Tebeth" (Esther ii. 16). These features, together with the appearance of Babylonian and foreign names, are evidences of the changes that were overtaking the people of Israel. Nehemiah tells us that his inquiry after the condition of his brethren and country was made "in the month *Chisleu*, in the twentieth year". By comparing this passage with the next date, given in Neh. ii. 1, we discover that this was the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. Strictly speaking Artaxerxes is not a private name, but an appellative title, like Pharaoh, and was common to a number of kings. It means "Great King" (*Arta* = great, *Kshatza* = king). From the record of the Behistun rock (see *The Berean Expositor*, Volume IV/V, pages 78, 79) we learn that he was the husband of Esther ("the queen also sitting by him" Neh. ii. 6), and the father of Cyrus, who gave the order to rebuild the temple (Ezra i. 1).

The date of this twentieth year of Artaxerxes is B.C.454, proof of which will be found in the series already referred to entitled "Time and Place". This is of extreme importance because of the relation of this date with the prophecy of Dan. ix. On this date, therefore, Nehemiah commences his record, and tells us that he was in "Shushan the palace". The city of Shushan has been excavated, and a palace, built on a mound 1,000 feet square, laid bare. The palace had several groups of columns enclosing a central hall 200 feet square, and outside, separated by a wall some eighteen feet thick, were three porticos 200 feet wide and supported by columns. It is highly probable that in one of these, protected by awnings, the great banquet, described in Esther i. took place. The river upon which it stands is referred to in Dan. viii. 2 by the name *Ulai*, which occurs in the writings of Pliny, who, in his Natural History, calls it *Eulaeus*. To Nehemiah, on this auspicious date, came Hanani, one of his brethren and certain men of Judah (Neh. i. 2).

The edict of Ezra i. 3 had not yet gone forth; the Jews were not yet "free", consequently Nehemiah enquires concerning those that had "escaped" which were left of the captivity. These that are said to have "escaped" may have slipped away from the lands of their captivity and made their way back to Jerusalem, but there is another word, *malat*, that carries that meaning. The word used here, *peletah*, occurs in Ezra ix. 8, 13, 14, 15, "escape" and "deliverance", where the idea is not so much slipping away from

captivity as being delivered from, or spared, captivity. In Ezra ix 14 the word “escaped” is practically synonymous with a “remnant” and consequently Nehemiah may refer to those who by some means had avoided transportation and so remained in their desolated and ruined city. This meaning is confirmed by the reply of Hanani,

“The remnant that are left of the captivity there in the Province are in great affliction and reproach: the wall of Jerusalem also is broken down, and the gates thereof burned with fire” (Neh. i. 3).

We read of this company in Jer. xl. There they are called “The people that were left in the land” (6); “The poor of the land, of them that were not carried away captive to Babylon” (7); “a remnant of Judah” left by the king of Babylon (11); and “The Jews which are gathered” (15). Judæa, the portion of the royal tribe of Judah, is now called “The Province”, and is so referred to by the letter sent by Tatnai to Darius the king (Ezra v. 5). It was but one of the “hundred and twenty and seven provinces”, referred to in Esther i. 1. Over the whole kingdom Darius had set a hundred and twenty princes, ruled over by three presidents “of whom Daniel was first” (Dan. vi. 1, 2). The difference between the hundred and twenty-seven provinces and the hundred and twenty princes is left unexplained, but this is an evidence of truth rather than of a discrepancy, for there might have been many reasons to account for it, well known to all at the time, whereas a forger would have seen to it that the number in both accounts was the same. This remnant left in Jerusalem were in “affliction and reproach”, and, moreover, the wall and the gates of the city being destroyed, the private life of the people was invaded, and the observance of the law hindered, as may be seen from the command of Nehemiah in chapter xiii. 17-22. While the gates with their locks and bars remained unrepaired, it was not possible to enforce the keeping of the sabbath against the intrusion of those who sold wares. Upon hearing this grievous news, Nehemiah tells us that he sat down and wept and mourned certain days and fasted, and then addressed himself by prayer to “The God of heaven”. This divine title is peculiar to the times of the Gentiles, it suggests that God had withdrawn Himself from among His people and ruled from afar, even as Nebuchadnezzar had been forced to acknowledge that “The heavens do rule” (Dan. iv. 26, 35). The title occurs in II Chron. xxxvi. 23, and Psalm cxxxvi. 26, where the deliverance of Israel from Pharaoh and other enemies is the theme. The bulk of the occurrences is found in Ezra (eight occurrences), Nehemiah (four occurrences) and Daniel (four occurrences).

#2. Prayer, Providence and Provision.

pp. 212 - 215

The prayer of Nehemiah, consequent upon the sad report he had received concerning his people and their city, occupies the remaining portion of the opening chapter of this book. It has interesting parallels with the prayer of Daniel, recorded in Dan. ix. Both prayers are concerned with the same subject, but whereas Nehemiah's prayer was focused upon his interview with the king—which interview was to produce the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem (Neh. ii. 7, 8 and Dan. ix. 25), the commandment being given in the year B.C.454—Daniels' prayer led to the prophetic vision of the seventy weeks, the date line of which was this self-same year, B.C.454, "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem", and which looked, not to the immediate rebuilding of the street and the wall in troublous times, but to the final and blessed restoration of the city and people at the time of the end.

Both men were moved to tears, fasting and prayer, the one by the report of Hanani, the other by the prophecy of Jeremiah (Neh. i. 4, 5; Dan. ix. 1, 2). Both addressed God as "terrible" and "dreadful" (Neh. i. 5; Dan. ix. 4), using the same Hebrew word. Both speak of God keeping covenant and mercy, both call upon God either to let His ear be attentive or to incline His ear. Both unite their personal confession with the confession of their people, and both refer to Moses as the Lord's "Servant", attributing to him the law, commandments, covenants, curses and promises, exactly as is found written in the Pentateuch.

"Prosper I pray Thee, Thy servant this day, and grant him mercy in the sight of this man. For I was the King's cup-bearer" (Neh. i. 1).

This prayer that he might "prosper" was no self-seeking on the part of Nehemiah. It was not the prosperity of ease and plenty; it was rather the carrying forward of the project he had in mind. The primary meaning of the Hebrew words, *Tsaleach* is "To go over, or through, a river" and then it came to mean the surmounting of obstacles and achieving success. The obstacle that was before Nehemiah's mind was the possible attitude of the king. How would he react to the request of a captive to be released and sent back to build the walls of a rebellious city? If with suspicion and disfavour, a man so intimately attached to the royal person of the king might easily pay forfeit for such temerity with his life. He was the King's cup-bearer, or "butler" as the Hebrew word is translated in Gen. xl., where it is made clear that such an official could offend his royal master and suffer imprisonment. In an Eastern court, where poison was often resorted to, Nehemiah's was a position of great trust, and the possible corruption of one so intimately connected with the royal table, was therefore a constant course of anxiety to him who wore the crown.

When Nehemiah addressed the king he used the conventional title of respect, "Let the king live for ever!" and sought favour in his sight (Neh. ii. 3, 5), but in his prayer to the

God of heaven, he referred to the mighty king Artaxerxes as “this man”, yet not with any disrespect for he used the noblest Hebrew word he could, namely *Ish*.

Four months intervened between the report of Hanani and the request before the king. Four months of waiting, of grieving, of praying. Whether Nehemiah had any plan which he was waiting to put into effect, we cannot know, but the king observed the sadness of the man, and knowing that he was not physically ill, his comment was, “This is nothing else but sorrow of heart”. Instead of saying, “Now I knew that I should be pitied by my royal master”, Nehemiah makes no secret of the fact that the king’s command made him “sore afraid”. He promptly, yet respectfully, unburdened his heart before the king, saying,

“Let the king live for ever: why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my father’s sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?” (Neh. ii. 3).

The Lord prospered the way of Nehemiah and the first obstacle was surmounted:

“For what dost thou make request?” (Neh. ii. 4).

This word, “make request”, is often used to indicate prayer, for example, “To seek” by prayer and supplication, as in Dan. ix. 3. Before Nehemiah prays the King’s aid, he puts up another prayer to the God of heaven, but this time, no analysis of it nor comparison with Daniel’s is possible for it was wordless and instantaneous.

“So I prayed to the God of heaven, and I said unto the king” (Neh. ii. 4, 5).

Like Daniel, Nehemiah may have prayed regularly “three times a day” “toward Jerusalem” (Dan. vi. 10) “kneeling on his knees”. But Nehemiah knew that prayer was something beyond and above all convention; without bodily movement or the upward glance of an eye, without perceptible pause, he cast his all on God and spoke to the king.

Now, preparation for this very epoch-making movement had been made by God Himself. Thirteen years previously, a Jewess, named Esther, had been taken by the King and made queen instead of the deposed Vashti (Esther ii. 17). When the people of Israel were threatened with extermination by the hatred of Haman, Mordecai, Esther’s uncle, even then realized the Lord’s hand in the elevation of his niece to the throne, saying, “Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?” (Esther iv. 14).

Nehemiah’s request was put before the king:--

“If it please the king, and if thy servant have found favour in thy sight, that thou wouldst send me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers’ sepulchres, that I may build it” (Neh. ii. 5).

Before the record of the king’s reply comes the parenthetical clause (“the queen also sitting by him”). The more frequent word for “queen” is the Hebrew *Malkah*, but the word here is *Shegal*, which occurs only in Psalm xlv. 9; Dan. v. 2, 3, 23, and in the

passage before us. It is not a Hebrew word but comes from the ancient Akkadian *sha* “bride” and *gal*, “great”. It would exactly fit Esther’s position as the foreign bride of the great king. God sometimes answers our prayers years before they are breathed, and the coming together of the two passages—“So I prayed to the God of heaven, and I said unto the king” and the parenthetical clause “the Queen also sitting by him”—throw light upon a neglected aspect of this vital subject.

The prayer of Nehemiah was granted. Leave of absence from the court, together with letters addressed to the governors “beyond the river” guaranteeing safe convoy, together with instructions to the keeper of the King’s forest, or park, (*pardes*, a Persian word that gives us, through the Septuagint, the word “paradise”) to provide the necessary timber for the work of restoration which he was about to undertake. A man of prayer need not be impractical: the special providence that placed Esther on the throne, did not necessarily mean that beams for building would come “out of the blue”. These necessary things, though provided by the king, were nevertheless the answer of God as Nehemiah recognized when he said,

“And the king granted me according to the good hand of my God upon me” (Neh. ii. 8).

We shall learn by the record that follows, that answered prayer and providential interposition do not render us immune from attack. Like Paul at a later date, Nehemiah could have said regarding this work to which he had been led,

“A great door and effectual is opened unto me, *and* there are many adversaries” (I Cor. xvi. 9).

The story we are about to follow is one largely made up of these two elements. They are features that are associated with all true service, our own included, and if we study this record of Nehemiah aright, there will be brought to light that which will encourage us to persevere, as well as reveal the perennial methods of spiritual opposition, and the spirit in which all such animosity must be met.

We commence this study with the words that immediately follow: “Then I came to the governors beyond the river” (Neh. ii. 9) with which our next article must open.

Pentecost and the Mystery.

pp. 163 - 170

In this pamphlet we shall endeavour to demonstrate the difference between the earlier Epistles of Paul, written before Acts xxviii., and the later Epistles written after the setting aside of Israel as recorded in Acts xxviii., and show the way in which various terms, ordinances, etc., are used, and note any omissions, additions or modifications which took place owing to the change of dispensation that followed the blindness of Israel.

In examining these subjects, we must ever bear in mind the fact that they must be viewed from two standpoints—the Divine and the Human. From the Godward side the dispensations are but the unfolding of the Will of God, arranged and ordered “before the world began”. From the Human side, man’s failure calls for the interposition of the sovereignty of the Lord, and ushers in dispensation after dispensation. Adam, in innocence, placed in the Garden of Eden, had no intimation of the provision of the Redeemer, yet God had provided a Ransom and arranged for man’s Salvation *before* man fell. This by no means excused the sin of man, or helped it on. So with the Pentecostal dispensation. For the third time the Gospel of the Kingdom was proclaimed (1st by John the Baptist, 2nd by the Lord Himself, 3rd by Peter and the twelve), accompanied with signs and wonders attesting the fact of the Resurrection of Christ as the Son of David. Fully and unreservedly the Apostles preached, declaring, upon the authority of God and the whole of the Old Testament, that all that was needed to usher in the Kingdom was the *Repentance of Israel*. Nothing in the economy of the time could be found to give the slightest hint that God was preparing something, totally different, which was to be introduced upon the manifested failure of Israel. *But this is in fact what the Lord was doing*. With our fuller knowledge, gained by the subsequent revelation of the Mystery “hid in God”, we may look upon this transitional period, and see that which none could know without the key supplied in the later Epistles.

We have abused this added knowledge by reading into the words of a dispensation that PRECEDED the revelation of the Great Secret, that which was unrevealed to man at the time. The pre-eminence of Israel in earthly blessing is the characteristic of the Millennial Kingdom, and this is emphasized by the Apostle Paul in the very last Epistle of the Pentecostal dispensation (Rom. xi. 17-21). Looking back now we can see, scattered through these earlier Epistles, some indications that another dispensation must come, but these are so veiled, or so arranged, as to harmonize with the anticipations of the Millennial Kingdom that characterize the early epistles.

First of all, we would direct our readers’ attention to the following list of some of the words used in the earlier Epistles, but which occur rarely, if at all, in the later ones. The usefulness of this list would be increased if we included in our reckoning the “Acts”, the “Gospels”, and “Hebrews”, and the number of examples would then be largely multiplied. We, however, leave this for our readers to work out for themselves.

In the Epistles to the Church, Christ is never called the “Shepherd” although He is so named both in Hebrews and I Peter. The members of the Church which is the Body of Christ, are never called “Sheep” although this title is found in those parts of the N.T. devoted to callings other than that of the mystery.

It would take us too far from our present theme to deal with “the other sheep” of John x. 16, we note it here in order that it may be evident that the passage has not been overlooked, but refer the reader to other issues of this series that deal with the wider ministry of the Gospel according to John.

Before Acts xxviii.		After Acts xxviii.	
I & II Thess., Cor., Gal., Rom.		Eph., Phil., Col., I & II Tim., Titus.	
“Jew”	25 times.	once	-
“Israel”	14 x	twice	-
“Israelite”	3 x	-	-
“Abraham”	19 x	-	-
“Moses”	9 x	-	-
“To Baptize”	12 x	-	-
“Baptism” (<i>Baptisma</i>)	once	twice	-
“Lord’s Supper”	once	-	-
“The Loaf” in connection with the Lord’s Supper	7 times	-	-
“The Cup” in connection with the Lord’s Supper	7 x	-	-
“Gifts” <i>charisma</i> (meaning “Gifts of the Spirit”)	9 x	-	twice
“Miracles”	4 x	-	-
“Tongues”	22 x	-	-
“Interpret”	7 x	-	-
“Healing”	3 x	-	-
“Prophesying”	13 x	-	-
“Prophecy” (as gifts)	4 x	-	twice
“To circumcise”	8 x	once	-
Circumcision”	23 x	6 times	-

In another pamphlet, we examine the subject of the “One Body”, and find that in I Cor. xii., it was explained as being “*Partial*”, in contrast with the “*Fullness*” of Eph. i. 23.

Let us examine this subject a little closer, and we shall see that many of the essential elements of the “One Body” are to be found scattered in these earlier Epistles.

It will be remembered that the Unity of the Spirit, which has to be kept “in love” is defined in Eph. iv. as consisting of One Body, One Spirit, One Hope of our calling, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, and One God and Father.

In this wonderful sevenfold unity the Three Persons in the Godhead have their place. In I Cor. xii. 4-6 in connection with the diversities, administrations and operations of the gifts, which formed the basis of the ecclesiastical “body” (I Cor. xii. 12-27), we read that it is the same SPIRIT, the same LORD, and the same GOD, Who worketh all in all.

In verse 13 we read, “For by ONE SPIRIT are we all BAPTIZED into ONE BODY”.

In I Cor. viii. 6 we read, “To us ONE GOD, THE FATHER and ONE LORD JESUS CHRIST”. Again we read, “And now abideth FAITH, HOPE, and LOVE” (I Cor. xiii. 13). It will be seen that the seven wonderful components of the Unity of the Spirit are here, although not yet brought together in order, nor invested with their fuller and higher meaning. Had the nation of Israel repented, and the Kingdom come as a consequence, these passages would have exactly fitted the prophecy of Zech. xiv. 9, “And the LORD shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be ONE LORD and His Name ONE”.

As it is, the Kingdom is in abeyance; and instead of ONE LORD being *King*, He is exalted as HEAD of the Church, His Body; not “over all the earth”, but “in the Heavenlies”; for “earthly things” are connected with the Kingdom of Israel (John iii. 12).

The One Body of I Cor. xii. is connected with “Gifts”. “All these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will, FOR AS the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also the Christ. FOR by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body and have been all made to drink into one spirit”. The fact that *all* had a gift is compared to the body having many and varied members, yet all composing one body. The words, “All made to drink into one Spirit”, refer to the promise of John vii. 37, 39. (Compare Mark xvi. 14-20; Acts ii. 33).

A question arising out of the foregoing subject is: “Does the term ‘The Baptism of the Spirit’, of the Pentecostal dispensation, mean the same thing as the Baptism of Eph. iv.?” We hope to demonstrate in another pamphlet that the “One Baptism” of Eph. iv. is the Baptism of the Spirit, to which the reader is referred. We sometimes meet a Christian who tells us that he has “received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost”, or that he is “Praying for the Second blessing”. “Second blessings” may be a legitimate subject for prayer, on the other hand, they may result from undispensational views. The believers’ charter COMMENCES (in Eph. i. 3) with the fact that God “HATH blessed us with ALL spiritual blessings”.

The book of the Acts gives us very clear data as to what the Baptism of the Spirit is. Acts i. 5 and ii. 14-16 make it quite clear as to what the term refers. Let us examine the passages carefully:

- Acts ii. 1-4. “And began to SPEAK with other tongues.”
- Acts viii. 18. “When Simon SAW the Holy Spirit was given.”
- Acts x. 44-46. “They HEARD them speak with tongues.”
- Acts xix. 6. “They SPAKE with tongues and prophesied” and I Cor. xii. 1-27.

Almost without exception, miraculous gifts followed the Baptism of the Spirit—but such is nowhere hinted at in the Epistles written after Acts xxviii. Ministering the Spirit

and working miracles is connected with justifying faith, in Gal. iii. 5, 6. Is it so now? The One Baptism of I Cor. xii. is *essentially* connected with Miracle and Supernatural Gifts. Is it so now? Do members of the One Body possess the power to prophesy, speak with tongues, take up serpents, and drink deadly things unhurt? Do they *really* believe the words to be true of themselves, “They shall LAY HANDS on the sick, and they SHALL recover”?

In a former day, Paul could raise the dead and heal the sick: but this was *before* Acts xxviii. After Acts xxviii. he instructs Timothy to use wine medicinally, and leaves a valued helper behind, sick! Faith to believe that the Lord *can* heal one, however, must not be confused with these miraculous gifts.

The Baptism of the Spirit in Pentecostal times was subsequent to salvation: often by the space of days, weeks, and months; whereas Eph. i. 13 says that “we are sealed ‘upon believing’ (*pisteusantes*) with the Holy Spirit of promise, Who is the Earnest of our inheritance”.

Eph. ii. 15, 16, links the One Body with the Work of Calvary, “For to make in Himself of the twain ONE NEW MAN”, “And that He might reconcile both unto God in ONE BODY by the cross”. When the Holy Spirit quickens a dead sinner into life, He, *at the same moment* links him for ever WITH CHRIST; raising him up, together and seating him together with Christ in the heavenlies. This union with the Risen Saviour makes the believer a member of the ONE BODY, and neither the “laying on of hands” can confer, nor the “excommunication” of men take away, this blessed position of grace. The One Body of I Cor. xii. was evidenced by “signs” and “wonders”. The Unity of the Spirit is without any such evidence; in fact, it is belied by many who profess to be upon the ground of the One Body, by their manifest divisions; it is belied by the ignorance of the vast number who seem hardly conscious of its existence on the page of Scripture. No visible signs attest its reality. It is among the things “not seen, yet eternal”, which faith receives. A man may have evidences of *salvation*—but the truth of the *One Body* is totally independent of any and every appeal to sight, rite or ordinance.

Let the reader now turn to the Acts and note how vitally “Water Baptism” is connected with the Baptism of the Spirit. See, for example, Acts x. 44-48.

The subject of Water Baptism is a large one. The writer believes that its administration was by Immersion; and was only that of believers. But the question of “administration” is only of importance if Water Baptism is a “command” for us to-day, in this dispensation; the greater question being “Does Water Baptism belong to the present dispensation?”

No one can read the opening chapters of the Acts without at once seeing that the cry of John the Baptist “Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand”, and the baptism that accompanied that proclamation, are there taken up again. The baptism, truly, is no longer “John’s baptism”, but in many ways it is the same.

The Apostle Peter no sooner sees that conviction has pierced the heart of his hearers than he says, “Repent, AND BE BAPTIZED, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost” (Acts ii. 38). “Then they that gladly received his word were *baptized*, and the same day there *were added* about three thousand souls” (verse 41).

At Samaria “When they believed they were baptized” (Acts viii. 12). In Acts xvi. 14, 15, we read of Lydia, who was baptized, and her house. In xvi. 30-33, the apostle Paul speaks to the Jailer, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house and was baptized, he and all his”.

So with Crispus, in Acts xviii. 8 (with which read I Cor. i. 14), “many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized”. The Apostle in his defence (Acts xxii. 16) says of his conversion, “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord”. We do not believe that unbiased exegesis would attempt to divorce the “baptism” here from the “washing away of sins”. It is only when we mix up dispensations that we are driven to wish that some Scriptures said other than they do. That baptism had a typical teaching as to *cleansing* can also be gathered by reference to Heb. ix. 19, “Meats and drinks and diverse WASHINGS and CARNAL ORDINANCES”. The word translated “washings” is rendered “baptisms” in Heb. vi. 2.

Some of the passage quoted above, from the Acts, include the *house* of the believer as well as himself. Lydia, the Jailer, Crispus and Zaccheus, believed, “and their house”. It is important to distinguish between “house” and “household”, especially as the A.V. uses both terms interchangeably. The “house” refers to parents and children, the “household” includes the family, servants, visitors, etc., etc. The Apostle spoke of Salvation to the jailer for him and his *house* (*oikos*), he then spoke to all that were in his household (*oikia*). In I Cor. i. 16 the word *household* should be *house*. “To you, and to your children”, the promise was given; and family conversion and blessing seems to have been the general thing during the period of the Acts. Is it so now?

The Apostle Paul refers to another wonderful symbolism in Rom. vi., where he speaks of being “buried with Christ”. It must, however, be remembered that the *primary* teaching of Rom. vi. is not Water Baptism, but *Death to Sin* (verse 2). Those who had been united to Christ in His Resurrection Life were to remember that they had also been *crucified* with him and buried with Him. Burial with Christ is a solemn yet blessed truth for us to-day, but quite independent of Baptism or other rites.

We have, in passing, referred to I Cor. i.; let us turn to that passage again, as verse 14-17 are often used in this controversy.

It is both absurd and untrue to teach from these verses that the Apostle Paul did not baptize, or that he considered baptism *in that period* to be wrong. It is not that he thanked God that the Corinthian believers were not baptized, but that he was thankful that he, personally, had had so little to do with it, because the Corinthians had turned the

Divine ordinance into a party cry, and had gathered around those who had baptized them, and made them into party leaders. This Paul abominated.

There is, however, in verse 17, a statement which demands most careful attention. We do not deny that the Apostle means, by the words “Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel” that the Lord desires faith in Himself and not faction over ordinances; but we venture to say that, with even this thought in mind, not one of the Apostles who had received the commission to “Go preach baptize” could ever have so definitely said “Christ SENT ME NOT to baptize BUT to preach the Gospel”.

The Apostle Paul hereby makes another statement which helps us to see that he was not to be reckoned among the twelve Apostles. For, although he laboured in conjunction with them during the proclamation of the Kingdom (which was always accompanied by baptism) yet such was his commission that, when the Kingdom was no more, and baptism came naturally into disuse, his Apostleship only took upon itself its higher and greater meaning. It is abundantly clear that during the Pentecostal dispensation there were *two baptisms*.

Eph. iv. as definitely tells us that, in the Unity of the Spirit which *we* are called to “keep” there is “ONE BAPTISM”. The one baptism whereby a believer of the present dispensation is made a member of the One Body is the work of the Holy Spirit, which not only united him on Resurrection ground to the Risen Saviour, but has buried his old nature together with Christ—the Baptism wherewith Christ was baptized in death, an aspect of baptism often ignored (Matt. xx. 22, 23).

The Epistles to Timothy and Titus contain explicit directions to the leaders in the churches “that they may know how they ought to behave in the House of God”, but we look in vain for any direction as to baptism—not a word of instruction or caution as to administration, as to the fit candidates for it, as to any of the many things that it is continually necessary to be told and taught wherever baptism is practiced.

Linked with the subject of baptism is that of the Lord’s Supper. In I Cor. xi. the Apostle declares how he received instructions from the Lord on this important subject, and in other parts of this Epistle he refers to the Lord’s Supper. In I Cor. x. 17, he draws a lesson of Unity from the fact of there being *one* loaf, just as he does in I Cor. xii. by the fact that the diverse gifts were given by the *one* Spirit. Water Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and gifts, were all closely connected with the Kingdom, and when the Kingdom became in abeyance, these consistently became in abeyance too. Hence, we read through Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I and II Timothy and Titus in vain to find the SLIGHTEST *reference to ordinances of any kind whatever*. Timothy needed no instruction as to ordinances, neither do we; for we are in a dispensation where ordinances are not commanded. It is very remarkable, and worthy of notice, that those Christians who have brought to light most prominently during the past century the subject of the One Body are those who have caused more divisions than any others; and have stumbled more enquiring believers as to this very subject, by their tyrannical conception of the Lord’s Supper.

Closely allied to the ordinances is the subject of Church Government. Here again a comparison of I Corinthians and Timothy and Titus will lead to the same conclusion as above, namely, that there is a TOTAL DIFFERENCE between the two periods.

I Cor. xii.	I Tim. iii. and Titus i.
7-11. "Every man" possessed a miraculous gift; "every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation" (xiv. -26). "Let the prophets speak two or three" (xiv. -29).	"An overseer must be blameless the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach, etc., etc. Likewise the Deacons" (Read I Tim. iii. 1-13, Titus i. 5-14).

In the passages which have reference to the Pentecostal period, the instructions to the church deal with miraculous gifts at every point; while in the parallel passages in Timothy and Titus (dealing with the ministry in the church), there is *not a single mention of gifts*; the only qualifications specified being those of a moral and godly character. I Cor. xii. - xiv. is inspired Scripture, yet we believe we are right when we say that these chapters would have been *utterly useless*, so far as *practical instruction* was concerned, to the churches where Timothy and Titus had to work; simply because they deal with an element which is conspicuously absent from the church at the time of writing the later Epistles.

While we find some things omitted in the later Epistles, as ordinances and miraculous ministry, we find the subject of the ministry of women repeated. This is valuable for it shows us that, where anything which belonged to the Pentecostal dispensation *was to be perpetuated* in the New dispensation, *the Apostle said so*, and repeated his instructions.

I Cor. xiv. 34	I Tim. ii. 8-14.
"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but to be under obedience, as also saith the law" (i.e. Gen. iii. 16).	"I will therefore that men (males <i>Gk</i>) pray." "I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, Eve, and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression."

A reference to I Cor. xi. will show that the question of being veiled, which was emphasized in the Pentecostal dispensation, is *not repeated* in I Timothy.

If it be not invidious to compare portions of Scripture together, we would ask—Are not Ordinances and Spiritual Gifts, as important that the Apostle was *inspired to repeat* the one, and *inspired to omit* the others? We believe that this silence of Scripture is eloquent to those who have ears to hear. There was no need for instruction as to the use, or the abuse of "Gifts", if no one possessed them. There was no need of regulations as to Baptism in Water, for the Apostle had previously instructed them as to the *One* baptism. There was no need for the solemn warning about the Lord's Supper; for that, being

connected with the New Covenant, was, like the Kingdom and the Covenants, in abeyance, believers now having not even a type to remind them of their absent Lord, but simply faith, unaided by sight or feeling, just faith in the Word of God.

Summarizing, we have found by comparison that—

- (1) There is a distinct difference between the Epistles written before and after Acts xxviii.
- (2) That the difference is chiefly found in connection with the omission of Gifts and Ordinances, from the later Epistles.
- (3) These belonging to the “Kingdom” help to show that the dispensation before Acts xxviii. was connected with “Kingdom” promises; whereas, now, there is a dispensation connected with a secret purpose revealed only after Israel had proved unfaithful.
- (4) That the Baptism of the Spirit is not to be taken as identical in the two dispensations.

The Second Sphere of Blessing. The New Jerusalem.

*(Being the substance of an address given by the Principal
at one of the Saturday Conferences at the Chapel of the Opened Book.)*

#1. The subject introduced. pp. 36 - 40

Self-government! Democracy! The voice of the people! What visions of peace, of liberty, of prosperity, these words conjure up in the mind of man! Ever since the absolute autocracy of Nebuchadnezzar Gentile rule has gravitated towards this goal. Each succeeding stage of development however has been a step downward. The limited monarchy of the Medo-Persian succession is likened, not to gold, but to silver, and, at the time of the end, Gentile rule will be an unholy mixture of “iron and clay”. Babel early usurped dominion in the earth, and its dread power persists right through until the Day of the Lord. In the book of the Revelation, Babylon “reigns over the kings of the earth” and corrupts them. By a dread ordeal Nebuchadnezzar himself learned that “the heavens do rule”, and the Saviour taught His disciples to pray, “Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven”.

For a period the earthly Jerusalem will be the Lord’s centre of government on the earth, but the Satanic rebellion that arises at the end of the Millennium shows that the earthly Jerusalem had neither the wisdom nor the power to succeed. Hence, at the last, we see God’s solution in the form of the *New Jerusalem* that descends from God out of heaven. Those who are the destined rulers and who occupy this city are the overcomers—those who have endured; those who have been “faithful over a few things”. These and allied features will be presented in the course of the following study, and though our calling and sphere of blessing are far removed from this heavenly city that comes down to earth, we can rejoice at the prospect it holds out for “peace on earth” in the fullest and most enduring sense of the term.

That “God made the country, but man made the town” is one of those sayings that are only partly true. If we limit its application to the days of industrialism, its force can be felt, but if we project it into the prophetic future, it will be found to be false, for in each of the three spheres of blessing our attention is focused upon a city and citizenship. Of the earthly Jerusalem the sum of glory is expressed in the proud boast, “This man was born here” (Psa. lxxxvii. 6). Of the second sphere, all that is revealed of it is concerned with the “Heavenly City”. That the third sphere of blessing—that pertaining to the mystery and the church of the One Body—is no exception is also clear, for members of the One Body are “fellow-citizens of the saints” (Eph. ii. 19), and Phil. iii. 20, using the word *politeuma*, translated in the A.V. “conversation”, reveals that “our citizenship is in heaven”.

Two cities represent, between them, the claim to rule the earth: they are Babylon, Satan's seat, and Jerusalem, the city of God. During the Millennium the earthly Jerusalem is to be the centre of authority in the earth, "for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa. ii. 3), but at the close of the thousand years, when Satan is let loose again, many of the nations will gather for battle, "and compass the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city" (Rev. xx. 9).

Following the great white throne judgment of Rev. xx. 11-15, comes the New Heaven, and New Earth, together with the New Jerusalem, which is seen descending from God out of heaven. Here at last the kingdom prayer will be answered. God's will shall then be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Here, at last, the lesson learned by Nebuchadnezzar, that "the heavens do rule", shall be universally acknowledged. Here, too, the title of this kingdom used by Matthew, "The Kingdom of Heaven", will be literally justified.

In the beginning there were but two spheres, "The heavens and the earth". During the ages, there have been three. In the city of the second sphere we are therefore prepared to find associations that are special and peculiar to its own distinctive purpose, and while the blessings of the church which is the Body of Christ are not to be enjoyed there, any light that can be thrown upon the distinctive place that the New Jerusalem occupies in the Divine scheme, will but make our own high and holy calling the more clearly seen and appreciated.

We therefore turn to the Scriptures and seek to discover all that is written and implied concerning this second and heavenly sphere.

Scriptural References.

Definite reference to the New Jerusalem is found only in three books of the Bible, namely Galatians, Hebrews and the Revelation.

The purpose with which the epistle to the Galatians was written does not necessitate an excursion into the question of spheres of blessing or reward for faithfulness, consequently the one reference to the New Jerusalem found there is in an allegory, where the Apostle likens "Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children" to Hagar and her son Ishmael, "the son of the bondwoman", but Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and the mother of them all, is likened to Sarah, Isaac being "the son of the freewoman" (Gal. iv. 21 - v. 1).

Paul has used the New Jerusalem to serve as an additional argument in his fight for freedom, but in this he had no intention of expanding the subject or of dealing with it dispensationally. The only note that arrests us in reading is that he contrasts Jerusalem "that now is" with Jerusalem which "is above", the contrast of "now" and "then" being implied but unsaid. The New Jerusalem will not only be "above", but belongs to the future day when the "former things are passed away".

The references in Hebrews to the New Jerusalem form an integral part of the teaching of that epistle, and are not brought in by the way or merely to enforce a point, as is the reference in Galatians. We cannot hope to appreciate the place of the New Jerusalem in the Divine scheme if we are ignorant of or hazy regarding the outline of Hebrews as a whole.

Chapters i. and ii. ranged under the heading, "The word spoken", and

Chapters xiii. 25- and xiii. under the heading, "Him that speaketh".

The remainder, that is the bulk of the epistle, is concerned with two alternatives, "On to Perfection" (iii. - vi.) and "Back to Perdition" (x. 19 - xii. 25-), with a great explanatory section which may be headed, "Perfection; where found".

Now the references to the New Jerusalem are found in Heb. xi. and xii., consequently a fuller analysis of this and the corresponding section, iii. - vi., is called for.

Hebrews iii. - vi. ON TO PERFECTION. |

Let us come boldly.

Example of unbelief.

Perfect v. babes.

No renewal unto repentance.

Senses exercised.

Crucify afresh the Son of God.

Hebrews x. 19 - xii. 25. BACK TO PERDITION. |

Let us draw near.

Example of faith.

Sons v. firstborn.

Found no place for repentance.

Discipline exercised.

Trod under foot the Son of God.

The example of unbelief in Heb. iii. and iv. is that of Israel in the wilderness who, though they were all redeemed from Egypt, yet did not all enter the land of promise, notable exceptions being Caleb and Joshua, types of the overcomer. The examples of faith given in Heb. xi. are drawn from many parts of the O.T., beginning with Abel, but, however varied the experience recorded, one thing is common to all, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth" (Heb. xi. 13).

In this connection Abraham is cited as the great example. To him the land had been given, yet "he looked for a city which hath foundations". He and those of like faith with himself "declared plainly that they seek a country"; "they desire a better country, this is, an heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city" (Heb. xi. 14-16).

Here therefore is a calling that has the character of reward (Heb. xi. 26, 35): it is over and above the calling that is unconditional and received as a gift.

Turning to Heb. xii., we have a more specific statement concerning the heavenly Jerusalem, and the structure will be useful in showing the development of the theme.

Hebrews xii. 15 - 25-.

- A | 15. | a | Looking diligently.
 - b | Lest any man fall back.
- B | 16, 17. The birthright bartered (*Prototokia*).
- C | 18-21. Ye are not come. Six “ands”. SINAI.
- C | 22, 23. But ye are come. Seven “ands”. SION.
- B | 23, 24. The birthright enjoyed (*Prototokos*).
- A | 25-. | a | See.
 - b | Lest ye refuse.

Heb. xii. 5-25- is occupied with a twofold theme. Verses 5-14 deal with sons, but verses 15-24 deal particularly with the firstborn and the birthright. The section dealing with “sons” speaks of those things which *all* are partakers, whether sons or firstborn. The section dealing with the firstborn, however, deals with what the firstborn may attain unto, with warning that a birthright can be exchanged for a mess of pottage. When dealing with the New Jerusalem, we are not dealing with salvation, but with those things that *accompany* salvation, which are essential to the attaining to this added blessing of the second sphere. Just as Ephesians is concerned with the gift of grace, and Philippians with the added prize, so Romans is concerned with the gift of grace, and Hebrews with the added prize, the only difference being the dispensations in which they obtain, and the spheres in which they operate: they are *parallel* but not *identical* (see previous study on pages 7 and 8). While salvation is by grace and therefore “sure”, the very nature of a race and of running for a crown introduces contingency; “So run, that ye may obtain”; “Not as though I had already attained”. So Heb. xii. 15-25- opens with the warning, “Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God”. It does not say “*fall* from the grace of God”, but uses the word *hustereo*, “to come short”, as found in Heb. iv. 1. Not sonship simply, but the birthright in particular; not deliverance from Egypt, but triumphant possession of Canaan is before us.

In contrast with *Sinai* Heb. xii. places *Sion*.

“But ye are come unto Sion, and unto the city of the living God and to the church of the firstborn and to the spirits of righteous ones having been perfected” (Heb. xii. 22-24).

The structure of Heb. xii. 15-25-, already given, places in correspondence “The bartered birthright” and “The birthright enjoyed”, for, as already noted, the two words “birthright” and “firstborn” are respectively *prototokia* and *prototokos*, the warning being to those who, for a brief period of ease in this world, forfeited the crown of faith in the next. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though heirs of the land of Canaan, “dwelt in tents”; though rightful possessors, were willing to be “pilgrims and strangers”. Moses had in view the difference between the pleasures of sin *for a season*, and the recompense of the reward. The second sphere, the heavenly Jerusalem, therefore, is largely associated with

that aspect of truth which speaks of Prize, Crown and Reigning, Hebrews being a parallel with Philippians, not with Ephesians.

We have the passages in the Revelation to examine, but before doing so, it may be useful to enumerate the characteristics of this Heavenly City. It is called “free”, “holy” and “great”; the city that hath “foundations”; the city whose Builder and Maker is “God”; the city of the “living God”. It is called the Jerusalem that is “above”, the Jerusalem that is “heavenly” and the Jerusalem that is “new”. In Hebrews the city is also referred to as a “heavenly country” and “a better, that is, an heavenly country”—heavenly because it is “better”, presumably, than the earthly sphere and city.

Hitherto we have read no description of this city, nor found any definite link between it and Old Testament prophecy. These features however come prominently forward in the references found in the book of the Revelation and will occupy our attention in the succeeding article.

#2. The City Described.

pp. 70 - 73

The first reference in the book of Revelation to the New Jerusalem makes it clear that the same element of reward which we have observed attaching to it in the epistle to the Hebrews is to be remembered here:

“Him that overcometh the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God” (Rev. iii. 12).

It will be observed that in describing this city John was obliged to include one feature out of many recorded in chapter xxi., namely, that it came down out of heaven from God. This fact is recorded twice in Rev. xxi. and is the first thing noted by John in verses 2 and 10.

For our salvation the Son of God “came down”, or “descended”; in John’s Gospel, particularly, as the Bread of Life which came down from heaven. In Ephesians, as the One Who afterward ascended far above all heavens that He might fill all things, we read that He “descended first”, and at the second coming, as recorded in I Thess. iv., the Lord Himself shall “descend from heaven”. The descent of the holy city from heaven to earth is for the purposes of grace and glory. It constitutes “the tabernacle of God” among men, with the consequent dwelling by God upon the earth among His people. The mind fails in the attempt to imagine the effect upon the world when at last it can be said, “The tabernacle of God is with men”! Some of the immediate effects are noted—Tears wiped away, and death, sorrow, crying and pain, gone for ever! The nations of the earth shall walk in the light of this city of God; Kings will bring their glory and honour unto it; the glory and honour of the nations shall be brought unto it, but nothing that defiles shall enter its gates!

With the coming of this city to the earth, Paradise will be restored, the tree of life made accessible, the healing of the nations provided for, and the curse removed! This city is the answer to the cry of the nations; here is the perfect administration; here is God's seat of government, "The throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it" and two great facts are recorded of His servants; "They shall serve Him", "They shall reign for ever and ever".

The physical description of the city can but be read and pondered. Whether the words, "The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal" (Rev. xxi. 16) indicate a cube, or whether the great pyramidal towers of Babylon are to be taken as blasphemous anticipations, cannot be dogmatically asserted. We can however give the reasons we have culled from the Scripture which lead us to think that, not a cube, but a great pyramid, with terrace rising above terrace is, possibly, the plan of this city.

First, the New Jerusalem is most definitely placed in opposition to Babylon.

BABYLON.—"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talk with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore, that sitteth upon many waters" (Rev. xvii. 1).

NEW JERUSALEM.—"And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife" (Rev. xxi. 9).

That a parallel is intended is obvious, and therefore needs no proof. Further examination confirms this and strengthens the conviction.

Babylon.	New Jerusalem
Carried away in spirit into the wilderness.	Carried away in spirit to a great and high mountain.
Seated upon a scarlet coloured beast. Blasphemy.	Descending out of heaven from God. Glory. Light. Most precious.
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.	Nothing that defileth.
Kings of the earth corrupted.	Kings of the earth bring glory.
Nations made drunk.	Nations walk in light.

So the list might be extended. The New Jerusalem is most evidently God's answer to Babylon's usurpation.

Near to the ruins of Babylon is a huge mound which is called Birs-Nimrod, 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 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 restored this tower, using different coloured tiles for each stage of the building, some of which can be seen in the British Museum.

The twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem, the twelve apostles of the Lamb, the twelve gates of pearl, all associate this city with the people and kingdom of Israel. It is the realization of “The kingdom of heaven”, “The days of heaven upon earth”, that Moses speaks of (Deut. xi. 21), the rule of the heavens that Nebuchadnezzar himself perceived must come.

Israel as a nation, when restored to favour, is likened to the restoration of an unfaithful wife, who had been “put away”. The “marriage” of the Lamb, which is associated so intimately with the New Jerusalem, and the fact that this city is likened to a “Bride”, make it impossible to interpret this event simply of the restoration of back-sliding Israel. On the contrary, here is a *new* company; one that has been faithful in a world of apostasy. Like Abraham, who endured and waited, they are “overcomers” and they reign with Christ. It is this that constitutes them a separate “sphere”, regardless of whether they are in heaven or on earth.

In the Millennium there will be a glorious temple, of which Ezekiel was inspired to speak specifically. In the New Jerusalem there will be no temple, “For the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it”. In Rev. xxi. we learn that God and the Lamb are the “temple”, and in Rev. xxii. that the “throne” of God and of the Lamb is in it, bringing together the offices of priest and king.

The Heavenly Jerusalem, with its rule by the great King-Priest, is God’s answer to the cry of the oppressed and the vain dreams of the Dictator. The failure of all human rule lies in the fact that the heart of man is beyond the power of any government, either to cleanse or to deliver. *Crime* can be the legitimate subject of law, police and parliament, but *sin* lies outside their scope.

In the beginning, before sin entered into the universe, there were two spheres, “The heaven and the earth”. During the ages, while the great redemptive purpose runs its course, “heaven itself” is at a distance, and a temporary “firmament” called for the time being “heaven” is brought into place. This firmament or heaven however is destined to pass away. The three spheres of blessing remain until the purpose of the ages is attained, but whether dispensational differences will continue or be modified when “God” shall be “all in all” is not a matter of revelation, and does not come into the present discussion.

While the purpose of the ages is unfolding there must persist “Three spheres of blessing”, each in living contact with the others, but never invading or neutralizing their distinctiveness. The heavenly Jerusalem is the link between heaven and earth, but, while it is called “heavenly”, it comes down from God out of heaven. It is the link with the earth, for it descends to its appointed site in Bible lands, yet while on the earth it is not of it, being distinctly a heavenly city, even though not in heaven itself.

Into these wider inferences and themes we cannot enter now. It is a joy to the believer to know, while living in a world that must be shaken to its collapse, that there is a “continuing city”, a city which has “foundations”, “whose Builder and Maker is God”.

The Self-Drawn Portrait of the Apostle Paul.

#14. Separate Features: His Humanity. pp. 25 - 27

“Here we see that tender friendship which watches over the health of Timothy, even with a mother’s care, that intense sympathy in the joys and sorrows of his converts, which could say, even to the rebellious Corinthians, ‘Ye are in our hearts to die and live with you’. That longing desire for the intercourse of affection, and that sense of loneliness when it was withheld, which perhaps is the most touching feature of all, because it approaches most nearly to a weakness” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

Timothy was given to the Apostle as a son. Over and over again this is the title that he uses, “My son Timothy”. Like a parent, the Apostle knew the many fears and anxieties that love and affection induce, as is evinced by his very epistles to Timothy, which show a remarkable interchange of thought, human in the extreme.

Who but Paul, thinking of Timothy, would crowd together in four verses such themes as elect angels, partiality, laying on of hands, personal purity, water drinking, wine, digestion, and Timothy’s “oft infirmities”, sins, and judgment? (I Tim. v. 21-24). Yet the transition is easy, natural and intensely human. The Apostle is urging Timothy, though young, to exercise himself in the office to which he had been called. He had to deal with charges made against elders, and Paul directs his eyes, above and beyond all earthly tribunals, to the Lord Himself and the elect angels. In view of that judgment-seat, Timothy would be strengthened to administer justice impartially. On the other hand, in appointing men to office in the church, Paul did not inculcate impartiality at the expense of discrimination, nor must Timothy be so falsely charitable as to partake of other men’s sins. So, with all this burden resting upon his son, Paul says, “Keep thyself pure”, yet, as he writes the words, he remembers that, if anything, Timothy was inclined to be too reserved, to abstemious, and, fearing lest this emphasis upon purity might be misinterpreted, he adds:

“Be no longer a water-drinker, but use a little wine for thy stomach’s sake and thine oft infirmities” (I Tim. v. 23).

Perhaps the responsibility attaching to the appointment of bishops, who must not be “given to wine” (I Tim. iii. 3), or of deacons, who must not be “given to much wine” (I Tim. iii. 8), had led Timothy to feel that he too should abstain.

In all this we can see the tender care of the Apostle for his son.

This same interchange of theme is brought about in passages where the Apostle reveals how intense was his desire for human fellowship. When Paul left Berea for Athens, Timothy remained behind, but upon arriving at Athens he sent a command that Silas and Timothy should come to him with all speed. Yet, with blessed vacillation,

when Timothy did arrive at Athens, the Apostle's deep concern for the faith of the Thessalonians made him, however reluctantly, send Timothy off again:

“Wherefore when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone; and sent Timothy our brother For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith” (I Thess. iii. 1-5).

How perfectly free the Apostle was from airs, pretensions, affectations. In II Tim. iv. he is a self-acknowledged martyr; he knows that he has finished his course; he is assured of a crown. Does he pause, for one moment, to strike an attitude? Never! In the course of his statement concerning his triumph, he drops from the skies to the earth, and reveals his intensely human heart, saying,

“Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me, for Demas hath forsaken me” (II Tim. iv. 9, 10).

Then, after other statements and instructions—in which he finds time to speak well of Mark, who once turned back (II Tim. iv. 11)—he says to Timothy:

“The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments” (verse 13).

In view of death, one might almost have forgotten parchments and books, but how lovely to see this utter lack of affectation in his request for the cloke left behind at Troas. So, on the Apostle goes, to the end of the epistle. Alexander the coppersmith is remembered, and the sad fact that at his first defence the Apostle was forsaken is immediately countered by that irrepressible catching up of a subject: “No man stood with me Notwithstanding the Lord stood by me” (verses 16 and 17).

The same swift play with words is seen in II Tim. ii. 9: “I suffer trouble, even unto bonds”, and then, quick as a flash, he adds: “*But the word of God is not bound.*” Incidentally, it is seldom that we hear this passage read with any intelligent appreciation of the mind that prompted it.

So, to return to chapter iv. He immediately passes from the reference in verse 8 to the crown to be given at the appearing of the Lord, to the urging of Timothy to come quickly: he has no sooner speaks of the heavenly kingdom, than he salutes the saints and says to Timothy: “Do thy diligence to come before winter” (verse 21).

Such is a sketch, and but a sketch, of the earthen vessel. Less than the least of all saints, yet not one whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles. A man of many moods, and several evident infirmities, but so enraptured by the Christ of God, so enthralled with His great love, that, time and again, we forget the earthen vessel for the glory it contained. May we not believe that if sanity and sanctity are near one another in sound and meaning, that it would be well for us all to be able to manifest the same human traits as were seen in spirit where the Apostle shines so brightly in the reflected glory of the Lord he loved.

We do not pretend to have given a portrait of the Apostle but, as we have said, only a sketch, which may serve its turn until we and he, together, shall be transfigured into that

glorious image of our Lord, which, being so far above all earthly attainments, will level us all, whether Paul, or Timothy, the reader or the writer, and enable us, with a true heart, to glory in the truth proclaimed by the Apostle that “Christ is all”. We value the Apostle, not merely for his own sake, but rather because of the Christ we have learned through him, and that not only because of the doctrine he was commissioned to proclaim, but through the manner of man that he was, by the grace of God.

Thoroughly Furnished (II Tim. iii. 17).

(Being introductory lectures given at the Christian Workers' Training Class).

#2. The Text and its Context. pp. 31 - 35

We have seen that the words “thoroughly furnished” indicate complete equipment, both in *matter* and in *method*. We now examine the context in order that by its light we may the better see what this complete equipment involves and implies.

Just as it is true that no man liveth unto himself or dieth unto himself, so it is true that all words used in rational discourse take some colour and modification from the passage in which they are found. Thus the expression “A well-furnished house” conjures up an entirely different set of ideas from the expression “A well-furnished mind”, yet the difference lies not in the words “well-furnished” but in their relationship either with a “house” or a “mind”. We must therefore not rest satisfied with having examined the meaning and usage of *exartizo*, but go on to consider the bearing that the context has upon its meaning.

As we look at the context that precedes and follows this word, the first fact that registers itself upon the mind is that it is almost entirely related to the Holy Scriptures. These Scriptures are said to be profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction (II Tim. iii. 16), and the exhortation follows in the next chapter to “preach the Word reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine” (II Tim. iv. 2), which most evidently looks back to the characteristics of the Word, already examined in II Tim. iii. 16.

By scrutinizing the whole epistle we discover that II Tim. iii. 10 - iv. 8 constitutes a complete member, and this will set the bounds of the immediate context which we are seeking. Broadly, it may be set out thus:

II Timothy iii. 10 - iv. 8.

- A | iii. 10-12. Paul's doctrine and ministry. The BEGINNING.
- B | iii. 13-17. Scripture for doctrine.
- C | iv. 1. The Judge and His appearing.
- B | iv. 2. Preach the Word with doctrine.
- A | iv. 3-7. Paul's doctrine and ministry. The END.
- C | iv. 8. The Judge and His appearing.

Omitting for the time being the references to the beginning and the ending of Paul's ministry, we have the closer context of chapter iii. 13 - iv. 2, which we must now examine more closely.

This passage opens with the deception that arises from the teaching of evil men, “deceiving, and being deceived”, and looks down the age to the time that will come when men shall turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables. In contrast with such fatal error the Apostle places the “thoroughly furnished” man of God.

This man of God was once a child: this man, who is now seeking to serve his Lord, once needed to be shown the way of salvation. We are not only saved to serve, but no one can possibly serve who has not already been saved, “for all have sinned”.

“From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (II Tim. iii. 15-17).

This passage may be restated in analyzed form thus:

A		B		15-.	The CHILD.
		C		-15-.	The holy Scriptures <i>Grammata</i> .
		D		-15.	Wise unto SALVATION.
A		C		16.	All Scripture <i>Graphe</i> .
		B		17-.	The MAN OF GOD.
		D		-17.	Furnished for SERVICE.

Here we see the range covered by the scriptures; the child must begin with them, and the man of God still needs them. They make wise unto salvation; they are profitable for doctrine; they provide a complete outfit.

Two words are employed here when speaking of the Scriptures, (1) *Gramma*, (2) *Graphe*. Both are derived from *grapho*, “to write”, but, whereas the Holy Scriptures with which Timothy was acquainted as a child are called *grammata*, referring rather to the “letters”, the “elements” of revelation, the Scripture spoken of in verse 16 is *Graphe*, meaning “The Writings”, and by common consent The Writings *par excellence*, namely, the Scriptures as a whole. Moreover the phrase, “It is written” (*gegraptai*), literally, “It hath been written (and remains so)”, is never used except to refer to the Scriptures as authoritative. The following passages are examples of this usage: Matt. iv. 4; Mark xiv. 27; Luke vii. 27; John xii. 14; Acts xv. 15; Rom. i. 17; and Gal. iii. 10.

The word used by Paul for “a child” shows that one can scarcely begin Christian training too early. *Brephos* (allied to “embryo”, Luke i. 41), refers to a newborn babe, and Peter does not hesitate to say, “As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word” (I Pet. ii. 2).

These Scriptures, learned by Timothy as a child at his mother’s knee, were able “to make wise” unto salvation. *Sophizo* is used in the Greek version of Psalm xix.: “The testimony of the Lord is sure, *making wise* the simple” (Psa. xix. 7).

These Scriptures, said the Apostle, “are given by inspiration of God”. The Revised Version has the following translation of the first clause of II Tim. iii. 16: “Every Scripture inspired by God *is* also profitable, etc.” The question of inspiration is so fundamental that we must ask the reader’s patient and careful attention to this translation, even though the nature of the enquiry necessitate references to dry grammar, and require hard thinking.

In order to make the grammatical problem as clear as possible to the reader not too familiar with Greek syntax, we give a few specimen passages of parallel construction, and then show the absurdities which result by translating them as the R.V. has translated II Tim. iii. 16.

Romans vii. 12.

<i>He entole</i>	/		/	<i>hagia</i>	/	/	<i>kai</i>	/	<i>dikaia.</i>
The Commandment		<i>is</i>		holy		and		just.	

I Corinthians xi. 30.

<i>Polloi</i>	/		/	<i>astheneis</i>	/	/	<i>kai</i>	/	<i>arrhostoi.</i>
Many		<i>are</i>		weak		and		sickly.	

II Timothy iii. 16.

<i>Pasa graphe</i>	/		/	<i>Theopneustos</i>	/	/	<i>kai</i>	/	<i>ophelimos.</i>
All Scripture		<i>is</i>		given by inspiration of God		and		<i>is</i> profitable.	

Hebrews iv. 13.

<i>Panta de</i>	/		/	<i>gumna</i>	/	/	<i>kai</i>	/	<i>tetrachelismena.</i>
But all things		<i>are</i>		naked		and		opened.	

To these could be added five other examples, namely, II Cor. x. 10; I Tim. i. 15; ii. 3; iv. 4; and iv. 9; but those set out will be sufficient. To help the reader, we draw attention to the fact that in the second column the verb “is” or “are” has to be supplied, it being absent in the original. *Kai*, the conjunction, is sometimes translated “also”, as we have found in the R.V. of II Tim. iii. 16. If it be permissible to translate *pasa graphe theopneustos kai ophelimos* by “Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable”, etc. the same rule should also apply to the four examples given above. But when we do so we get the following result!

“The commandment (being) holy *is* also, just.”
 “Many ones (being) weak *are* also sickly.”
 “All things (being) naked *are* also opened.”

Dean Burgon’s words are to the point here.

“At a period of prevailing unbelief in the *INSPIRATION* of Scripture, nothing but real necessity could warrant the meddling with such a testimony on the subject as is found in II Tim. iii. 16. We have hitherto been taught to believe that ‘*All scripture is given by inspiration of GOD, and is profitable*’, etc. The ancients* clearly so understood S. Paul’s

words: and so do the most learned and thoughtful of the moderns. *Pasa graphe*, even if it be interpreted ‘every scripture’, can only mean every portion of those *hiera grammata* of which the Apostle had been speaking in the previous verse; and therefore must needs signify *the whole of scripture*. So that the expression ‘all scripture’ expresses S. Paul’s meaning exactly, and should not have been disturbed.”

[* - The Dean cites Clemens, Tertullian, Origen, Gregory Nyss, Dial (ap. Orig. i. 808), Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril and Theodoret.]

Bishop Middleton says:

“I do not recollect any passage in the N.T. in which two adjectives, apparently connected by the copulative, were intended by the writer to be so unnaturally disjoined. He who can produce such an instance, will do much toward establishing the plausibility of a translation, which otherwise must appear, to say the least of it, to be forced and improbable But in fact the proposed rendering is inadmissible, being without logical coherence and consistency. The utmost that could be pretended would be that S. Paul’s assertion is that ‘every portion of Scripture *being inspired*’ (i.e. inasmuch as it is—because it is—inspired) ‘is *also* profitable’, etc. Else there could be no meaning in the *kai*. But, in the name of common sense, if this be so, *why* have the blessed words been meddled with?”

Dr. Henderson cites the following rule when dealing with the point:

“Such a mode of construction is at variance with a common rule of Greek syntax,—which requires that, when two adjectives are closely joined, as *theopneustos* and *ophelimos* (‘given by inspiration of God’ and ‘profitable’) here are, if there be an ellipsis (an omission) of the substantive verb *esti* (is), this verb must be supplied after the former of the two, and regarded as repeated after the latter.”

This rule is observed in the translation of the A.V., but broken in the translation of the R.V.

Let us now turn to the actual wording of the passage. We have already spoken of the usage of *graphe*, which, though it *could* mean anything written by anybody, is strictly reserved in the N.T. to refer to the Holy Scripture, “THE” writings, *par excellence*. *Graphe* therefore must be considered as equivalent to a proper name, and be treated as an appellative. *Pasa graphe* therefore signifies *tota Scriptura*, “the whole Scripture”, as *pasa Ierosoluma*, “all Jerusalem” (Matt. ii. 3) and *pas oikos Israel*, “all the house of Israel” (Acts ii. 36).

We find that *Josephus*, a contemporary of Paul, uses a similar expression to *theopneustos*, saying of the complete canon of O.T. Scriptures, that the prophets “wrote according to the *pneustia* that comes from God”; and *Philo*, another contemporary, calls the Scriptures “theochrest oracles”, that is oracles given under the dictation of God.

Theopneustos is composed of *Theos*, “God”, and a word derived from *pneo*, “to breathe”. Let us acquaint ourselves a little more closely with this word *pneo* and its derivatives.

Pneo: “The winds *blew*” (Matt. vii. 25).

There are seven occurrences of *pneo* in the N.T., every one referring, in the English, to the “wind blowing”, although we must remember that more than one word is translated “wind” in the A.V.

Pnoe: “A rushing mighty *wind*” (Acts ii. 2).

“He giveth to all life, and *breath*” (Acts xvii. 25).

These are the only occurrences of *pnoe*.

Pneuma: “God hath not given us the *spirit* of fear” (II Tim. i. 7).

This word has at least fourteen distinguishable usages in the N.T., as, for example, “God is spirit”, “The Holy Spirit”, “The gifts”. It is however outside our subject to pursue these subdivisions here.

Pneumatikon: “Now concerning *spiritual* (gifts)” (I Cor. xii. 1).

Pneumatikos: “*Spiritually* discerned” (I Cor. ii. 14).

Ekpneo: “He *gave up the ghost*” (Luke xxiii. 46).

Empneo: “Saul, yet *breathing out* threatenings” (Acts ix. 1).

Kapnos: “Vapour of *smoke*” (Acts ii. 19).

Hupopneo: “And when the south wind *blew softly*” (Acts xxvii. 13).

The word has entered into our language in such words as *pneometer*, *pneumatic* and *pneumonia*, in each case the primitive idea of “breathing” being retained. The words “inspiration” and “inspire” are used with this primitive idea of breathing, as well as in the doctrinal sense. “Inspire” is used as the opposite of “expire”, and we speak of the “inspiratory” organs, which draw in air during respiration. The Apostle asserts that “The sacred letters”, “All Scripture”, are “breathed by God”. In this passage it is not the *writers* that are in view. Holy men of God were indeed moved by the Spirit of God (II Pet. i. 21), but Paul, in II Tim. iii. 16, is speaking of “the writings” themselves. What has been written, *pasa graphe*, “All scripture”, is nothing less nor more than what “God breathed”. They are inspired words. It follows that such Scripture must be inerrant, infallible, authoritative, perfect.

Having learned this momentous fact, we defer consideration of its consequences until the next article.

#3. The Fourfold Equipment of the Man of God. pp. 73 - 77

In the second article of this series most of our space was devoted to the important matter of the Inspiration of Scripture, for both the message and the subject matter, as well as the equipment and the subsequent manner, will gain or lose in power, according as the preacher's assurance or lack of assurance that the Book that constitutes his message and his equipment is "given by inspiration of God".

No preacher to-day has any warrant to preface his own message by the words "Thus saith the Lord", but the book that supplies him with his doctrine, and gives life to his delivery, everywhere claims to be the word of the living God.

We have already examined the last part of the fourfold equipment spoken of in the passage before us, namely, "thoroughly furnished", but before we can estimate the completeness of the equipment provided the others must be given earnest consideration. In order that we may perceive the relation of these four parts let us note the following arrangement:

II Timothy iii. 16.

All		/	Doctrine	\		The man of God
Scripture		Therefore	/	Reproof	\	In
Divinely		profitable	\	Correction	/	order
inspired		for	\	Instruction	/	that
						unto all good works.

Writing to the Hebrews, the Apostle said, "The word preached *did not profit*", and gives as the reason a "lack of faith" (Heb. iv. 2). This supplies an important corrective. The Scriptures, even though divinely inspired, are addressed to intelligent, moral creatures. They are certainly "profitable" if received by faith, acknowledged by obedience, and held in love; but there is no warrant for believing that they can be of profit to anyone who does not "mix with faith" the things he hears. Were it otherwise, the superstitious Jew, who wears his phylacteries, or fixes the Mezuzah to this doorpost, is an example to be followed. It is well to realize the mind of God in this matter.

Take another example. The epistle of James asks a pointed question, which only a shallow reading could cause to be misunderstood to mean that James is teaching something contrary to justification by faith:

"What does it profit, though a man SAY he hath faith, and have not works? can THAT faith save him?" (James ii. 14).

Or let the Apostle speak to the Jew, trusting in the external rite of circumcision:

"For circumcision verily profiteth if thou KEEP the law; but if thou be a BREAKER of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision" (Rom. ii. 25).

Or, once more, let the Apostle show the hollowness even of martyrdom, where “charity” is lacking:

“And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing” (I Cor. xiii. 3).

Inspired Scripture is most certainly profitable, but only if it be accepted in faith and acknowledged in life.

Ophelimos occurs four times in the N.T., always in the pastoral epistles.

Ophelimos (“Profitable”).

“For bodily exercise is profitable for a little; but godliness is profitable unto all things” (I Tim. iv. 8).

“These things (i.e. that believers should maintain good works) are good and profitable unto men” (Titus iii. 8).

“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable” (II Tim. iii. 16).

The Apostle condemns the doctrine of the false teachers, not saying that their teaching is “uninspired”, but that it is “unprofitable” (Titus iii. 9); “useful for nothing” (II Tim. ii. 14); “vain” (I Tim. vi. 20), in utter contrast with inspired scripture which is “sound” or “healthful” (I Tim. i. 10; II Tim. i. 13) and profitable indeed.

There is nothing vague about the “profitableness” of Scripture, and the Apostle proceeds at once to specify the four ways in which it is peculiarly profitable to “the man of God”.

First and foremost he places “Doctrine”. It is only necessary to read through the pastoral epistles to perceive how anxious the Apostle was that Timothy should know and hold fast the doctrine that he had received. He is warned against anything “contrary to sound doctrine” (I Tim. i. 10); is exhorted to give attention to “the reading to doctrine” (I Tim. iv. 13); to keep a vigilant look out for “teaching that is otherwise”, *heterodidaskaleo*, but to maintain “the doctrine that is according to godliness” (I Tim. vi. 3). So when he would call Timothy’s attention to his past life, he opens with, “Thou hast fully followed my doctrine” (II Tim. iii. 10).

If here, in II Tim. iii. 16, we translate *didaskalia*, “teaching”, we shall be quite true, providing that we realize that the meaning of the Apostle is the teaching of the person, and not the conferring upon him of a gift of teaching. As *Alford*, with a play upon words, puts it:

“It is not Timothy’s ability as a teacher, but his stability as a Christian which is here in question.”

Doctrine is perhaps positive truth; the very stuff with which the teacher builds up the believer. It will be remembered, however, that, at times, the Apostle combined

“warning” with his “teaching” (Col. i. 28). So the second item of profitableness given is “reproof”.

Elenchos, the word translated “reproof”, primarily means “the refutation of error”, then, as a result, “conviction”. The A.V. translates *elenchos*, “To tell one’s fault” (Matt. xviii. 15); “To reprove” (Eph. v. 11); “convince” and “convict” (John viii. 9, 46); “rebuke” (Titus i. 13; ii. 15).

“A Bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince (*elencho*) the gainsayers Wherefore rebuke (*elencho*) them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith” (Titus i. 7-13).

Reproof, therefore, has in view the blessing of the one reproofed, consequently, the third item is “Correction”, *epanorthosis*. In the classics this word means “to straighten what has become crooked” and is applied to manner of life. It contains the word *orthosis*, which is from *orthoo*, “to rectify”, which comes in II Tim. ii. 15, for “rightly to divide” is *orthotomeo*. In Titus i. 5, where the Apostle says “set in order” the things that are wanting, the word is *epidiorthoo*.

These two, “reproof” and “correction”, are included in the final item, “instruction”, for *paideia* is derived from *pais*, “a child”. The word occurs but six times in the N.T., and of these four are found in Heb. xii., where the A.V. translates the word “chastening” or “chastisement” (Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11). The Apostle leaves “reproof” and “correction” undefined, but “correction” he defines as “instruction in righteousness”. In Heb. v. 13, “a babe” is described as being unskillful in “the word of righteousness”, which shows that there, too, a similar idea was in the Apostle’s mind. We shall also see that the “crown” that he expected is the “crown of righteousness”, and so Timothy, “the *man* of God”, would have been disciplined by the Scriptures with this goal in view, “That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (II Tim. iii. 17).

Timothy is the only N.T. character to whom the title “Man of God” is given. Peter refers to “men of God” (II Pet. i. 21), but this has reference to O.T. prophets. The title was first borne by Moses who is referred to by this name in six different places (Deut. xxxiii. 1; Josh. xiv. 6; I Chron. xxiii. 14; II Chron. xxx. 16; Ezra iii. 2; and Psalm xc. title). Others who bear the title are Elijah, Elisha, David, Shemaiah and Hanan. Added to this list must be the references to five unnamed witnesses, one of whom proved to be an angel (Judges xiii. 6, 8) (we hope to deal with this title more fully in the next article).

Timothy, who knew the holy scriptures, would not fail to realize the solemnity and importance of such a title. He was being called upon to take up a position, indicated by prophecy (I Tim. i. 18), and reinforced by gift (II Tim. i. 6), that placed him in a singular place of trust, and such opposition as was endured by Moses, David, Elijah and Elisha would probably be his, but, by grace, all the encouragement of the triumph of those men of God, was his also. At this time Timothy was still a young man; Paul could still say to him, “Flee youthful lusts”, “Let no man despise thy youth”, yet with all that, the Apostle

also knew by actual, living experience, the altogether wonderful enabling of the grace of God. Yet, in spite of all this, it is surely for our encouragement that this gifted, prophetically appointed man, is at the last referred to the fourfold equipment of the inspired Scriptures, just as any ungifted person must be to-day. We are therefore not justified in sitting down with folded hands, simply because the day of “gift” and “prophecy” has passed. “We have a more sure Word.”

The word here translated “perfect” and the word translated “thoroughly furnished” are both derived from the same root word, *artuo*, “to make ready”, which is found in the N.T. with but one figurative meaning, “to season with salt” (Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34; Col. iv. 6), but this word is at the basis of a series of compounds and derivations that speak of “making ready” and “equipping” for a particular purpose.

The word *exertismenos*, translated “thoroughly furnished”, occurs, as we have already seen, in Josephus:

“They were in a mighty disorder, and in want of all necessities, and yet were to make war with men” (*Tois pasi kalos exertismenos*) “who were thoroughly well prepared for it” (*Ant. iii. 2. 2*).

Here the equipment is that of a soldier.

In chapter ii. the Apostle had used three figures in illustrating the special characteristics of one who would press toward the mark for the prize; the soldier, the athlete, and the husbandman. What inexhaustible supplies the Scriptures provide for the man of God in these three great typical characters! Is he a good soldier? then his girdle is the truth, his sword is the Word of God. Is he an athlete? then the histories of such overcomers as Caleb and Joshua and those who obtained a good report (Heb. xi.) are his example and inspiration. Is he a husbandman? the seed he sows is the Word of truth and the harvest sure. It must be remembered that the “Scriptures” referred to in II Tim. iii. 15, 16 are the O.T. books. The N.T. Scriptures were in process of completion, but, at the time of writing, would not be accessible to Timothy as a whole.

The following comment from *Conybeare and Howson* is a useful note on “Doctrine”, “Correction” and “Instruction”:

“St. Paul frequently uses the Old Testament *for teaching*, i.e., to enforce or illustrate his doctrine, e.g., Rom. i. 17. The numerous quotations from the Old Testament, in Romans and Galatians, are worthy examples of its use for *confutation*. *Epanorthosin* means the *setting right that which is wrong*. The Old Testament is applied for this purpose by St. Paul in I Cor. xiv. 21; I Cor. x. 1-10, and generally, wherever he applies it to enforce morality.

Paideian ten en dikaiosune.—The word *paideia* has the meaning of *chastisement* or *discipline*; compare Heb. xii. 7. It is here used as a severer kind of *epanorthosis*. Thus the Old Testament is applied in I Cor. v. 13.” (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*).

It is the Old Testament that Paul speaks of in II Tim. iii. 15 and 16 as “sacred” and “inspired of God”. There is no problem about the N.T. It goes without saying that if the O.T. be inspired, the N.T. must be. But the converse is just as true: if the O.T. be not

inspired, then the N.T. cannot be, for the O.T. histories, doctrines, types and prophecies are so inextricably interwoven into the Gospels, Epistles and the Apocalypse, that the inspiration of the N.T. is impossible if the inspiration of the O.T. be denied.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any who will prayerfully ponder the passage that is before us, but that one of the most important factors in the training of the Christian worker is the equipment provided by an intense belief in and love of the Holy Scriptures. This characterized our Lord Himself and every one of His faithful followers, and should now certainly be the outstanding characteristic of any teacher who professes to follow the example of the Saviour or the pattern left by Paul.

#4. “The Man of God.” The implications of the title. pp. 102 - 108

We have seen that the Holy Scriptures are able to make even a “child” wise unto salvation, and that they also are equally able to equip, most thoroughly, the “man” of God. Merely to contrast the “child” with the “man”, however, is not enough, for the title “Man of God” in the O.T. had a definite meaning with which Timothy would be well acquainted. He would not fail to perceive the high honour, as well as the great responsibility, that the conferring of such a title upon him implied. The comment against the title of Psalm xc. in the *Companion Bible* is, “There are seven specially so called”, and it is highly probable that these seven named men of God will provide a perfect picture of this high office.

We will not attempt to survey the whole of these occurrences, but rather give a representative selection, so that what is intended and covered by the office of “man of God” may be kept in mind as we consider its bearing upon the position of Timothy and of all who follow in his steps. So wonderful is the Scripture, so completely does the Lord know the end from the beginning, that it is not putting too great a strain upon our faith to anticipate that much that is said of the different “men of God” mentioned in the O.T. will be focused upon the one “man of God”, Timothy. Let us search and see.

The first occurrence of the title is found in Deut. xxxiii. 1, “This is the blessing, wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death”. The last is “A prayer of Moses the man of God” (Psalm xc.). The first and last references have this in common, that either Moses or Israel forfeited inheritance in the land. Moses’ death, mentioned in Deut. xxxiii. 1, is explained in xxxii. 48-52. Moses was to see the land of Canaan from Mount Nebo, but he was to die before Israel entered:

“Because ye trespassed against Me among the children of Israel at the waters of Meribah-Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin; because ye sanctified Me not in the midst of the children of Israel.”

Psalm xc. opens the fourth book of the Psalms (xc.-cvi.), which corresponds with the fourth book of the Law, the book of Numbers, and speaks of this experience of Moses as it was also shared by those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness. To this verses 9 and 10 refer, for every one that was twenty years of age and upward died during the forty years wandering. To this Psalm cvi., the closing Psalm of the book, refers:

“They soon forgot His works they envied Moses also in the camp Yea,
they despised the pleasant land so that it went ill with Moses for their sakes
he spake unadvisedly with his lips” (Psa. cvi. 13-24).

They angered him at the waters of strife (Meribah—see Deut. xxxii. quote above).

The first “man of God” stands as a warning to all who follow, to remember the great responsibility that attaches to this office, and avoid “striving” (*Meribah* Numb. xxvii. 14). “The servant of the Lord *must not strive*” (II Tim. ii. 24). Secondly, the fact that even Moses forfeited the right to enter the promised land is a solemn warning to all who have responsible positions in ministry, for II Timothy speaks of suffering and reigning with Christ, or of denying Him and so being denied (II Tim. ii. 11, 13), which subject is closely related to this matter of “striving about words” (II Tim. ii. 14). In contrast with Moses who did not “finish his course” the Apostle put his own case, “I have finished my course henceforth a crown” (II Tim. iv. 7, 8).

With this encouragement we come back to note the other references to Moses as “the man of God”, and see whether they, too, point to any other important principle contained in the second epistle to Timothy.

The second reference occurs in Josh xiv. 6, where Caleb comes to Joshua and speaks of these very same forty years of wilderness wandering, but, this time, instead of forfeiture because of failure, reward because of faithfulness is the keynote. “Thou knowest the thing that the Lord said unto Moses the man of God concerning me and thee at Kadesh-barnea”. Caleb endured, and, at the end of the forty years’ wandering, claimed his reward. The last but one reference to Moses, the “man of God”, is found in Ezra iii. 2 where, once again, the name Joshua comes before us, this time the High Priest. “The Prophets” open with Joshua, “The Captain of our salvation”, and end with Joshua, “the High Priest”, and so take us to the epistle to the Hebrews, where Christ, the true Joshua (Heb. iv. 8 “Jesus” here is “Joshua”) is represented as the “Captain”, or “Author” (Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2 *Archegos*) and “Finisher”, or “Perfecter” (Heb. xii. 2 *Teleiotes*) which again emphasizes the relation of service with suffering and with a crown, and so enforces the thought already brought forward in II Tim. ii. 11-13 and iv. 7, 8.

To complete the record, there remain but two further references to Moses as the “man of God”. These are in I Chron. xxiii. 14 and II Chron. xxx. 16, and have, as their contexts, the services of the Law. In the first passage David brings one part of the service of the Levites to an end, “They shall *no more* carry the tabernacle”, and these are “*the last words of David*” (I Chron. xxiii. 26, 27).

In the second reference, Hezekiah, after a period of ruin and desolation, attempted a revival, sending out a proclamation from Beersheba to Dan (thus including the, then, separated house of Israel), “to come and keep the Passover unto the Lord God of Israel at Jerusalem: for they had not done it of a long time in such sort as it was written” (II Chron. xxx. 5). Hezekiah’s proclamation was mocked by some, “nevertheless divers of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulun humbled themselves, the Passover was kept in *the second month* instead of in the first, as was provided for in the law (Numb. ix. 6-13). A multitude of the people failed to cleanse themselves, “yet did they eat the Passover *otherwise than it was written*” (verse 18), but, by his prayer, Hezekiah seems to realize that the preparing of the heart, even though in some points of ceremonial the people were at fault, was of chief importance. In this he was evidently right for we read: “The Lord hearkened to Hezekiah and healed the people” (verse 20).

So, too, by the time Paul wrote the second epistle Timothy “rule” had given place to “ruin”. Corporate testimony had gone the way of all flesh, stress is laid upon the individual, “thysself”, no reference is made to “bishops and deacons”. In such circumstances much that is done in the way of worship and witness must fall very far short of the original constitution; must indeed be by “otherwise than it was written”. In such days of departure it is therefore a comfort to the man of God to remember that the Lord set His seal upon the “preparation of the heart”, even though in many things the service that is now possible falls very short of that which would have been demanded of the apostolic assembly.

Here then is the first of seven “Men of God” whose lives and testimony illuminate the epistle addressed to the man of God in New Testament times.

Moses. The Man of God.

- A | Deut. xxxiii. 1. BLESSING. Moses’ failure to enter the land.
- B | Josh. xiv. 6. JOSHUA, the Captain.
- C | I Chron. xxiii. 14. DAVID. “No more carry the tabernacle.”
- C | II Chron. xxx. 16. HEZEKIAH. “Otherwise than it was written.”
- B | Ezra iii. 2. JOSHUA, the High Priest.
- A | Psalm xc. PRAYER. Israel’s failure to enter the land.

With this encouragement let us consider what further light may be forthcoming from the remaining references. The seven named “men of God” are: (1) Moses; (2) Samuel; (3) David; (4) Elijah; (5) Elisha; (6) Shemaiah; and (7) Igdaliah.

In the passage where Samuel is called “a man of God” (I Sam. ix. 6-10), Saul, the son of Kish, is introduced into the narrative, and the anointing of Saul to be king soon followed. This desire for a king was the result of Israel’s other desire “to be like these nations”. It was a step down from the high position they had occupied, with none but God Himself as their King. Samuel grieved at this departure and fall, and yet, without condoning their act, remained with the people, saying, “God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you: but I will teach you the good and the right way” (I Sam. xii. 23).

Just as the emphasis here is on “teaching” so the word “doctrine”, the command to “teach” and to appoint faithful men who shall be “apt to teach” are outstanding features of II Timothy. The church has failed to live at the spiritual height revealed in Ephesians, and its ministry no longer compares with the self-sacrificing service of the Philippians; nevertheless “the Lord will not forsake His people for His great name’s sake” (I Sam. xii. 22), and so this “man of God” promises “to teach” the good and the right way. While the reader will need no further exposition of this subject he will find a reading of II Timothy helpful to his understanding thereof.

Following historic sequence, David is the next “man of God”, and he is so named by Nehemiah at the dedication of the wall at Jerusalem:

“And the chief of the Levites to praise and to give thanks, according to the commandment of David the man of God, ward over against ward” (Neh. xii. 24).

There is a reference back, here, to a passage already considered, namely, I Chron. xxiii., for there David commanded the Levites “to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even” (verse 30). Much was done under the combined efforts of Nehemiah and of Ezra to bring the service and worship of God back to conformity with the law of both Moses and David, yet

“Many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy” (Ezra iii. 12).

To such, the prophet Haggai spoke, saying:

“Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing? The desire of all nations will come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts” (Hag. ii. 3, 7).

As he compared the “church” over which he was about to take control, with the “church” as it was first formed when the revelation of the mystery called it into being, Timothy might well weep—nevertheless, weak though it was, a glory awaited it, for the glory of the church consists not in ordinances, ceremonies, or orders of ministry, but in the personal presence of the risen Lord. Timothy, and all like him, would be encouraged in the midst of much that was poor and frail and “otherwise than it was written”, to stress the sanctifying presence of the Lord Himself.

Immediately following this reference to Haggai comes the reference to the law of uncleanness, a passage that makes one think of Paul’s words to Timothy, “If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master’s use, and prepared unto every good work” (II Tim. ii. 21).

Out of the abundance of material that is discovered when considering the teaching of Scripture concerning Elijah and Elisha as “men of God”, two incidents are so evidently

related that they stand out from the rest of the narrative, and to these we draw the reader's attention.

Elijah (I Kings xvii.).	Elisha (II Kings iv.).
<p>THE WIDOW'S CRUSE OF OIL. "The barrel of meal shall not waste, neither shall the cruse of oil fail, until the day that the Lord sendeth rain upon the earth" (14).</p> <p>THE DEAD CHILD. Elijah "stretched himself upon the child three times . . . Thy son liveth" (17-23).</p>	<p>THE WIDOW'S POT OF OIL. "Go borrow thee vessels not a few Go, sell the oil, and pay the debt, and live thou and thy children of the rest" (1-7).</p> <p>THE DEAD CHILD. Elisha "stretched himself upon the child . . . Take up thy son" (8-36).</p>

Throughout the O.T. oil is a type of the Holy Spirit, and in the earlier epistles of Paul the word *pneuma* occurs with considerable frequency. For example, there are 36 occurrences in Romans, and 15 in Ephesians, but three only in II Timothy:

"God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" (II Tim. i. 7).

"That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us" (II Tim. i. 14).

"The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. Grace be with you. Amen" (II Tim. iv. 22).

Here, therefore, is somewhat of a parallel with the widow's cruse of oil, or the widow's pot of oil. In comparison with earlier epistles, there was little indeed to boast of. Yet, just as, under the good hand of God, the small amount of oil was found to be ample, so the keeping power of the Holy Ghost, even though all the gifts of the spirit be now withdrawn, will prove all-sufficient. Timothy is no longer reminded of supernatural and spiritual gifts; no longer is he to expect miraculous healing, or the gift of prophecy. He is to see to it that in place of supernaturally endowed teachers he now appoints "faithful men" "able to teach" and, even though told to stir up the gift which he had already received, he is at the same time reminded that the spirit which he had received of God was a spirit of power, love and a sound mind, and these are the gifts of the spirit that are available to-day. Under grace, they are all-sufficient. The twofold miracle of the raising of a child to life but emphasizes the great doctrine of the resurrection, without which neither Timothy, nor his successors, could hope to prevail.

For the remainder, "Shemaiah, the man of God" commands Rehoboam that he must not fight against Israel (II Chron. xi. 2), even though it be with the laudable intention of bringing "the kingdom again to Rehoboam". It is not the will of God that we should engage in strife with those who have left the teaching of the Apostle. There will be no great revival or reunion of believers brought about by missions or other methods, but, there must be maintained a witness for the truth (whether men will hear or whether they will not), and a patient waiting for the day of the Lord's appearing (II Tim. iv. 1-4).

The last example, "Igdaliah, the man of God" (Jer. xxxv. 4) is associated with the test and triumph of the sons of Rechab, whose obedience to the command of their father was held up by the Lord as an example, to the shame of Israel. These Rechabites were not

descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but from Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses, and were known as Kenites (Numb. x. 29; Judges i. 16). Thus the last example of the “man of God” sets its seal upon the extreme importance of loyal obedience to the will of God in spite of all external pressure and inducement.

There is more, much more, in these passages, than we can hope to include in such an article as this, but let us summarize what we have seen.

MOSES, the first example of the “man of God”, brings before us a warning concerning “striving” and the teaching of II Timothy concerning the difference between “living” and reigning”.

SAMUEL as the “man of God” witnesses in a day when God is rejected and a human king occupies His place, Israel desiring to be “like the nations”. The stress is placed upon “teaching”.

DAVID is referred to by Nehemiah as the “man of God” in connection with the appointment of the Levites for praise and thanksgiving, these being acceptable and possible, even though there was much that led to weeping, when the temple built after the captivity was compared with that of Solomon’s day. We live in a day of small things, but should serve to the fullest of our ability.

ELIJAH and ELISHA emphasize the wonderful way in which the dearth of spiritual power may be overcome by the God of resurrection. SHEMAIAH warns against any attempt to re-unite christendom, and IGDAIAH commends simple, whole-hearted, loyalty.

Let all who would be “men of God”, “thoroughly furnished unto all good works”, ponder these heart-searching lessons.

#5. The Furnishing, its completeness.

pp. 146 - 150

We have examined the word translated “thoroughly furnished”, and considered some of the ways in which the Apostle himself exemplified, both in matter and in method, the completeness of the equipment provided. By comparing scripture with scripture, we now discover that the full preparation of the believer for Christian service falls under three heads, or in other words, it is a threefold preparation that is required.

- i. The preparation provided by the Holy Scriptures, which “thoroughly furnish” unto “all good works” (II Tim. iii. 17).
- ii. The preparation that involves separation, purging; “sanctified” and “prepared unto every good work” (II Tim. ii. 19-21).
- iii. The preparation supplied by abounding grace, providing “sufficiency”, so that the worker may “abound to every good work” (II Cor. ix. 8).

We have already noted the preparation provided by the Scriptures and now pass on to II Tim. ii. to discover the preparation indicated there. While the context is not devoid of reference to the Scriptures, they are not so specifically referred to as in II Tim. iii. 15-17. We read of the Word of Truth, but it is its “right division” that is stressed (II Tim. ii. 15): in verse 18 we read of “the truth” and of the resurrection, but it is in connection with a warning concerning error, not a positive declaration of doctrine. We certainly read that the foundation of God standeth sure and that the Lord knoweth them that are His but the point of the verse that contains this doctrine is the urging of all who name the name of Christ “to depart from iniquity”. We read of a great house and its many vessels, some for honourable use, and the rendering of personal service to the Master, and of others that have no such honour, but, once again, the message speaks of “purging”, “sanctifying”, “being meet for the Master’s use” and so “prepared unto every good work” (II Tim. ii. 19-21). In the next verse we have the whole teaching crystallized in two words, “flee”, “follow”. If we turn to the only other occasion on which Timothy was addressed as a “man of God” we shall find the same two words,

“But thou, O man of God, *flee* these things, and *follow* after righteousness”
(I Tim. vi. 11).

Nothing is actually said in II Tim. ii. concerning “denominations”, “sects”, “christendom” and the like, but a guiding principle is there which makes one see very clearly that a servant of God who would preach and teach the mystery and be found “meet for the Master’s use”, must not only see the truth clearly for himself but stand clear of all compromising associations. In II Tim. iii. 15-17 the sequel is “saved”, then “service”, whereas in II Tim. ii. 19-21 the sequel is “sanctified”, then “service”. We have observed that where II Tim. iii. 17 uses the words “thoroughly furnished”, II Tim. ii. 21 uses the word “prepared”. This word *etoimazo* means “to prepare” as one prepares a road to facilitate progress (Matt. iii. 3); or as one prepares a “dinner” or “feast”, like the passover; or a people for some specific duty. It is used of the Lord’s gracious work of preparing for them that love Him; for Paul’s request to Philemon to prepare him a lodging and for the adorning of a bride in readiness for her husband. The word implies watchfulness, “Be ye also *ready*”; “They that were *ready* went in”. It also implies willingness, “Lord I am *ready* to go with Thee”; “*ready* always to give an answer”. The use of the word in the O.T. is very similar to that of the N.T., only that, in the former, the word is occasionally used to translate a Hebrew word meaning “a base” or “foundation”. This can be seen in Ezra ii. 68; iii. 3; and Zech. v. 11. The idea, too, of establishing or firmly settling is found in I Kings ii. 46. Consequently, some commentators view the “preparation of the gospel of peace” with which the believer is “shod” (Eph. vi. 15) as referring to the military *hupodema* (sandal) which enabled the Roman soldier “to stand” against the shock of an enemy. Each of the ways in which *etoimazo* is used, as cited above, can be applied to the preparation of the “man of God”. His ministry is intimately associated with a “way” and a “meal”; with a “people” and a “home”; with readiness to speak, and with watchful care, even as it is expected that the true servant of the Lord will not only be “always abounding in the work of the Lord”, but at the same time “stedfast” and “unmoveable” (I Cor. xv. 58).

Words, either spoken or written, constitute the material with which the servant of God must serve, and in the Pentecostal equipment, the twelve Apostles were miraculously enabled to speak in the language of those who were assembled at Jerusalem. Such supernatural equipment does not pertain to the present dispensation, but a recognition of the place that language must occupy is implied, even though such ability to speak be attained by slower and more painful processes. There is no doubt about the apostle's attitude to this great matter:

“Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air” (I Cor. xiv. 9).

He proceeds to remark, that while there are a great variety of voices in the world, “none of them is without signification”. If, therefore, said the Apostle, “I know not the meaning of the voice” the effort will be wasted. He stressed the need to “interpret” whenever the gifts of tongues was exercised; he affirmed that even though he prayed in an unknown tongue, his understanding would be “unfruitful” and concluded his remarks on this important element of service by saying:

“I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all. Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue” (I Cor. xiv. 18, 19).

The gift of language is a sacred trust and no man of God is “thoroughly furnished” who is not scrupulously careful in the use of this great implement. From I Cor. xiv. we can compile the following words, each of which has a distinct bearing upon the purpose of speech and therefore indicates what should form a part of the preacher's preparation:--

“Edification”, “exhortation”, “comfort”, are set forth as objects at which to aim. “Revelation”, “knowledge”, “prophecy” or “doctrine” are indicated as the burden of the speaker's message. Distinction in sound, easy of being understood, words having signification and meaning, are alone profitable, and “to be understood” is the goal of all speech. The words “easy to be understood” in I Cor. xiv. 9, translate the Greek word *eusemos*, a word that is composed of *eu*, “good”, and *semos*, “a sign”. It indicates the avoidance of ambiguity, but inculcates the choice of words the significance of which cannot be missed. If our words are “good signs” we shall not select them merely for their “sound” but for their “meaning”. In I Cor. xiv. 10 the word “without signification” is *aphonon*, or “dumb”, as in xii. 2, a word the meaning of which is not clear, like the intelligible noises uttered by the dumb. In I Cor. xiv. 11 the word “meaning” is, in the original, *dunamis*. Where the meaning is not grasped a word loses its dynamic force, and accomplishes nothing; conversely, when the full meaning is understood, such a word will possess power approximating to a “miracle”, as the same word is rendered in xii. 10 and 28. While therefore we must stress the spiritual preparation of the man of God—without which, necessarily, all will be dead and ineffective—the spiritual man will not despise the Dictionary, the Grammar, the Concordance, the Lexicon, and all aids that are at hand to enable him to “speak with understanding”. Eternal issues hang upon the use of “right words”. “How forcible” said Job “are right words!” (Job vi. 25). How needful to be able to speak a word “in season”! (Isa. l. 4). How precious are words “fitly spoken”! (Prov. xxv. 11). How important to follow the example of “the Preacher” who “sought to

find out acceptable words even words of truth"! (Eccles. xii. 10). The "thorough furnishing" of the man of God, even though it take cognizance of both "matter" (II Tim. iii. 16, 17) and "morals" (II Tim. ii. 19-21), would still be lacking if it did not also provide for the "manner" in which the message entrusted should be given.

Among the elements of "manner" that are found in Scriptural references to acceptable ministry, must be included "assurance".

"The gospel came not unto you in word only but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance" (I Thess. i. 5).

"Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of" (II Tim. iii. 14). The slightest doubt entertained in the heart and mind of the speaker, will make itself felt in the hearer, to the weakening of the testimony. While mere "self-assurance" must be avoided, it should be manifest that the speaker utters what he has to say with conviction, that he can at least say, "One thing I know"; "We speak that we do know and testify that we have seen". He must avoid the "uncertain sound" as he would the plague. In the eyes of the world he must exhibit a strange combination for he must be "gentle", yet he must be "bold". He must avoid "striving", yet he must "contend earnestly for the faith". He must be patient, apt to teach, and mingle "longsuffering" with "doctrine", and "endurance" with "evangelizing" (II Tim. ii. 24, 25; iv. 2, 5; Eph. vi. 19). In his attitude to those to whom he ministers, he must be made "all things to all men". He must be both "father" and "mother" to his hearers (I Thess. ii. 11; I Cor. iv. 15; Philemon 10), and have a ready and practical sympathy with them in all their joys and sorrows. He will feel for the prisoner, as "being bound with him" (Heb. xiii. 2). "Who is weak, and I am not weak" said Paul; "who is offended, and I burn not?" (II Cor. xi. 29). He will see in the weak brother one for whom Christ died, so that he will curtail or deny himself many a legitimate right, lest by offending the weaker brother he should sin against Christ" (I Cor. viii. 7-13). While it is true that we might obtain help in the study of the Scriptures or in the knowledge and use of language from our friends and brethren, where can such unselfish and truly spiritual characteristics be gained except in fellowship with the Lord Himself? Though we be not aware of it, others will "take knowledge of us" if we have been in His Presence. If we cry "Who is sufficient for these things?" the answer still stands, "My grace is sufficient for thee", "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God".

"And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye ALWAYS having ALL sufficiency in ALL things, may abound to ALL good works" (II Cor. ix. 8).

Time and Place.

or

The Scriptural association of chronology and topography with doctrine and purpose.

#2. The purpose of the ages implied in Gen. i. 1. pp. 11 - 13

The majestic opening words of Holy Scripture describe the first action of all time. "In the beginning" (*B'reshith*). The word *reshith* is the feminine form of *rosh*, "head", and while primarily *rosh* means "head", only incidentally "beginning", *reshith* on the other hand, primarily means "beginning", and incidentally "chief", but is never translated in the A.V. "head". The LXX translated it by the Greek *arche*, and so is parallel with John i. 1. That it is utterly futile to speculate upon what was "before" the beginning, our very language testifies, for, where time is not, "before" is meaningless.

An examination of the usage of *reshith*, "beginning", leaves the mind with the impression that something more than "time" is implied. First we observe that there is no article ("the"), so that the Hebrew reads "In beginning", and opens the door for the thought, "With what motive and with what ending?" There are two other occurrences of *reshith* in Genesis: the first is,

"And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel in the land of Shinar, and he (Nimrod) went forth out of that land into Assyria (Asshur), and builded Nineveh, etc."
(Gen. x. 10, 11).

Here we have an illustration of the anticipatory character of *reshith*. Nimrod began with Babel, but he went on and added Erech, Accad and Calneh, in the land of Shinar, thereafter extending his conquest outside that land, including Nineveh and Calah.

The other reference to *reshith* is Gen. xlix. 3, 4:

"Reuben, thou art my firstborn, and the *beginning* of my strength unstable as water, thou shalt not excel."

Here again the "*beginning* of my strength" asks for its sequence, its correspondence, and the "end" is found to be failure and instability.

This word *reshith* is translated "firstfruits" eleven times (Lev. xxiii. 10, etc.), and it is the very essence of firstfruits that they anticipate a harvest to come. In Job viii. 7 and xlii. 12 the "beginning" is related to the "end"; as it is also in Isa. xlvi. 10.

By this time, most of our readers will have thought of the title given to Christ in the Revelation:

“I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending” (Rev. i. 8).

“These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God” (Rev. iii. 14).

“It is done, I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end” (Rev. xxi. 6).

“I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last” (Rev. xxii. 13).

With these glorious truths must be included the testimony of the apostle Paul:

“He is the head of the body, the church: Who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the preeminence” (Col. i. 18).

Let us examine these references more carefully. Rev. i. 8 associates the title, “the beginning”, with the great age-abiding name Jehovah: “The Lord which IS, and which WAS, and which IS TO COME.” Here, in this Name, all time is comprehended, past, present and future, and He is the “Almighty”, so that what He “began” to do at the creation of heaven and earth, He will “finish” in the day of God. The “beginning” implies an end, or goal. In Rev. xxi. 6 the goal is reached: He that sat upon the throne said, “It is done.” When we ponder Rev. iii. 14 with Gen. i. 1, to what other conclusion can we come than that Christ is there in Gen. i. 1, the “beginning of the creation of God”, and in Him, the “first”, creation will at length reach its goal, for He is also the “last”, and He is the “Amen”, the faithful witness to the onward movement of the ages.

In Col. i. 18 there is a limitation. He is there seen, not so much in His relationship to creation, as to the church. True, all creation is the work of His hands (Col. i. 16, 17), but it is there in the background, while the new creation, already seen in the church, which is the body, sets forth in miniature the creation to come. Christ is undoubtedly “The beginning” of that new creation, which has as its goal what is vividly expressed in Col. iii.

“The image of Him that created him, where there is neither Greek nor Jew; but Christ is all, and in all” (Col. iii. 10, 11).

This, in its turn, exhibits the goal that is implied by the opening words of Gen. i. 1:

“In the *beginning* God created the heaven and the earth Then cometh the *end* that God may be all in all” (Gen. i. 1 with I Cor. xv. 24-28).

Christ is “all and in all” to the church of the mystery: God shall be “all in all” when the complete new creation is laid at His feet. So, the words “It is done” of Rev. xxi. 6 refer to the works of Rev. xxi. 5: “Behold, I make all things new.” We observe also that in I Cor. xv. Christ is the “firstfruits”, a word which we have seen is implicit in Gen. i. 1.

We return to Gen. i. 1, and with increasing wonder look at those opening words, “In beginning”, could be expressed idiomatically, “As a beginning”, demanding, some time

and somewhere, a sequel, an end, a harvest. God created the heaven and the earth with an object, and His purpose may be expressed thus:

In beginning God was ALL. Heaven and earth sprang into being at His command. But God is not merely Almighty, He is essentially “Love”. Creation therefore moved forward to the “Image”, in Whose likeness Adam was created. Adam however did not obey mechanically, as do the sun, moon and stars, and so the long discipline of sorrow accompanies the advent of man, leading irrevocably down to the “unspeakable” Gift of Love, and, at long last, up to the willing submission of a new creation.

We therefore complete our exhibition of the implication of Gen. i. 1 as follows:

In the beginning God was ALL, but when the end comes, God will be ALL IN ALL.

two vastly different things. He is indeed One that “declares the end from the beginning”, and worketh all things according to the counsel of His Own will.

#3. Before the overthrow, and Since the ages times. Gen. i. 2. pp. 46 - 49

Although there is no statement as to time in Gen. i. 2, upon examining other parts of Scripture we shall learn that a most important time period is associated with it:

“And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep” (Gen. i. 2).

“And”, the translation of the Hebrew *vav*, is also translated by the adversative “but” (Gen. ii. 6).

“Without form and void”, cannot refer to the original state of creation, first of all because, elsewhere, God Himself says that He did not create the world in that condition and, secondly, because the word *bara*, “create”, denotes “to cut” or “carve”. This meaning is reflected in the Greek word *kosmos*, “world”, which is once translated “adorning” (I Pet. iii. 3) and, with *kosmeo*, “adorn”, “garnish” and “trim”. The verb “was”, in the phrase “The earth *was* without form and void”, translates the preterite of *hayah*, “To be, exist, become, come to pass”. The word is translated “became” in Gen. ii. 7, “and man *became* a living soul”, and this translation is true, for it is self-evident that until he “breathed” man was not a living soul. Similarly we translated Gen. i. 2, “But the earth *became* without form and void”. The words translated “without form and void” are the Hebrew words *tohu* and *bohu*. *Tohu* occurs twenty times in the O.T., and is translated “without form”, “waste”, “vain”, “vanity”, “nothing”, “in a wilderness”, “the empty place”, “confusion” and “a thing of nought”. *Bohu* occurs but three times, and is translated either “void” or “emptiness”. While certain conclusions could be drawn from the words themselves and their roots, we have a safer and more

convincing argument to hand in the usage of these words in the inspired Scriptures themselves. The only One Who can supply us with first-hand information about the process of creation is God Himself, therefore one word spoken by Him must outweigh all else that ever has been or can be said on the subject.

“For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God Himself that formed the earth and made it; He hath established it, He created it NOT IN VAIN (*tohu*), He formed it to be inhabited” (Isa. xlv. 18).

The two words *tohu* and *bohu* come together in Isa. xxxiv. Let us acquaint ourselves with the context. In verse 2 we have the words, “Indignation”, “fury”, “destroyed”, “slaughter”, and verse 4 takes us to the day of which Peter speaks in his second epistle (II Pet. iii. 10, 12):

“And all the host of heaven shall be *dissolved*, and the heavens shall be *rolled together* as a scroll: and all their host shall *fall down*, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree. For My *sword* shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon *Idumea*, and upon the people of my *curse*, to judgment” (Isa. xxxiv. 4-6).

This is not creation but dissolution. This is the result of curse and judgment, “For it is the day of the Lord’s vengeance” (verse 8). This land is to “lie waste” (Isa. xxxiv. 10) and be uninhabited or traversed by man until the age ends, and to describe this utter desolation the prophet has recourse to the words of Gen. i. 2, *tohu* and *bohu*:

“He shall stretch out upon it the lines of confusion (*tohu*) and the stones of emptiness (*bohu*)” (Isa. xxxiv. 11).

We have confirmation of this meaning in the writings of the prophet Jeremiah:

“I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was *without form, and void*; and the heavens, and they had no light” (just as darkness was on the face of the deep) “there was no man the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by His fierce anger” (Jer. iv. 23-26).

Here, once again, we have anger and its result. If Isa. xxxiv. said the land was to “lie waste” Jer. iv. says “The whole land shall be desolate” (Jer. iv. 27).

However interested he may have been in this study of *tohu* and *bohu*, the reader may be wondering where the “time” element comes in. To this we now address ourselves. In Eph. i. 4 we read: “According as He hath chosen us in Him *before the foundation* of the world.” This word “foundation”, *katabole*, must not be confused with the “foundation” of Eph. ii. 20 which is *themelion*. *Kata* means “down” and *ballo* means “to throw”. “Katabolism” is used to this day in Biology to define the breaking up process of metabolism or the processes, in living beings, of assimilation and decomposition. The verb *kataballo* is used by Paul in a context that leaves no room for doubt: “Persecuted, but not forsaken; *cast down*, but not destroyed” (II Cor. iv. 9). This meaning is confirmed by John in the Revelation: “The accuser of our brethren is *cast down*”

(Rev. xii. 10). This verb *kataballo* occurs many times in the LXX version. We find it used of the siege of a city:

“Joab battered the wall, *to throw it down*” (II Sam. xx. 15).

It is used of the overthrowing of Israel in the wilderness:

“He lifted up His hand against them, *to overthrow* them in the wilderness; *to overthrow* their seed also among the nations, and to scatter them in the lands” (Psa. cvi. 26, 27).

Again it is written concerning the destruction of Tyre:

“And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus: and *break down* her towers” (Ezek. xxvi. 4).

A correspondent recently sent us a paper in which he agreed that the verb *kataballo* means “To overthrow”, but by some process which he did not reveal nor support either by Scripture or the Lexicon, he maintained that the noun *katabole* meant “making a new start”. It is foreign to the genius of language, whether ancient or modern, thus to separate noun and verb. If I *sing* (verb) that which I sing must be a *song* (noun). I cannot “sing” a “speech” or anything outside the category of “song”. Similarly, if I *overthrow* (verb), that which is *overthrown* cannot be something freshly started or something constructed.

We therefore bring together the testimony of the Hebrew words *tohu* and *bohu* and the meaning and usage of *kataballo* and *katabole*, with the result that we are forced to translate Eph. i. 4, “before the *overthrow* of the world” and refer it to a period that comes between verses 1 and 2 of Gen. i. Further light upon this period is thrown by the time reference in II Tim. i., which deals with the same calling and company as those of Ephesians:

“Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus *before the world began*” (II Tim. i. 9).

The original reads *pro chronon aionion*, “before age-times”.

We therefore now know two things of intense interest from the point of view of Biblical chronology.

- (1) The church of the mystery was chosen in Christ before the overthrow of the world.
- (2) And that with the reconstruction and making of the heavens and the earth in the six days, the age-times began.

Seeing that the dissolution of II Pet. iii. stands at the end of the present creation, just as the chaos of Gen. i. 2 stands at the beginning, it is a sound inference to draw that just as the “ages” commence with the present creation, they come to their end with the new heaven and the new earth. Looking at Gen. i. 1 and 2 together, in this matter of time and purpose we perceive that as a beginning, looking constantly at the end in view, God created the heaven and the earth. This end, however, was not to be attained mechanically

or by arbitrary force; moral beings were created, whether Satan, spirits or man, and the possibility of fall and judgment was foreseen and provided for, so that the glorious end shall be attained in Christ, by grace, with due recognition of the values of righteousness, holiness and love.

#4. The Seven Days of Gen. i. 1, 2 - ii. 2. pp. 87 - 89

It is impossible to speak of the present creation without referring to time. It is often spoken of as “The six days’ creation” to distinguish it from the primal creation of Gen. i. 1 and the new creation of Rev. xxi.

In this connection of time we must first consider the word “day”. It is conceded at the outset that *yom*, “day”, may mean an indefinite period of time, and that it is so used in Gen. ii. 4, “In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens”, where “day” covers the whole of the six days’ creation. Gen. i. 3 to ii. 3 however is a unit in which the “day” occurs fourteen times, and an examination of its usage will leave little room for doubt but that a literal day of twenty-four hours is intended.

At the creation of light the Lord divided the light from the darkness, calling the light “day” and the darkness “night”. This division of time has remained ever since and, just as we find Noah receiving parallel commands to “replenish the earth” and with reference also to the subduing of the animal creation and the honouring of the image of God in man (Gen. ix. 1, 2, 6), so, as in Gen. i., this is preceded by a covenant which promised that “while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, the day and night shall not cease” (viii. 22). Again, Gen. i. 5 adds, “And the evening and the morning were the first day”.

If, as some have said, these are geological days, involving an “evening”, that might have lasted millions of years, can anyone explain what kept alive the grass, the herb, and the fruit tree during its icy and inky darkness, or how the fowl of the air or creeping things managed to exist? for every day’s work is summed up with the formula: “The evening and the morning were the day.” Yet if we interpret Gen. i. 1, 2 as the creation of the heaven and the earth which was created during the six days of the subsequent revelation, we shall be compelled to teach that these “days” are geological ages. The rocks evidence their age-long growth, the very fuel we burn witnesses that long ages must have passed in the process of turning forests into coal. But if we interpret i. 1, 2 as we have done, that is, seeing a primal creation in the beginning followed by an overthrow, we can place our geological ages in between verses 1 and 2 and look upon the present creation as occupying literally just six days, for it was largely a *reconstruction*, the word “create” only occurring in the record for two acts, (1) the creation of the inhabitants of the sea (verse 21), for in the primal creation, as in the new earth, there was, and there will, “no sea”, and (2) the creation of man (verse 27).

The summary of the six days' work is given in Gen. ii. 3: "All His work which God created and made."

Because, to express the facts, we should have had to use a clumsy circumlocution, we have said in the earlier part of this article, "and the creation of light". But the word "create" is not used of light; the statement is "Light be, and light was." Similarly, "Let there be a firmament", "Let the waters be gathered", "Let the dry land appear", "Let the earth bring forth", and so on.

The present creation was constructed to form a platform upon which the drama of the ages should be enacted, after which it is destined to pass away so that the goal of the ages might be enjoyed in a new heaven and earth, which are to be the glorious complement of the heaven and earth created as a "beginning".

A legitimate question to raise in connection with the six days' creation is, Why should the Lord have taken *six* days and not *five* or *ten* or any other number? Further, Why should the Lord have "rested" on the seventh? We are assured that "The Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary" (Isa. xl. 28). We are certain that the six days of creation and the seventh day rest are not mentioned without purpose and, seeing that the very "beginning" of Genesis anticipated its glorious "end", we return once more to the consideration of "time" in relation to the doctrine of Scripture, with the assurance that if we "seek" we shall "find".

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God had created and made" (Gen. ii. 1-3).

In other studies we have drawn attention to the way in which Noah stands as a sort of "second man and last Adam", and in connection with this use of the number seven, we find that *shebu* "seventh", occurs nowhere else in Genesis except in chapter viii. 4, where we read that "the ark rested in the seventh month". Not only Noah but his father Lamech emphasize this, for Lamech, the father of Noah, was 777 years old when he died.

In Gen. xxvi. 33 we read: "And he called it *shebah* (that is an oath)", and it is a feature not to be lightly passed over that the same Hebrew root that supplies us with the number seven gives us the word for "oath" and "to swear". The words *shaba* and *shebua*h, "to swear", occur in Genesis twenty-one times, or three times seven.

We have seen that the opening sentence of the Bible (Gen. i. 1) anticipates, as a kind of firstfruits, the end, and it may be well to remind the reader that the Hebrew of that verse contains 7 words, 14 syllables and 21 letters. We now see that in the choice of this number "seven" God has, in type, sworn that His purpose shall be accomplished. In the epistle to the Hebrews the Apostle quotes Gen. ii. 2, and from an examination of other

scriptures, concludes that “There remaineth therefore a rest (*sabbatismos*) to the people of God” (Heb. iv. 9).

To keep this hope alive in the hearts of His people, the Lord placed the observance of the Sabbath day prominently in the tables of the covenant. To impress us still further with the extreme importance of this symbolic number, the Lord has multiplied these sabbatic observances. The word that is translated “rest” in Gen. ii. 2 and 3 is *shabath*. The law of Moses contains a series of feasts, or holy days, that carry on a progression of sevens. We have the seventh DAY (Lev. xxiii. 3); seven DAYS (Lev. xxiii. 6); seven WEEKS (Lev. xxiii. 15); the seventh MONTH (Lev. xxiii. 24); the seventh YEAR (Lev. xxv. 4); seven times seven YEARS (Lev. xxv. 8) and seventy times seven YEARS (Dan. ix. 24).

Here we have design and purpose. The glorious Jubilee, when every debt was cancelled, every man set free, every inheritance entered and enjoyed; the annual Feast of Tabernacles in the seventh month when every man sat, as it were, under his own vine and fig tree and none made him afraid; the prophetic period of Dan. ix. after which Israel’s restoration should be complete, all speak of the same thing, and pledge the attainment of the same goal.

From our three studies in the time factor of Gen. i. 1 - ii. 3 it is abundantly evident that a knowledge of this feature is by no means of mere academic interest, but that it enters into the very fabric of revealed truth, and is no mean factor in its interpretation.

#5. The Site of the Garden of Eden. Gen. ii. 8-14. pp. 127 - 130

Our attention having been wholly occupied with “time”, we have hitherto found no opportunity to give heed to the testimony of the Scriptures concerning “place”. We have the first topographical note in early Genesis:

“And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden” (Gen. ii. 8).

The name of this country, in which Paradise was planted, means “delight”, and the word occurs in various forms six times, being translated “pleasure” and “pleasures”, “to delight”, “delights”, and “delicates”. Eden itself, the country, is named exactly 14 times in the O.T., where it is found in Genesis, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Joel. As we should expect, the name is found in other languages. In Arabic it signifies “delight”, “tenderness” and “loveliness” (Firuzabadi *Kamus*). In the cuneiform texts it signifies the plains of Babylon, and in the Accado-Sumerian (inhabitants of Mesopotamia that preceded the Babylonians) it is *Edin*, “the fertile plain”. The Greek word *hedone*, meaning “pleasure”, is used in the LXX of Isa. xxxvii. 12; Ezek. xxvii. 23 and Amos i. 5, although these “Edens” have no reference to Gen. ii. 8. It was because of their beauty or pleasantness that the districts were called by this name. The Eden of Gen. ii. 8, is the most ancient

name in all geography. The garden of Gen. ii. was planted “eastward” in Eden. In his translation of Rosenmuller’s *Biblical Geography of Central Asia* the Rev. N. Morran has reduced the numerous theories as to the exact situation of Eden to nine, but none of them answer all the conditions of the problem. This brings us to an important question. For whose information were the geographical notes of Gen. ii. 8-14 written? Were they given by God to Adam? We can see no reason why the information should have been given to him. We know that it was given in writing by Moses, and, to illustrate and enforce the point we desire to make, we turn to another geographical note. In Gen. xxiii. we have the record of the death of Sarah, in which Moses wrote:

“And Sarah died in Kirjath-arba, the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan” (Gen. xxiii. 2).

It is evident that when Moses took up his pen to write the book of Genesis, he had in his possession the several “books of the generation” of his fathers. In the family documents relating to Abraham and Sarah, the place where Sarah died is called by but *one name*, Kirjath-arba, but, later, for the benefit of Israel who were then about to enter the promised land under Joshua, Moses gives the more modern name of the ancient city, namely “Hebron”, and, in Numb. xiii., adds a note,

“Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt” (Numb. xiii. 22).

If, therefore, when he wrote Genesis, Moses found it expedient to bring its ancient geography up to date we must be prepared to find his explaining pen at work in Gen. ii. When we realize that the flood in the days of Noah, must have seriously altered the configuration of the land, diverted the course of rivers, buried some tracts of land beneath the sea, and brought up above sea-level, some part of the sea-bed, we can readily see that references to geographical boundaries, countries and rivers true in the days of Adam, may, in Moses’ day, have proved valueless, except for archaeological purposes. Moreover, one of the lands mentioned in Gen. ii. is Ethiopia. Now in the Hebrew this word is “Cush”, and as Cush was not born until over two thousand years after Adam, to speak of Adam knowing the land by the name of one of his descendants who lived *two thousand years after his time* would be an anachronism.

Ethiopia, in Africa, is not the only land of Cush. Cush was the father of Seba, Havilah, and Sabtechah (Gen. x. 7, 8); Nimrod moved northward into Assyria, the others went South and settled in Arabia, consequently, there is no reason why we should introduce a region of Africa into Gen. ii. We must, however, return to the record of Gen. ii. Moses tells us that the river which watered the garden, parted, and was divided into four heads. The word “head” being *rosh*, we must understand this to refer to the sources of these rivers, not their mouths.

“The name of the first is Pison: that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of the land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx stone.”

Nothing further is said of this river in Scripture but the Companion Bible tells us that it flows West of the Euphrates, and that in the year of Nabonides, the last king of Babylonia, it was called *Pullakat*. Havilah is associated with “Shur, that is before Egypt

as thou goest toward Assyria”, (Gen. xxv. 18), and Ophir, famous for its gold (Job xxviii. 16), is associated with Havilah in Gen. x. 29; and again Moses gives the added note:--

“And their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the East”
(Gen. x. 30).

If four great rivers took their rise from the river that watered Paradise, it is plain that Paradise itself must have been in an elevated tract of country. Lenormant says, “*Eden*, in the Accadian and Sumerian texts is used sometimes to designate a *plain* in opposition to a *mountain*. But this is never the bottom of the valley” The Tigris (Hiddekel, Accadian for Tigris) and the Euphrates both rise in Armenia, thus, once again, we observe a connection between Adam and Noah, for the Ark rested on “one of the mountains of Ararat”, which tradition places in Armenia. Two other rivers take their rise in this region, the Kur and the Araxes, which flow into the Caspian Sea. These rivers cannot be identified with the Pison or the Gihon, but such may be what remains of them since the disruption at the flood. As the Bible is the only book that declares that this district is the cradle of the human race, it has for thirty three centuries been ahead of the “science” of the day.

Quatrefages, the great French scientist and anthropologists, says, “that the study of the various populations, and of their languages, has led scientists of the greatest deliberation and authority to place the cradle of the human race in Asia, not far from the central mass of that continent, and in the neighbourhood of the region where all the principal rivers which plough their way to the north, to the south, and to the east, take their rise”. It is in Central Asia alone that wheat is indigenous, and must have been carried thence by man as he spread abroad. In Gen. ii. 12 Moses speaks of the gold, the bdellium and the onyx stone as constituting an easy means of identifying this district. The word bdellium occurs but twice in Scripture, once in Gen. ii. 12, and once in Numb. xi. 7, where the manna is likened to it. This shows that Israel, for whom Moses wrote, were well acquainted with this substance, though today there may be uncertainty as to its identity. The LXX considered it to be a precious stone, and translate the word by *anthrax* and *krystallos*, while Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion render it bdellium, a transparent aromatic gum which is formed by a tree that grows in Arabia. The Rabbis, however, translate the word by “Pearl”.

In our earlier studies, we have found that the references to “time” in Gen. i., ii. 3 have a symbolic value far outweighing their primitive meaning. As we look at this first great reference to “place” are we not justified in expecting that its description answers some more important purpose than that of satisfying the Israelites as to the identity of the site of Paradise?

Three great streams of humanity have their origin in this district; the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth, and, mingled with the descendants of the true seed preserved alive in the ark, we learn of the Canaanite, and their frightful progeny.

“In the following times of history, we have seen how the river of mankind from the mountains of Armenia poured itself into the plains of the Tigris and the Euphrates. The tribes of men went forth unto the regions of the stream of Paradise, acquired power and gathered riches. But of gold they made gods, decked them with jewels and brought incense to the things which have noses and smell not” (Dr. M. Baumgarten *Theological Com. on O.T.*).

Whether this be so or not may perhaps remain a moot point, but it seems reasonable to suppose that in a book which covers 2000 years of history in eleven chapters (Gen. i.-xi.) not one verse, certainly not seven (Gen. ii. 8-14), would be devoted to matter transient in its application, and the original meaning of which is now beyond the power of man to ascertain. The geography of the book that brings before us the glorious prophecy of Paradise restored, is centred around the same land that is brought before us in Gen. ii. The references to Asia Minor on the West (Rev. i.-iii.); beyond the Euphrates on the East (Rev. xvi. 12); with Jerusalem and Babylon as rival cities and systems, enable us to see that not only does Revelation corresponds with Genesis as to the entry and removal of the Serpent, sin, death and curse, but that the very geographical site of Eden, may yet form the earthly basis of the heavenly city when at last it descends from God out of heaven. Its gold will indeed be good, its stones most precious, and its gates pearls (see the earlier reference to the Rabbinical interpretation of bdellium).

#6. The land of Nod, the city of Enoch (Gen. iv. 16, 17). pp. 178, 179

The first geographical reference of Holy Scripture deals with the site of the garden planted by the Lord, “eastward in Eden”. The second speaks of a city built by rebellious man, “on the east of Eden”.

“And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod on the east of Eden. And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son Enoch” (Gen. iv. 16, 17).

The curse pronounced upon Cain included the words: “A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.” “Vagabond” is the translation of the Hebrew word *Nod*, which gives its name to the land whither Cain went. The same word that is translated “Nod” in Gen. iv. 16 is translated “wanderings” in Psalms lvi. 8, where David, though taken by the Philistines to Gath—a spiritual “land of Nod”—rejoices in the fact that “God is for me”, a contrast indeed with the condition of Cain.

We have a similar instance of the meaning of a place from an experience of a visitor related in Gen. xxviii. 19.

“And he called the name of that place Bethel: but the name of that city was called Luz at the first.”

In this land of Nod the first city upon earth was built. The second city to be mentioned was built by the arch-rebel Nimrod, and its name was Nineveh, (Rehoboth may not be the name of a city, but the boulevard of the great city Nineveh: also “between Nineveh and Calah” may indicate one great city) (Gen. x. 10-12). The next city to be built was Babel (Gen. xi. 4, 5 and 8), and the fourth the wicked city named Sodom (Gen. xviii. 24).

This sinister history of city-building, recorded in the early pages of Genesis, finds its echo in the book of the Revelation, where Babylon is called “that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth”. Thus Enoch the city of Cain, the vagabond; Nineveh the city of Nimrod, the mighty rebel; Sodom, to which apostate Israel is likened (Isa. i. 10; Rev. xi. 8) and Babel, the city of final antichristian rebellion, are linked together.

Enoch comes from *chanak*, “to dedicate”. The word is chiefly used to indicate the dedication of offerings, houses or persons, to the Lord, and this leads us to suspect that Cain dedicated his child and his city to the Serpent, the Wicked One, whose child he was (I John iii. 12). In Dan. iii. 2, 3, the word is used of the dedication of an image by Nebuchadnezzar for idolatrous purposes. Closely associated with Cain’s city is the “civilization” introduced by his immediate descendants (Gen. iv. 20-22), an attempt to blunt the edge of the curse on the earth that Cain suffered. This is in severe contrast with the attitude of the great descendant of the other Enoch, “the seventh from Adam”, who refused to mitigate the

“work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed” (Gen. v. 29),

and looked forward to the fulfillment of the type which his son Noah, and Noah’s great work, foreshadowed.

Where Cain “builded a city”, Noah “builded an altar”, and both “buildings” are associated with the ground that was cursed (Gen. iv. 17; viii. 20, 21). So, later, we read that Nimrod, the rebel, builded Nineveh (Gen. x. 11) and **the rebellious nations of the earth proposed to build a city and a tower (Gen. xi. 4)**; but Abraham, who obeyed, built an altar unto the Lord (Gen. xii. 7, 8).

Thus we have, in the first two geographical notices in Genesis, the site of the garden which the Lord planted, and the site of the city which Cain builded, which clearly symbolize the two antagonistic lines of doctrine that culminate in the destruction of Babylon and the restoration of Paradise foretold in the closing book of the New Testament.

[**Bold verse** - see *Time and Place* 35, page 20 for error corrected]

#7. The First Registry of Births and Deaths (Gen. v. - vii. 6). pp. 189, 190

Once more, we leave the question of “place” and return to the element of “time”.

“This is the book of the generations of Adam” (Gen. v. 1). A serious writer has recently put forward the idea that the fourteen generations of Genesis, refer not to what follows, but to what goes before. Thus, Gen. ii. 4 refers to the first chapter of Genesis, and speaks of the “origin” of heaven and earth, and so throughout the book.

While an appeal to Matt. i. 1 most certainly shows that, there not the “descendants”, but the ancestry of Jesus Christ constitute His “generations”, an examination of the usage of *toledoth*, “generations”, in the O.T. makes the idea of ancestry impossible in every case. The only meaning that fits all cases is “family history”, the context alone deciding whether the look is backward or forward.

“The generations of Pharez.”

These are found in the book of Ruth, but one looks in vain for any of the *ancestors* of Pharez: what is given is a list of his *descendants*, from his son Hezron to David.

An example where “family history” better fits the case is found in I Chron. xxvi., in verse 31 of which chapter the expression “according to the generations of his fathers” obviously looks backward. Two “books of generation” are found in Scripture. The first relates to Adam, the second to Christ, and between the two is to be found the chronology of the Scriptures. After the birth of Christ, chronology ceases, and all attempts to construct a chronology of the N.T. fail because the necessary facts are wanting.

Anstey, in his work “The Romance of Bible Chronology”, says:--

“In a conversation with a friend, the present writer, in claiming authenticity for the chronological records of the early chapter of Genesis, was met by the objection ‘At any rate there were no Registrars of Births and Deaths in those days’, to which we replied, ‘That is just exactly what the fifth chapter of Genesis is’. It might have been copied from the fly-leaf of an old patriarchal family Bible, or genealogical family chart. The family records that are preserved in these days are little else but records of births, marriages and deaths, but they go back farther than any other records in the family chart. Moses was the literary executor of Joseph, and the custodian of the heirlooms of antiquity preserved by the chosen race.”

The chronology that extends from Adam to Noah is simplicity itself, but in later Scriptures we meet increasing complication. It may be good for us to construct our own chronology, collecting the material from the record of the Scriptures themselves. We shall soon find that we must not assume that the son named in the genealogy is always the firstborn, or that where the firstborn is included, he is always mentioned first. Seth was born after Cain and Abel, and, though mentioned first, Shem was not the eldest

(Gen. x. 21). While there is a most careful catalogue of births and deaths in the line of Adam to Noah in Gen. v. no such genealogy is given of the line of Cain (Gen. iv.). Some have objected to the length of life attributed to Adam and the Patriarchs, but if we tamper with the 930 years of Adam's life, and reduce it to so many "months", what shall we do with the statement in the same book that Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh? After all, it is more reasonable to believe that, in the beginning, disease was less rampant than in later times, and the climate not so changeable as it became after the Flood.

It will be noticed that Moses does not give the "date" of the birth or death of each individual, neither day nor month being included, but reckons by complete years. This principle must be remembered when using the chronology.

"Methuselah is said to have been 969 years at his death (Gen. v. 27), but actually it will be discovered that he was 968 years, 1 month and 17 days old, plus whatever fraction of the year of his birth was included in the 65th year of his father Enoch, when the flood began" (*Anstey*).

"Since Ussher, no chronologer who has adopted the numbers given in the Hebrew text as the basis of his calculation, has ever failed to fix the flood in the year AN. HOM. 1656, and the death of Joseph in the year AN. HOM. 2369" (*Anstey*).

The chronology of the Antediluvian Patriarchs.

<i>Anno Hominis.</i>	
0	<i>Adam created</i> (Gen. v. 1).
130	Age of Adam at birth of Seth (Gen. v. 3).

130	<i>Seth born.</i>
105	Add age of Seth at birth of Enos (Gen. v. 6).

235	<i>Enos born.</i>
90	Add age of Enos at birth of Cainan (Gen. v. 9).

325	<i>Cainan born.</i>
70	Add age of Cainan at birth of Mahalaleel (Gen. v. 12).

395	<i>Mahalaleel born.</i>
65	Add age of Mahalaleel at birth of Jared (Gen. v. 15).

460	<i>Jared born.</i>
162	Add age of Jared at birth of Enoch (Gen. v. 18).

622	<i>Enoch born.</i>
65	Add age of Enoch at birth of Methuselah (Gen. v. 21).

687	<i>Methuselah born.</i>
187	Add age of Methuselah at birth of Lamech (Gen. v. 25).

874	<i>Lamech born.</i>
182	Add age of Lamech at birth of Noah (Gen. v. 28).

1056	<i>Noah born.</i>
600	Add age of Noah at the Flood (Gen. vii. 6).

1656	<i>The Flood.</i>

Here is the most venerable family document in the world, the family history of the ancestors of all mankind. To remove it from the book is to leave mankind without a record of its beginning, and more serious still, to snap the link that binds Adam, the first head of the race, to Christ, the true Head and Saviour of mankind.

#8. The chronology and typical dates of the Flood (Gen. vii., viii.). pp. 230 - 232

The simple, straightforward register of births and deaths that provides the chronological link between Adam and the Flood, carries with it the conviction of truth.

We now come to the record of the flood itself and upon examination find in it a number of interrelated dates so connected with the narrative that they can be neither removed nor altered without dislocating the whole. Seen in their true place, as records of actual fact, they vivify the story and place the narrative upon the high ground of actual history.

Let us first of all assemble our data.

“For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights” (Gen. vii. 4).

“And Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth” (Gen. vii. 6).

“And it came to pass after seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth” (Gen. vii. 10).

“In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights” (Gen. vii. 11, 12).

“And the waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days” (Gen. vii. 24).

“And the waters returned from off the earth continually: and after the end of the hundred and fifty days the waters were abated” (Gen. viii. 3).

“And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat” (Gen. viii. 4).

“And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month were the tops of the mountains seen” (Gen. viii. 5).

“And it came to pass at the end of the forty days, that Noah opened the window of the ark which he had made” (Gen. viii. 6).

“He stayed yet another seven days: and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark” (Gen. viii. 10).

“And he stayed yet another seven days; and sent forth the dove; which returned not again unto him any more” (Gen. viii. 12).

“And it came to pass on the six hundredth and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth” (Gen. viii. 13).

“And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried” (Gen. viii. 14).

We cannot help but be struck with the opening and closing dates given here. In order that the evidence may be the better seen let us use figures, instead of spelling out the numbers.

Years when the flood came: 600th year of Noah.

Year when the waters were dried up: 601st year, 1st month, 1st day.

Six is the number of man, of labour, of failure, and of the measurement of time. Seven is associated with perfection, rest, and attainment. It is significant that Noah, whose name means “rest”, and of whom the word “perfect” is first used (Gen. vi. 9), should at the close of his 600th year experience the flood and the deliverance of the ark, and that the drying up of the waters of judgment should coincide with the New Year’s day of Noah’s seventh century. The type is too clear to be missed, and, linked together with the witness of the first chapter of Genesis, makes us certain that all has been ordered according to a mighty plan.

If we were asked to say how many days there were in five months, we should have to ask for a clear statement as to the word “month”. The first five months in our calendar have 31, 28, (29), 31, 30, 31 days, so that we should require to know what months were intended before a total could be reached. But the Hebrew month was a period of 30 days which gave 360 days for 12 months, leaving 5 days to be accounted for. Time was measured by the revolution of the sun, as it is to this day, and the year was one of 365 days. The feast, however, were regulated by the revolution of the moon.

“Blow up the trumpet in the new moon” (Psa. lxxxi. 3).

“Your new moons and your appointed feasts” (Isa. i. 14).

“Burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings, in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all the solemnities of the house of Israel” (Ezek. xlv. 17).

We must not make the mistake of imagining that the Hebrew names and number of months must necessarily have been used by Adam, Noah or Abraham: we can only be tolerably certain that no *radical* changes could have been made at Sinai, for day and night, summer and winter, remained unaltered, and the length of the solar year is independent of any dispensational change among the sons of men. As can be seen from the following data, the narrative of the flood contains positive proof of the average length of a month.

The flood commenced on the 17th day of the 2nd month and the ark rested on the 17th day of the 7th month. Thus we have an interval of exactly 5 months, which Gen. viii. 3, 4 declares to be 150 days. A month therefore must have averaged 30 days. We cannot, however, be dogmatic and say that a month *must have been* 30 days because

the Hebrews reckoned 30 days to the month except when they saw the new moon on the 30th, which then became the 1st day of the new month.

Kennedy, a chronologer of the eighteenth century, makes the length of time during which Noah was in the ark exactly 365 days. He maintained that Moses *measures* time by solar years, and *computes* time by lunar years. His attitude to the Scriptures encourages one to give him a hearing, for he says:

“The Hebrew text has never been corrupted in the article of Chronology by Jew or Pagan, by chance or design. It is not more certain that there is a sun and moon in the heavens than it is that not a single error of the press, or of Jewish transcriber, has crept into the present copies of the Hebrew Massoretic Text, to give the least interruption to its chronological years.”

Returning to details, and, particularly, typical foreshadowings, let us look at Gen. viii. 4.

“The ark rested in the 7th month, on the 17th day of the month.” What is there suggestive about these dates? At first, nothing, but when we remember that in the month Abib, the month of the Passover, Moses instructed the Israelites to reckon that month “the beginning of months, the first month of the year to you” (Exod. xii. 1, 2), we discover that the 17th day of the 7th month is a date to be noted. The 7th month became the 1st month. The Passover was observed on the 14th, and on the 17th the Lord was raised from the dead, consequently, the specific date of the resting of the ark on the mountains of Ararat becomes one of intensely typical importance.

The rain was upon the earth 40 days and 40 nights. This is the first occurrence of this critical number in the Scriptures. It is the number of trial. We immediately think of the 40 days occupied by the spies in spying out the Land, with the consequent 40 years wandering in the wilderness, (Numb. xiii. 26; xiv. 34); or of the 40 days of Jonah iii. 4; or of the 40 days preceding the temptation in the wilderness (Matt. iv. 2).

Again we see how complete, and how satisfactory is the account given of the flood, and its particular events. May these studies confirm our faith that these Scriptures are inspired, authoritative and trustworthy.

The SECOND EPISTLE to TIMOTHY.

#17. “According to my gospel” (ii. 8, 9). pp. 13 - 17

In the preceding article of this series we have had brought before us the important association of “considering” and “understanding”. We now pass on to another most wonderful faculty of mind, the exercise of memory:

“Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel” (II Tim. ii. 8).

Memory plays an important part both in Christian witness and Christian growth. Personality and memory are so interlinked that, where the memory becomes an utter blank, responsibility also ceases.

Both the faculty of memory and the failure of forgetfulness have played, and still play, an important part in the experience of the believer. Look at the fickle memory of Israel:

“We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick” (Numb. xi. 5).

Yet they forgot the bondage, the burdens, and the bitterness of Egypt. We find therefore in that great prophetic song of Jehovah’s name* (* - see “Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth”, Volume XXIV, page 81) the charge laid against Israel that:

“Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and has forgotten God that formed thee” (Deut. xxxii. 18).

So also in the Divine summary of Psalm cvi. we read,

“Our fathers *understood not* Thy wonders in Egypt; they *remembered not* the multitude of Thy mercies; but they *provoked* Him at the sea, even at the Red sea They soon *forgat* His works” (Psa. cvi. 7, 13).

On the one hand the Apostle urges us to “remember” our past alienation and hopeless condition as Gentiles in the flesh (Eph. ii. 11, 12), but, on the other, to “forget” the things that are behind, as we press toward the mark (Phil. iii. 13, 14), exhortations of which we all are in constant need.

Paul invokes the power of memory in the opening of this second epistle to Timothy, saying, “I have remembrance of thee” (II Tim. i. 3); “Being mindful of thy tears” (i. 4); “I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee Lois Eunice” (i. 5); and “I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands” (i. 6).

In II Tim. ii. 8 the Apostle appeals to Timothy himself to remember certain facts concerning the great central theme of his message, and charges him to put his hearers in remembrance of the self-same teaching (ii. 14). Let us now consider more exactly what it was that Paul was so anxious for Timothy to remember:

“Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel” (II Tim. ii. 8).

While the A.V. reads, “Remember that Jesus Christ”, thereby suggesting that Timothy was to remember some *fact about* the Lord rather than the Lord Himself, the R.V. omits the word “that”, as does also the *Companion Bible*, in its margin. There is however good reason for its retention. When Luke wrote “Remember Lot’s wife” (Luke xvii. 32), he put the words “Lot’s wife” in the genitive. Here, however, in II Tim. ii. 8, the words “Jesus Christ” are put in the accusative. Timothy was called upon to remember, not so much his Lord, but one or two particular facts about his Lord that were vital to his ministry. In verse 18 of the same chapter the words that follow the verb “saying” are in the accusative, and so the translation given in both the A.V. and the R.V is, “saying that the resurrection is past already”.

In the original text, these facts that Timothy was urged to remember, are in the following order:

- (1) That He was raised from the dead.
- (2) That He was of the seed of David.
- (3) That these two facts must be kept together in their relation to that gospel which Paul calls “My gospel”.

From earliest times the literal, physical resurrection of our Lord from the dead, and the reality of His human nature, were alike the subject of attack and denial. Docetism (from *dokein*, “to seem”) taught that the body of Christ was not real or material, but only an appearance. But, intimately associated with the resurrection of Christ is the hope of His people; so much so that to deny either is to destroy both. It matters not which way the problem is stated, the result is the same.

“If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins” (I Cor. xv. 16, 17).

That doubts concerning the literal fact of resurrection had already been entertained and expressed in the Church is seen by reading verses 17 and 18 of this second chapter of II Timothy.

“And their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some” (II Tim. ii. 17, 18).

If he did not believe and maintain the glorious fact of the resurrection, it would have been impossible for Timothy to have succeeded Paul, either as an evangelist or as a minister of the Mystery. In II Tim. i. the Apostle speaks of that gospel of which he had

been appointed preacher, apostle and teacher of the Gentiles, and for which he suffered, and the one outstanding fact that he brings forward there is that:

“Our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel” (II Tim. i. 10).

The fact that Christ was of the seed of David can be looked at from more than one angle. In the first place, whoever believes that fact, must believe that Christ was really Man, that His body was really flesh and blood, and, from the standpoint of the kingdom and its hope, it was vital to the fulfillment of prophecy and covenant. So far as the dispensation of the mystery is concerned, the fact that Christ was of the seed of David, proves that God was manifested *in the flesh*, but from the standpoint of Peter and his ministry, the same fact not only demonstrated His manhood, but pointed to the realization of the hope of Israel:

“David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ *to sit on his throne*; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ” (Acts ii. 29-31).

The basic epistle to the Romans makes it very clear that Christ was of the seed of David, according to the flesh:

“The gospel of God concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead” (Rom. i. 1-4).

While Paul most surely believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was of the seed of David, according to the flesh, he tells us in connection with his ministry of reconciliation:

“Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, *though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more*” (II Cor. v. 16).

If he would make full proof of his ministry, Timothy must therefore do the same. Others may preach the gospel of the kingdom; others may stress the reality of the throne of David. These ministers of the circumcision and the kingdom were right so to do. But Timothy had been chosen to maintain that good deposit of truth which is found only in the prison ministry of the apostle Paul. In the form of sound words which he had heard of Paul, the throne of David is overshadowed by a higher and greater throne. A higher throne, a vaster kingdom, a more spiritual realm, is associated with that seat “far above all”, and to this the Apostle would have Timothy devote himself; this he would have him pass on to faithful men who should be able to teach others also; consequently, the Apostle follows the two items that deal with the incarnation and the resurrection of Christ with the qualifying words:

“According to my gospel; wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, even unto bonds” (II Tim. ii. 8, 9).

Here we have the prisoner of the Lord, “even unto bonds”. *Desmos*, “bonds”, and *desmios*, “prisoner”, are poignant words in connection with the ministry of the mystery.

“And now, behold, I go bound (*deo*) in the spirit bonds (*desmos*) and afflictions await me” (Acts xx. 22, 23).

Verse 24 shows him at the beginning of a “course”; II Tim. iv. 7 shows the course finished. At Acts xx. imprisonment lay before the Apostle, but it is clear that he also knew that, associated with prison, a ministry awaited him. It is in this searching letter to Timothy that his prison ministry (made available to us in the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians), is brought to its conclusion.

What a light is thrown upon the character of the Apostle by the concluding words of II Tim. ii. 9, “But the word of God is not bound”. If we read this on one straight level with the rest of the verse we destroy its meaning. To realize the full import of the clause we must imagine a pause, followed by the lighting up of the Apostle’s face as the contrast between the limitations of the servant in his bondage, and the Word in its freedom flashed upon his mind, and lighted up his devoted spirit. Earlier, he had said so pathetically at the close of the epistle to the Colossians, “Remember my bonds”, but when he had requested prayer for an “open door” he had, with sublime indifference to his own state, simply asked for “a door of utterance” or “for the word”, *logos*, as it is literally. So, here, a prisoner, awaiting his earthly doom, no longer in military custody with a degree of liberty, as was the case in Acts xxviii., but now, since the great fire of Rome and the subsequent persecution of Christians, imprisoned as an evil doer. In the circumstances of his case, the Apostle knew that from this charge there was no earthly release.* (* - See series entitled “The Powers that Be”, Volume XXXI). Yet, from this dungeon, marked with death, sounds the triumphant, unselfish, note, “But the Word of God is not bound!”

Returning to the qualifying clause “according to my gospel”, it is well to read this with Eph. iii. 6, 7.

“That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel whereof I was made a minister.”

To stop at the end of verse 6 is to omit an important truth. The mystery is not connected with the promises found in the gospel preached by Peter, “great and precious” though they were. Peter knows of a “royal priesthood and an holy nation”, but this is entirely outside the scope of the mystery. The believer who rejoices in the truth of the mystery is continually assailed by suggestions from outside that tempt him to leave the high and holy ground of his calling to participate in the ministry of other callings and spheres. One will feel keenly the charge, unjustly leveled at him, that he has no “evangelistic” sympathy or ministry. Another will be baited with the false charge of Pharisaic exclusiveness, and be tempted to make a protest by stepping down from the exalted ground of his high calling. May one and all “remember” the insistence made in this short epistle upon the exclusive character of our witness.

“The testimony of our Lord and of me His prisoner.”

“The pattern of sound words, heard of me.”

“The things which thou hast heard of me the same commit.”

“My gospel.”

“Knowing of whom thou hast learned them.”
“By me the preaching might be fully known.”

If unwarranted and uninspired this insistence on the personal pronoun would be disturbing, but the statements are as true as John iii. 16. When we realize how few there are who stand for the truth of the mystery, we should be all the more determined, by grace, to devote our every effort to its support and to its furtherance. If only all those who realize the blessedness of the calling could say “One thing I do”, what a testimony would go out from this little, despised company! May every reader ponder II Tim. ii. 8, 9 as before the Lord, making it a very personal matter. We might do worse than breathe the earliest recorded prayer of Paul:

“Lord, what wilt THOU have ME to do” (Acts ix. 6).

#18. The Faithful Saying (ii. 10-13). The difference between living and reigning with Christ. pp. 49 - 54

In our last article we left Paul in bonds, suffering as an evildoer but exulting in the fact that “the word of God is not bound”. The subject is in some measure continued to verse 13, the end of the present section.

“I endure”, said the Apostle, and associated his endurance with the *aionion* glory of the believer. “If we endure”, continued the Apostle, and associated that endurance of the believer himself with the added glory of “reigning” with Christ.

In the original, the words translated in the A.V. of II Tim. ii. 10 and 12 “I endure” and “If we suffer” are the verb *hupomeno*, from *hupo*, “under”, and *meno*, “remain” or “abide”. The noun form of this word is *hupomone*, and is translated “patience”, and it would be wise if, in the verb, we brought the two words together and translated II Tim. ii. 10 and 12 “patiently endure”, for there may be a grudging or murmuring endurance, which is far from the Apostle’s meaning here.

Let us use this opportunity of becoming acquainted with the usage and derivations of this word *meno*, and for our present purpose let us confine ourselves to the epistles to Timothy.

Meno, “To remain or abide”:

“If they *continue* in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety” (I Tim. ii. 15).
“If we believe not, He *abideth* faithful” (II Tim. ii. 13).
“But *continue* thou in the things which thou hast learned” (II Tim. iii. 14).
“Erastus *abode* at Corinth” (II Tim. iv. 20).

The simple and literal reference to “abiding” at Corinth helps us to understand what “continuing” in the faith implies. In an earlier epistle the Apostle has put “continuance” in the faith over against “being moved away” from the hope (Col. i. 23), which shows that he had in mind the primitive meaning.

Epimeno, “To remain on”, and so “persist”, and so “continue”. It would be best if *meno* were allotted the translation “remain” and *epimeno* the translation “continue”, so giving the prefix *epi* its value.

“Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; *continue* in them” (I Tim. iv. 16).

There are, of course, many other occurrences of these words, and, moreover, many other combinations, such as *prosmeno*, *diameno*, *katameno*, etc., all of which must be consulted if the reader would be “thoroughly furnished”. For our present purpose it is sufficient if we have established the relation that exists between the two words translated “endure” and “patience”, and if both are seen in association with their basic idea of abiding or remaining. To endure is “to remain under”, and patience is that grace of “remaining under”, awaiting God’s good time for deliverance. The man who could leap from the contemplation of his bonds to the exultant testimony that, nevertheless, the Word of God was not bound, was not a man to “remain under” as a result of either fear or despondency. His endurance was willing and an act of faith, and counted as such in the eyes of the Lord.

The Apostle knew that there was a purpose in his sufferings—“I endure all things for the elect’s sakes”—and this very knowledge was sustaining. If we can say with Job, “He knoweth the way that I take”, and if we are convinced that, at last, after we have been tried, we “shall come forth as gold”, most of the sting will be removed from persecution, and joy will take its place. While it would be gratuitous to assume that none of Paul’s sufferings fell upon him because of his own frailty and because he was a man of like passions with ourselves, we do know that from the moment of his commission until the end of his course the Lord associated with his ministry the suffering of great things for His name’s sake (Acts ix. 16).

As a reference to II Cor. xi. and xii. will show, not only at the beginning of his ministry did he endure unparalleled sufferings, but when that period came to a close and he faced the prospect of the second ministry, visualized in Acts xx. 22-24, he spoke of a new set of sufferings intimately associated with his ministry of the mystery, saying:

“Who now rejoice in my sufferings *for you*, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body’s *sake*, which is the church, whereof I am made a minister” (Col. i. 24, 25).

He told the Ephesians that his imprisonment was for them, and his tribulations were for their glory (Eph. iii. 1, 13), and in his last epistle, the one before us, we find the same claim.

The opening word of verse 10, “Therefore”, is, in the original, *dia touto*, “because of this”, and there are some who have felt that the Apostle was here referring back to the free and unbound character of the Word of God. *Dia touto*, however, followed by *hina* (in order that) is a phrase that the Apostle employs elsewhere, and by it refers to what follows. For example:

“Therefore it is of faith, *that* it might be by grace” (Rom. iv. 16).

“Therefore I write these things lest I should use sharpness” (II Cor. xiii. 10).

“For this cause I obtained mercy, *that* in me first” (I Tim. i. 16).

Paul therefore endured affliction that the elect might benefit, though we know how resolutely he repudiated the remotest idea of associating himself with the atoning work of the Saviour, saying, “Was Paul crucified for you?” (I Cor. i. 13), “Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed” (I Cor. iii. 5).

Paul’s sufferings on behalf of the church of the mystery laid no foundation for either the salvation of the members of that church nor its position in glory, but there is, as we have learned, an added glory, called in Phil. iii. “the prize”, in Col. iii. “the reward”, in II Tim. iv. “the crown”, and in the very context of our verse, “reigning with the Lord”. Now with regard to this added thing, we discover the Apostle does introduce his own example.

“Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an example for our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto the body of His glory” (Phil. iii. 17-21).

This body of humiliation must not be interpreted as referring to the body of every believer, for the Apostle has made his meaning plain in the Philippian epistle.

The word translated “vile” in the A.V., which we translate “humiliation”, is *tapeinosis*. Just as we saw the word “endure” meant literally “to remain under”, so we discover that this word primarily means a low-lying place or condition, hence “lowly” or “humble”. Now in Phil. ii. 8 we read of Christ that “He humbled Himself” (*tapeinoo*), and in Phil. ii. 3 the believer is exhorted to follow the Saviour’s example with “lowliness of mind” (*tapeinophrosune*). To this the Apostle refers when he says “I know how to be *abased*, and how to abound” (Phil. iv. 2). It is this voluntary humiliation that is in view in Phil. iii. 10.

“That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death, if by any means I might attain unto the out-resurrection out from among the dead” (Phil. iii. 10, 11).

Just as this “conformity” (*summorphomai*) is no ordinary, average, experience, but something in advance of even the Apostle’s experience (“Not as though I had already attained”, Phil. iii. 12), so the parallel, “conformity” (*summorphos*) of verse 21 is not the blessed hope which belongs to every member of the one body, but that “out-resurrection” to which the Apostle aspired, and for which he voluntarily suffered. This is the background of the teaching of II Tim. ii. 10-13.

Coming a little closer to the actual wording of verse 10 we find that we must translated the passage:

“Therefore I endure all things for the elect’s sakes, that they may also obtain *that* salvation *which* is in Christ Jesus with age-abiding glory.”

It is not “salvation” in its primary sense, but “salvation with age-abiding glory” that is in view. The whole testimony of Scripture makes it unnecessary to think that the elect will ever fail of salvation, but the elect may not all voluntarily share the humiliation of Christ; the elect may not all even desire to be conformed to His death. The elect are certainly on the one Foundation, Christ, yet for the building they erect subsequent to their salvation they may receive a reward or they may suffer loss. That this is the teaching of the Apostle the expansion of II Tim. ii. 11-13 is proof:

“It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we patiently endure, we shall also reign with Him; if we deny him, He also will deny us; If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful: He cannot deny Himself.”

Here we have two very distinct phases of the work of grace.

(1) Free and full, unmerited, favour, that reckons the believer to have died together with Christ, and consequently pledges that he shall live together with Him, quite irrespective of his endurance or works, even if there should be a sad lack of faith subsequent to salvation (and Heb. iii. 12 is the classic example of the heart of unbelief in the believer, see Heb. iii., iv.). This lack of faith, which, while not depriving the redeemed of the title “believer”, would prevent him from taking the title “faithful”; this smallness of faith would not touch the fact that he was saved, for “He abideth faithful, He cannot deny Himself”.

(2) Faithfulness, however, is marked with Divine approval wherever it is found. Caleb and Joshua wholly followed the Lord, and they not only received, in type, “salvation”, but “age-abiding glory”, which many of their contemporaries lost. Consequently endurance under trial and a steadfast adherence to the Lord will be honoured, and the honour, in this passage, is “reigning with Him”. In Rom. viii. 17, 18 we have the two classes of believers brought before us, “If children, then heirs; heirs of God”. Nothing can alter this fact. It is all of grace, and is parallel with the opening clause of II Tim. ii. 11, “If we died with Him we shall also live with Him”. But Rom. viii. 17 continues, “and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may also glorified together”.

This is an advance upon the *former* position, which is parallel with the glorious testimony of Ephesians, “not of works”. The *latter* is parallel with Philippians, “work out your own salvation”. The former is the *hope* of the calling, whatever calling may be in view, the latter is the *prize* of that calling, whatever calling may be in view.

This “prize”, this “reward”, this “crown”, this “reign” may be lost, and the one thing picked out by the Apostle when writing to Timothy was that of denying the Lord. With

Nero on the throne and persecution raging, this denial of the Lord was an ever-present and dreadful possibility. The Apostle encouraged his son Timothy, and he encourages all of us who follow, however feebly, to endure, by speaking of the “age-abiding glory”. Membership of the One Body is eternal, but the added glory (whether spoken of in Matthew, the Gospel of the Kingdom, or in Hebrews, the Epistle of the heavenly phase of the Kingdom, or in Romans, the Epistle of the grace of God to the Gentile as well as the Jew, or in Philippians and II Timothy), is age-abiding. We see the same principle at work in the book of the Revelation.

“To him that overcometh will I grant to sit *with Me* in My throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne” (Rev. iii. 21).

“And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years” (Rev. xx. 4).

Here we perceive that every one that attains to the age-abiding glory of the Revelation was not only saved, but endured. The throne and the glory are not the same as those of II Tim. ii., but the principle remains. We are not Apostles, but we all have a sphere of influence, and our example may help or hinder fellow-believers from reaching that age-abiding glory that was in the Apostle’s mind, for which he endured, and concerning which he not only taught but “warned” (Phil. iii. 17-21; Col. i. 28). This last reference, namely Col. i. 28, is too good an illustration of the principle found in II Tim. ii. 11-13 to be passed over. In Col. i. we have two presentations, parallel with the two positions of II Tim. ii.

(1) The believer shall be *presented* holy, and unblameable and unreprouable, by reason of the death of Christ. This is parallel with the statement, “If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him”.

(2) The believer may also be *presented* perfect, and this is connected with “warning and teaching”. Col. ii. is the great warning, “Beware”, “Let no man beguile you of your reward” (not your life, that is safe) (Col. iii. 3). This is parallel with the added glory of reigning with Christ if the believer endures.

Coming back to the passages under review, we learn that “This is a faithful saying”. There are five such sayings in the pastoral epistles, and it is possible that they were well-known as part of the method of teaching adopted in the early church, or part of the service with which the believer would be familiar. They are,

- (1) “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief (or first)” (I Tim. i. 15).
- (2) “This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work” (I Tim. iii. 1).
- (3) “This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation” (Namely the preceding teaching concerning godliness and bodily exercise) (I Tim. iv. 9).
- (4) “It is a faithful saying: For if we died with Him, we shall also live with Him” (II Tim. ii. 11, 13).

- (5) “This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works” (Titus iii. 8).

The testimony concerning the prize and the crown is as much a faithful saying as the testimony that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners: may we believe *all* that God has spoken.

**#19. (ii. 14-26). The Structure of the passage as a whole,
The warning of verse 14 in particular.
pp. 89 - 93**

We have now considered together the following sections of this second epistle to Timothy:

- (1) THE SALUTATION AND REMEMBRANCE (i. 1-7).
- (2) THE FORSAKEN MESSAGE (i. 8-18).
- (3) THE GOOD SOLDIER (ii. 1-13).

These members find their correspondence in the third and fourth chapters of the epistle, leaving the two central members:

- D | ii. 14-26. “Approved” (*dokimos*).
- D | iii. 1-9. “Disapproved” (*adokimos*).

to complete the epistle and its corresponding members.

Throughout the epistle, so far, there has been an intermingling of sunshine and shadow, rejoicing and suffering. This is obvious to the most superficial reader. In the salutation we find not only encouraging words for Timothy’s benefit, remembrances of his home life and Christian upbringing, reminders of the special gift that he had received by the laying on of the Apostle’s hands, but we find also the exhortation to stir up this gift, and the very solemn reminder that God had not given to us a spirit of cowardice, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

In the second section, we have the exhortation, “Be not ashamed”, and the repeated reference to the fact that suffering is often the mead of faithfulness here, and we have also the triumphant testimony of the Apostle to the faithful keeping of the Lord. In the section now concluded, namely ii. 1-13, if there be the necessity to endure, to suffer evil, to strive and to wait, there is also the counterbalance of crown and reign. Timothy therefore would be led by these succeeding steps to the glorious conclusion that the only thing that really matters in this present sphere is that we shall be *approved* unto God (II Tim. ii. 15), with its dreadful counterpart in chapter iii., of those like Jannes and Jambres who are *disapproved* concerning the faith (iii. 8).

The section before us, II Tim. ii. 14-26, divides into three parts as follows:

- A | 14, 15. The WORKMAN and the TRUTH. "The word of truth."
- B | 16-23. ERROR and the TRUTH. "Concerning the truth."
- A | 24-26. The SERVANT and the TRUTH. "Acknowledging the truth."

Everything revolves around "The truth". In the first case we have right division of the truth, which leads to unashamed work. Secondly we have wrong division of the truth ("past already"), which leads to the overthrowing of the faith, and, thirdly, we have the acknowledging of the truth, which liberates from the snare of the devil.

At the heart of this epistle we are at the heart of all service, all loyalty, all good success. Nothing is so important as our attitude to the truth. If we are wrong there we are wrong altogether. It may be that truth must be spoken in love (Eph. iv. 15); it may be that the Apostle combined faith with truth ("verity", I Tim. ii. 7); it may be that the whole armour of God is made up of something more than the girdle of truth (Eph. vi. 14); it may be that the fruit of the Spirit is goodness and righteousness as well as truth (Eph. v. 9); but, without truth, there would be no ministry of love, no apostolic record, no armour of God, no fruit of the Spirit.

While this threefold division of the section before us is important, it is not complete; we therefore set out in more detailed form the structure:

II Timothy ii. 14 - 26.

The approved concerning the truth.

THE WORKMAN AND THE TRUTH.

- A | a | 14. Strive not about words.
- b | 15-. Study to show thyself approved.
- c | -15. That he may be unashamed.

ERROR AND TRUTH.

- B | 16. Exhortation. Shun. Increase ungodliness.
- C | d | 17, 18. Teachers and doctrine. A canker.
- e | 19-. God's foundation. Sure.
- e | -19. God's foundation. Seal.
- d | 20, 21. Teachers and doctrine. Great house and vessels.
- B | 22, 23. Exhortation. Flee. Avoid. Gender strifes.

THE SERVANT AND THE TRUTH.

- A | a | 24. Servants of the Lord must not strive.
- b | 25. Repentance.
- c | 26. That he may be delivered.

Let us now see what lessons await us as we examine more carefully each of these three subdivisions:

"Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers" (II Tim. ii. 14).

It is easy to go wrong at the outset of this new section. Just as the testimony of II Cor. iii. 6 can be distorted from the intended meaning of the Apostle—where the letter that kills stand for the law of Moses, and can be made to mean, what he most certainly never taught, that it did not so much matter whether we kept to the literal teaching of the Scriptures so long as we caught its “spirit”, a fantasy that has opened the door for much false teaching and false freedom—so II Tim. ii. 14 may very easily be misunderstood. The Apostle has insisted in this very epistle upon the necessity of having “a pattern of sound words”, and in contending earnestly for the faith, it often becomes an absolute necessity that we must “strive about words”.

In this solemn charge the Apostle uses the expression *logomacheo*, which word occurs, in noun form, in the earlier epistle, and in a context that settles the meaning of the passage before us.

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and *strifes of words*, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth” (I Tim. vi. 3-5).

There can be no possible comparison between such perverse disputings, and the patient and loving investigation of the believer into the very words of inspired truth, which he desires to hold fast in the face of all opponents.

The Apostle has made frequent reference to these false teachers, their doctrines, and their methods, and as, if we are to purge ourselves (II Tim. ii. 21), we must have some knowledge of this side of the matter, we will at once acquaint ourselves with the inspired words of warning.

“Teach no other doctrine” (I Tim. i. 3).

“Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions” (I Tim. i. 4).

“Some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling” (I Tim. i. 6).

“Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm” (I Tim. i. 7).

“There are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision” (Titus i. 10).

“Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth” (Titus i. 14).

“Avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain” (Titus iii. 9).

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called” (I Tim. vi. 20).

What are the “endless genealogies”? What are these “antitheses of knowledge, falsely so called”? What are these “strivings about the law”? We do not know with any certainty.

“In the epistle to the Colossians St. Paul had dealt formally with the pretended philosophy and vaunted insight, the incipient dualism, the baseless angelology, and the

exaggerated asceticism of local heretics whose theosophic fancies were already prevalent. In these epistles (to Timothy and Titus) he merely touches on them, because in private letters to beloved fellow-workers there was no need to enter into direct controversy with their erroneous teachings" (*Farrar, Life and Work of St. Paul*).

Much has been written setting out the errors of Gnosticism and other heresies, but while it stands written, "avoid", "shun", "turn away", there is no call to the believer to cumber his mind with a load of error or to occupy his time in pursuing fantastic speculations. Sufficient for him is the positive teaching concerning the "ages", and that sacred secret which was hidden from the "generations". To Timothy, as to ourselves, the positive injunctions are sufficient:

"Give heed to a *dispensation of God" (I Tim. i. 4).

"Consent to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus, and the doctrine which is according to godliness" (I Tim. vi. 3).

"Keep that which is committed to thy trust" (I Tim. vi. 20).

"Hold fast the pattern of sound words, which thou hast heard of me in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" (II Tim. i. 13).

[NOTE: * - The A.V. reads "godly edifying", the word which the translators had before them being *oikodome*, meaning "to build or edify". Whilst a few texts read *oikonomia*, authorities are unanimous that the true reading should be *oikonomia*, "dispensation". A somewhat similar scribal error is found in Eph. iii. 9, where the texts read *oikonomia*, "dispensation", instead *koinomia*, "fellowship".]

Here is the work that should claim all our time, energy and thought. We may know the errors we are to avoid by their fruits: They "minister questions", "vain jangling", "make shipwreck of faith", "suppose gain to be godliness", cause those who hold such teaching to "err concerning the faith", "overthrow the faith" and "lead captive" those who follow these pernicious doctrines and ways. Error and heresy are as old as man. So far as man is concerned, all error goes back for its origin to the garden of Eden. No error published to-day, with all the fervour of a new discovery, is really modern, it is but a new edition of an ancient lie.

We come back to II Tim. ii. 14 to re-read its exhortation in the fuller light we have received by this digression:

"Of these things"—namely the teaching of verses 11-13, and, in particular, the emphasis upon the "good deposit"—"put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers".

Two words used by the Apostle in this exhortation call for a little expansion. The word "profit" (*chresimon*) actually means "use", and inasmuch as it is by our fruits that we are known, so all true doctrine will conform to the test of Matt. vii. 15-20. *Chresimon*, "profit" should be read with II Tim. ii. 21, "meet for the Master's use", the word translated "use" being *euchreston*. The profitless fables which the Apostle exposes in I Tim. i. 5 are put over against "the end of the commandment" which is "love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned".

The second word calling for comment is the word “subverting”. The Greek word so translated is *katastrophe*, which the reader will recognize as the prototype of the English “catastrophe”, and Peter in II Pet. ii. 6 indicates the dire nature of this overthrowing of the faith, for he uses this same word to describe the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha as is used by Paul to describe the overthrowing of the believer.

The Apostle has more to say about the particular evil that was threatening the faith, and deals with it in verses 16-18, but before going further with this negative side of witness, he states what is the glorious anchorage for faith and service, and the one great principle of right interpretation, which, if we give attention to it, will keep, and satisfy, better than a whole library of works on heresies old or new, or thousands of testimonials written by fallible men:

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth” (II Tim. ii. 15).

**#20. The approved of God (ii. 15).
With special notes on Spoudazo (study)
paristemi (shew) and dokimos (approved).
pp. 130 - 133**

The reader will remember that the central members of the structure of the epistle concentrate attention upon two related words, “Approved” (II Tim. ii. 15) and “Disapproved” (II Tim. iii. 8). Step by step, our studies have led us through glorious revelation and solemn warning, and at last we reach the verse that lies near to the heart of the apostle’s word to Timothy and to ourselves. No one can read this epistle without sensing the apostle’s anxiety for Timothy. The days were dark; opposition was growing; evil doctrines within the church menaced the faith; love was waxing cold. How could the apostle best help Timothy and all who tread the path in after years? He calls up memories of Timothy’s home life; he reminds him of his gifts; he exhorts him to possess a pattern of sound words; he uses the figures of the soldier, athlete and husbandman; he refers to his own example; he encourages by linking together enduring and reigning; he warns concerning subverting heresies, and at last he gives his whole doctrine of perseverance in one verse, II Tim. ii. 15.

The verse divides naturally into three parts:--

- (1) THE APPROVAL OF GOD.
- (2) THE UNASHAMED WORKMAN.
- (3) THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETATION.

First of all, let us be clear as to the import of the command “Study”. The idea in the word is not that the person addressed is to be “studious”. It is certain that he must have some acquaintance with language, for his material is “the word of truth”, but he is

addressed rather as a “workman” than a scholar. The word translated “study” is the Greek word *spoudazo*. *Spseudo*, from which *spoudazo* is derived, means “haste”, (Luke ii. 16; xix. 5, 6; Acts xx. 16; xxii. 18; II Pet. iii. 12). Words have a tendency to degenerate, and, today, “haste” has lost its primary meaning and taken on another. “More haste, less speed” is a proverb of the world, but such “haste” is neither implied in the references given nor inculcated in the passage before us. In translating David’s statement “The kings business required haste” (I Sam. xxi. 8) the LXX uses the word *spoude*. In the A.V. *spoudazo*, and its associate words *spoudaios*, *spoudaios* and *spoude*, are translated more times by “diligence” and “diligently” than by any other. Let us note the passages, as they give a fair idea of the apostle’s meaning in II Tim. ii. 15. The following occur in the pastoral epistles themselves.

“He sought me out very diligently, and found me” (II Tim. i. 17).

“Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me do thy diligence to come before winter” (II Tim. iv. 9, 21).

“Be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis” (Titus iii. 12).

“Bring Zenas and Apollos on their journey diligently” (Titus iii. 13).

These five references have to do with travel, and, to this day, a special type of carriage is called a Diligence, especially in France. Both speed and care are associated with *spseudo* and the words “assiduity”, and “sedulous”, very nearly approach the intention of the original. In Eph. iv. 3 the word is translated “endeavour”. The exhortation to “study” also includes the idea of earnest and close application, implying some element of endurance and, as we have already seen, some driving necessity that demands haste in its primary meaning. Whatever it be that makes such demands upon the child of God must be of supreme importance. Let us see what it is.

“Be diligent to shew thyself approved unto God.”

In the original the word translated “to show” is *paristemi*, from *para*, “beside”, and *istemi*, “to stand”. The combinations of the root word “to stand” are numerous and of great variety. We will refer only to those that occur in II Timothy but commend to the “diligent” reader the examination of this word and its combinations in detail.

Istemi, “To stand”. “Nevertheless the foundation of God *standeth* sure” (II Tim. ii. 19).

Anastasis, “To stand up”. “Saying the resurrection is past already” (II Tim. ii. 18).

Anthistemi, “To stand against”. “*Withstood* Moses.” “*Withstood* our words” (II Tim. ii. 8; iv. 15).

Aphistemi, “To stand away”. “Depart from iniquity” (II Tim. ii. 19).

Enistemi, “To stand in”. “Perilous times shall *come*” (II Tim. iii. 1).

Paristemi, “To stand beside”. “Study to shew thyself.” “The Lord stood with me” (II Tim. ii. 15; iv. 17).

Peristemi, “To stand around”. “But *shun* profane babblings” (II Tim. ii. 16).

It would be impossible for any acquainted with the Greek language to read this epistle without becoming aware of this interplay of words. See how many of them come within the context of II Tim. ii. 15. Because of the perilous times that are to “*stand in*” and because of those, like Jannes and Jambres, who will *withstand* the truth, we are

encouraged to look forward to the glorious day of *standing up* from the dead, rejoicing that, in spite of all opposition, the foundation of God *standeth*. We should, consequently, be diligent to *stand beside* God, knowing that He will *stand beside* us, and should *stand around*, or aloof, from profane babblings, and *stand away* from iniquity. Even more than all this is crowded into the exhortation of II Tim. ii. 15. Timothy would know the exhortation of Eph. vi. to “stand”, “stand against” and “withstand”, and only those who have personally assimilated the many and wonderful occurrences of *istemi* and its combinations can hope to gather from II Tim. ii. 15 a tithe of its encouragement, warning and strength. This may sound like hard work. It is. A *workman* is being addressed and he has been exhorted to use *diligence*. While it is not practical to set out all these items, a little more attention must be given to the word translated “shew”.

Paristemi, “shew”, is translated “To present” in the following passages:--

“That he might present it to Himself a glorious church” (Eph. v. 17).

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

“Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom that we may *present* every man perfect in Christ Jesus” (Col. i. 28).

The two latter references bring before us two aspects of truth. In the former of them presentation has no reference whatever to our works, our service, our growth, or anything we have done or can do: all is based upon the death of Christ. But in the latter the presentation has to do with service, with going on unto perfection, with growth and with reward (Col. ii. 18). This aspect is similar to that of II Tim. ii. 15, where Timothy is exhorted to “present himself”, an exhortation completely foreign to the outlook of Col. i. 22. In thus exhorting Timothy Paul encourages him by recounting how the Lord had “stood with” him.

Again, service is in view, and in both chapter ii. and iv. we have the crown as a reward. Whether any member of the One Body will stand before the judgment seat of Christ or not, it is certain that the Colossian saints were assured that their service would be either rewarded, or otherwise (Col. iii. 24, 25), and Paul looked forward to the award of a righteous Judge (II Tim. iv. 8). Consequently when we realize that *paristemi* occurs in Rom. xv. 10, “We shall all *stand before* the judgment seat of Christ”, it is evident, with Col. i. 28, iii. 24, 25 and II Tim. iv. 8 in mind, that something parallel is intended in Paul’s exhortation to Timothy. We must now give attention to the one great thing that Timothy was to aim at: “Be diligent to present thyself approved unto God.”

“APPROVED.” The original word is *dokimos*, and, like *istemi*, the ramifications of the word and its combinations are too wonderful to be appreciated apart from personal acquaintance with them. We will, however, draw attention to a few obvious features. First of all, we note that the structure places *dokimos*, “approved”, (II Tim. ii. 15) over against “*adokimos*”, “disapproved”, (II Tim. iii. 8). The root of the word is *dokeo*, and implies the passing of an opinion after weighing the evidence, hence it is sometimes translated “experience”, and “proof”. The form *dokimos* is found in the LXX in the sense of the refining and purifying of metals, and *dokimion* is used by Peter when comparing

the “trial” of faith to the testing of gold (I Pet. i. 7). Already, in I Cor. iii., the apostle had written at length regarding the “sure foundation” and the approval or disapproval of the “work” and a comparison of this passage with II Tim. ii. will therefore be useful.

<i>I Cor. iii. and xv.</i>	<i>II Tim. ii.</i>
The foundation (iii. 10, 11).	The foundation (19).
Gold, silver, wood, etc. (iii. 12).	Gold, silver, wood, etc. (20).
The trial, <i>dokimazo</i> (iii. 13).	The approval, <i>dokimos</i> (15).
Reward, or suffer loss (iii. 14, 15).	Show (<i>paristemi</i>) the judgment seat (15).
Work abides (iii. 13, 14).	Workman that need not be ashamed (15, 21).
He himself shall be saved (iii. 15).	The Lord knoweth them that are His (19).
Resurrection doubted (xv. 12).	Resurrection misplaced (18).

Most evidently the apostle intended to bring all the encouragement that he could to bear upon Timothy to enable him to “stand” and for this purpose found nothing so powerful as that which had ever been before his own eyes:

“I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, henceforth a crown” (II Tim. iv. 7, 8).

Let us not be wise above what is written for there is still evident need for this “warning and teaching”, if servants of the Lord are to be “approved” in that day. We have seen already that the word *dokimos*, “approved”, is associated with the fiery trial of both gold and faith, consequently all the allusions to suffering, persecution, affliction and endurance with which this epistle abounds are focused upon this verse, this workman and his work. We must reserve the consideration of the remainder of this verse for our next article.

#21. The Unashamed Workman, and Right Division (ii. 15). pp. 191 - 194

As a redeemed and justified sinner, Timothy could look forward without a tremor to that future presentation which will result from the death of Christ, when he would be “holy, unblameable and unprovable”. In II Tim. ii. 15, however, he is seen not so much as a saved sinner, but as a responsible servant, and while nothing he did, or omitted to do, could make any difference regarding his blessed hope; the question of the prize or crown, of reigning or being denied, of being ashamed here or unashamed there, is raised with Timothy in his capacity of workman. *Ergates*, “workman”, means primarily a labourer or artificer, the meaning being retained unchanged to-day. We find it in Acts xix. 25 in association with such words as “silversmith” and “craftsman” (24); “occupation” and “craft” (25); “made with hands” (26); and, if the Alexander of verse 33 be the coppersmith, (a matter that must await proof), his appearance in II Tim. iv. 14 is suggestive.

Both when exhorting others, and when speaking of himself, the apostle often speaks of “working with the hands” and although, so far as we can gather, he was under no necessity before conversion thus to earn his living, he was glad to find that his craft of tent-making was of service when the necessity arose (Acts xviii. 3). Service in the gospel or among believers is often denominated “work”. Timothy is exhorted to do the “work” of an evangelist (II Tim. iv. 5) and the equipment, by the Word, of the man of God, is a thorough outfitting “unto all good works” (II Tim. iii. 17). So also, under the figure of a “vessel”, the separated servant is meet for the master’s use, and prepared “unto every good work” (II Tim. ii. 21). As an example of the difference between the approval of God and the approval of men, compare the joyous consciousness of the Lord’s approval in II Tim. iv. 8, 9 with the estimate of man in II Tim. ii. 9, “I suffer as an evil worker, *kakourgos*”, and, in contrast to the suggestion of denial and shame of II Tim. ii. 12 & 15, see the confidence of II Tim. iv. 18, “The Lord shall deliver me from every *evil* work”. In this chapter the apostle has already brought before us three figures, and, together with those that follow, they all focus attention on this one element of being *ashamed*. We have seen how the word “ashamed” dominates the section i. 8-18. Timothy is exhorted not to be ashamed of the testimony of the Lord nor of Paul, His prisoner, but to suffer afflictions with the gospel (i. 8). Paul declares that, in spite of unprecedented sufferings, he is unashamed, and associates “that day”, to which he looks forward, with the sacred trust “committed” to him (i. 12). Onesiphorus is commended for his “diligence” and because he was not ashamed of Paul’s “chain” (i. 16, 17). With these examples on the one hand, and II Tim. ii. 15 on the other, we can easily see that the three figures introduced into II Tim. ii. 3-6 carry on the same message. The good soldier who endures hardness, will “please” his Lord, and will therefore be *unashamed*. The athlete who strives for masteries and who keeps the rules, wins a crown and so will be *unashamed*. The husbandman labours before partaking of the fruits, but the partaking is the very reverse of being *ashamed*.

To have to say of a servant that he is one who has drawn back under affliction and denied the Lord (II Tim. ii. 12) is but another way of saying that he is *ashamed* of the testimony of the Lord’s prisoner. And those servants of the Lord who “shun”, “avoid”, “turn away”, and “purge themselves” are “meet for the master’s use”, are “unto honour”, and so *unashamed*. Timothy therefore was exhorted to consider these various figures and apply the principles involved to his own work. In chapter i. there is an anticipation of the great principle of right division, for the apostle emphasizes “The testimony of the Lord and of me His prisoner”. He refers to that calling that goes back “before age times” but is manifest “now” that he is a prisoner. He draws attention to his own special ministry to the Gentiles and the “good deposit” entrusted to him and afterwards committed to Timothy, when he urged upon him the importance of having a pattern of sound words which he had heard of him, and in chapter ii. he exhorts Timothy to commit to faithful men “the things he had heard of him”. What is all this but the application of right division? Here a distinction between the apostle’s earlier ministry and his “prison ministry” is intimated. Here is a recognition of the distinctive calling of Eph. i.—“before the foundation of the world”. Here is the claim that the apostle, preacher and teacher of the Gentiles, is Paul, and here the distinction is made between “that good deposit” and other parts of God’s purposes. If Timothy is to be unashamed of

his work he must know and appreciate these distinctions, otherwise (by occupying himself with service that belongs to other callings and dispensations, and so not being engaged in “God’s building”), his work, being revealed by fire, will be found worthless. While Timothy might be expected to perceive the necessity of right division, Paul is anxious that he should not be left to his own inferences. How then shall the apostle best put the principle that is vaguely seen at work right through chapter i.? Shall he once more go back in mind to the child Timothy at his mother’s knee? Shall he visualize the teaching of those holy Scriptures that had made Timothy wise unto salvation? Does he remember that a Jewish mother would most certainly teach her boy some of the Proverbs? and that Timothy’s father, being a Greek, and living in Galatia, would most certainly have read the Greek version of the O.T., known as the Septuagint? We cannot tell, but this we do know, that Timothy needed no explanation of the term “right division”. We can dismiss all attempts made by commentators to discredit this fact and feel perfectly safe in doing so, because we shall be “comparing spiritual things with spiritual”. In the Bible used by Timothy occurs the following verse:--

Pasais hodois sou gnoize auten, hina orthotome tas hodous sou (Paroimai iii. 6).

“In all thy ways acquaint thyself with it (fem. ref. to *sophia*, wisdom, in verse 5) in order that it may rightly divide thy paths” (Prov. iii. 6).

We find the same word in Prov. xi. 5, where it is again used of a “way”. These are the only occurrences in the LXX. We are not now concerned with the differences here observable between the A.V. and the LXX but are desirous that all shall see that the words used by Paul in II Tim. ii. 15 and known by Timothy are identical.

Orthotomeo, “To rightly divide”.

Temno, “to cut”, does not occur in the N.T but several combinations of the word are found.

“Sharper”, *Tomoterōs*. “Sharper than a two-edged sword” (Heb. iv. 12).

“Sharply”, *Apotomos*. “Rebuke them sharply” (Titus i. 13).

Peritemno and *peritome* refer to circumcision, and there is no need to stress the literal meaning of either the Greek or the English.

The word finds its place in our own language, and in such surgical expressions as Anatomy, Tracheotomy, and Phlebotomy, the primary meaning of cutting is retained unaltered. With this evidence before him, the reader will need no refutation of the many suggestions put forward as translations, such as “handling aright the Word of Truth”. Again, there is no possibility of mistaking what was to be rightly “divided”. It was not the believer’s conduct or service or anything to do with himself, but the “word of truth”. Just as Timothy was subsequently exhorted to “preach the Word”, so is he here commanded to divide that Word aright. What this principle involves when put into operation cannot be detailed here. Besides a number of volumes and smaller booklets, thirty-three volumes of this magazine have been published and they all have been subject to this one great principle. Right division distinguishes dispensations. It does not confound Kingdom with Church, Gentile with Jew, Mystery with Gospel, Earth with Heaven. It is beyond us, however, to attempt even a summary of its bearings, for there is no item of scriptural teaching to which the principle does not apply.

Moreover, let us repeat that what is here to be “rightly divided” is, and remains, the Word of Truth. No “higher critical” cutting up of the Scriptures is countenanced by this Word, and indeed we have only to read on to find in II Tim. iii. 16 one of the most emphatic statements concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures that the record contains. We can, however, easily rob the Word of its “truth” if we fail to “rightly divide” it. We can confound law and grace, to our undoing; we can preach Moses where we ought to preach Christ. We can be concerned with “earthly things”, to our loss, if our calling is associated with “things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God”. If we attempt to spiritualize the promises made to the fathers, we rob the word of promise of its truth. If we misinterpret Israel as of the Church; if we confound the Bride with the Body; if we preach the gospel of the circumcision to the Gentile to-day; if we do any of these things, we rob the Word of its truth.

One glorious result of “rightly dividing the word of truth” is that every statement of God may be taken without alteration. For instance, in the case of the promise, “The meek shall inherit the earth”, a rightly divided word has no need to substitute “heaven” for “earth”.

Let us heed this word of exhortation. If we are not occupied with that part of God’s purpose which has a present application, we shall most certainly be ashamed of our work. In other words, whether found in Genesis, Romans, Ephesians or the Revelation, “dispensational truth” is all the truth there is.

Happy is that workman who, though suffering under the disapproval of tradition, is approved unto God; that workman who will have no need to be ashamed of his work, because he has obeyed the great all-covering principle,

“Rightly dividing the Word of truth.”

#22. The Unashamed Workman, and his attitude to Error and Evil (ii. 16). pp. 232 - 235

The positive exhortation that had as its goal Divine approval and as its principle “right division” (II Tim. ii. 15) is followed by a strong negative exhortation, which is very characteristic of these pastoral epistles.

“But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness”
(II Tim. ii. 16).

This exhortation reverts back to verse 14 which speaks of striving about words to no profit but the subverting of the hearers. The word “profane” *bebelos* occurs five times in the epistles, and *bebeloo* the verb occurs twice, once in the Gospels and once in the Acts. Let us acquaint ourselves with the usage of this word.

“The priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless” (Matt. xii. 5).
 “Who also hath gone about to profane the temple” (Acts xxiv. 6).
 “The law is not made for a righteous man for unholy and profane” (I Tim. i. 9).
 “But refuse profane and old wives’ fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness”
 (I Tim. iv. 7).
 “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called” (I Tim. vi. 20).
 “But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness”
 (II Tim. ii. 16).
 “Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright” (Heb. xii. 16).

The value of the two first references is that they show that the primitive conception of the word “profane” is associated with the sanctity of a temple, and while no temple is in view in the references in the epistles, the contrast that is instituted is parallel, for “righteousness”, “godliness” and “a sacred trust” are the very stuff of spiritual worship and ministry. The words “vain babblings” are a translation of the Greek *kenophonia*, literally “empty sound”. Again, this is the very *antithesis* of the Apostle’s doctrine. In Col. ii. 8, 9 we have the contrast between the “vain or empty and deceitful philosophy” and the “fullness” and “completeness” that the believer finds in Christ. In Phil. ii., we have “vain glory” *kenodoxia* and the possibility of running or labouring “in vain”, in contrast; this time, not with the fullness that is found in Christ, but with His most blessed *kenosis*.

“He made Himself of no reputation” (Phil. ii. 3, 7, 16).

It might be useful if at this point we acquainted ourselves a little more intimately with the various words used by the apostle in these pastoral epistles, to exhort us to avoid, shun or turn away from these doctrines and practices that are inimical to the faith. We will look at the verse under consideration first. “Shun” (II Tim. ii. 16) *Periistemi*. This word occurs in John xi. 42 “stand by”; Acts xxv. 7 “stand round about”; and Titus iii. 9 “avoid”. It will be seen that in Acts xxv. 7 the people that “stood round about” were antagonistic, and in John xi. 42, at least unbelieving. Josephus uses the word to describe Adam’s attitude after his transgression, saying

“He flies from and *avoids* God’s company” (Ant. i. 1, 4).

We will reserve our examination of “what” must be avoided, shunned, turned from, until we have finished the present enquiry. “Strive not about words” *logomacheo* (II Tim. ii. 14). The substantive *logomachia* occurs in I Tim. vi. 4 “strifes of words”. The occurrence of the word “strife” *mache* in II Tim. ii. 23 in close association with “foolish and unlearned questions” and in association with “foolish questions, genealogies, and strivings about the law” in Titus iii. 9, make the meaning of the apostle quite plain. Keen investigation into the meaning and use of inspired words is not in mind. “Depart from”, *aphistemi*. The apostle uses this word twice in the first epistle to Timothy, where he says “some shall *depart* from the faith” (I Tim. iv. 1), and “from such *withdraw* thyself” (I Tim. vi. 5). “Purge” *ekkathairo* (II Tim. ii. 21), “Purge out the old leaven” (I Cor. v. 7). The word is used in some editions of the LXX, in Judges vii. 4 where the

A.V. reads “I will *try* them for thee there”. In other editions of the LXX, *dokimazo* is used instead. This is illuminating, for *dokimazo* is the word translated “approved” in II Tim. ii. 15, and shows that like all truth, it has two sides, the positive and personal being expressed in the word “approved”, while the negative is expressed in the word “purge from”.

With this experimental use of the word *ekkathairo* we should associate the doctrinal and basic use of *katharizo* which is found in Titus ii. 14 “*Purify* unto Himself a peculiar people”. Because He has already “purified” us by His blood, and because we are already a “peculiar” people for Himself, the reflex should be, as it is expressed in II Tim. ii. 21, that we should “purge ourselves” that we may be peculiarly “meet for the Master’s use”. “Flee” *pheugo* (II Tim. ii. 22). The apostle uses this word once again in the pastoral epistles, “O man of God, flee these things” (I Tim. vi. 11). “Turn away” *apotrepomai* (II Tim. iii. 5). This word does not occur anywhere else in either the N.T. or the LXX. It is, however, a word of common use in the Classics. The derivative *apotreptos* is used for the idea “abominable” which is suggestive. “Beware” *phulasso*. This word is found five times in the pastoral epistles as follows:--

“*Observe* these things” (I Tim. v. 21).

“O Timothy *keep* that which is committed to thy trust” (I Tim. vi. 20).

“He is able *to keep* that which He hath committed” (II Tim. i. 12, R.V. Marg.).

“That good thing which was committed unto thee *keep* by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us” (II Tim. i. 14).

“Of whom *be thou ware* also; for he hath greatly withstood our words” (II Tim. iv. 15).

Here is a further illustration of the two sidedness of truth. We have been entrusted with a glorious doctrine, this we are enjoined to “keep”. This not only includes our own personal loyalty, but a watchfulness upon the attitude of others. There are seven exhortations, to shun, strive not about words, depart from, purge, flee, turn away and beware. We have no option but to believe that they are written for our instruction, and to obey. It seems harsh and uncharitable in the eyes of some, to refuse to open the pages of the *Berean Expositor* to those who do not see eye to eye with those responsible for its witness. The standpoint of one recent correspondent was that we should have fellowship with any one who believed the inspiration of Scripture, even though they held such doctrines as that God was the Author of Sin, that Christ was God in a lesser or lower sense than Absolute Deity, and that Satan was created AS SUCH and serves the Lord equally with His beloved Son. Even this correspondent, however, had his limits. He draws the line at believing or not believing the inspiration of Scripture. This, however, gives the whole case away, for there are many who are most certainly “Christians” who entertain very opposite views on “inspiration”. After all “inspiration” is a doctrinal belief, and even though he says no doctrinal belief is to bar fellowship, our correspondent has in effect accepted the principle that guides ourselves, but draws the line a little lower down. Another believer has just as much right to draw the line lower still and include any or all who believe “God”. We have no option in these matters. Timothy was instructed to “withdraw” himself from any who taught “otherwise” than “the doctrine which is according to godliness” (I Tim. vi. 3-5), he was commanded to avoid complicity with teaching that antagonized the good deposit entrusted to him (I Tim. vi. 20;

II Tim. i. 14); he was to shun those who failed “rightly to divide the word of truth” saying “the resurrection is past already” (II Tim. ii. 16-18); he was “to purge himself” from those who held such things. We find it utterly impossible to construe such instruction, with having fellowship with all, whatever their doctrines, provided they subscribe to the basic doctrine of inspiration. It may be narrow, but so is the truth. We must now return to our theme, this time to take more particular note of what the believer is to shun and avoid.

We have already noted the word translated “vain babblings” used in II Tim. ii. 16, and so pass on to the next exhortation. The apostle tells Timothy that the great seal upon the one foundation includes the departing from “iniquity”. This word *adikia* includes the unrighteousness of such abandoned men as those described in Rom. i. 29 to the “wrong” confessed by the apostle in II Cor. xii. 13. Its primitive meaning is anything that is “Not right”; and one of its usages is to indicate that “unrighteousness” which is associated with an anti-christian attitude to the truth (Rom. i. 18; II Thess. ii. 10, 12). It is the word used by John of the believer who, in order to be maintained in his fellowship with the Father, needs cleansing from all “unrighteousness” (I John i. 9). No believer needs to be told to withdraw from positive iniquity, but he needs continually to withdraw from everything that he sees to be “Not right”, and this will exercise all the grace at his disposal, for the more he grows in grace and in knowledge, the more will he become sensitive to the “unrighteousness” of things around or within. He is to “purge himself from these”, not merely “purge himself”. “These” refer to the vessels of wood and earth, which in their turn indicate those who hold and teach doctrines contrary either to godliness or to the good deposit. He is to “flee” youthful lusts, and none who knows anything of the law of sin in his members will need a printed list here. Suffice it for the moment to realize that even a Man of God like Timothy was not strong enough to trifle or palter with youthful lusts, and neither are we, whatever our age may be; and finally, from a “form of godliness” that denies “the power thereof” Timothy was enjoined to “turn away”. One word has recurred in this examination, which we have not noted, that word is “godliness”. It is of such evident importance that we propose carrying over this study into our next article so that we may give all the attention and space possible to its investigation. Meanwhile let us remember that no solicitations to “keep the unity” can ever excuse us from full obedience to this sevenfold injunction to shun and avoid fellowship with either doctrine or practice that is contrary to the truth we have received through the ministry of the apostle Paul.

Tools for the Unashamed Workman.

#4. Translations.

pp. 239 - 242

While the student of the Scriptures must ever aim at first-hand understanding of the Word of God, he would indeed be unwise, as well as ungracious, to ignore the labours of men of all ranks and degrees of ability who have translated the Scriptures into our mother-tongue. Without attempting to place in any order of merit the translations to which we shall refer, we draw attention to their distinctive characteristics and to some of their limitations, trusting that those who may already possess copies will appreciate them the more and that those who do not as yet possess them will have their interest quickened, so that when they become available they will be appraised at their true worth and not passed by.

“Young’s Literal.” By this abbreviated title students generally refer to the work more fully described as:--

“The Holy Bible, consisting of the Old and New Covenants translated according to the Letter and Idioms of the Original Languages, by Robert Young, LL.D.”

Dr. Young profoundly venerated the Scriptures in their full and verbal inspiration and the following quotation from the preface to the Revised Edition will inform the reader of what to expect in his translation.

“This inspiration extends only to the *original* text, as it came from the pens of the writers, not to any translations ever made by man, however aged, venerable or good; and only in so far as any of these adhere to the original—neither adding to nor omitting from it one particle—are they of any *real value*, for to the extent that they vary from the original, the doctrine of verbal inspiration is lost, so far as that version is concerned.

If a translation gives a *present tense* when the original gives a *past*, or a *past* when it has a *present*; a *perfect* for a *future*, or a *future* for a *perfect*; an *a* for a *the*, or a *the* for an *a*; an *imperative* for a *subjunctive*, or a *subjunctive* for an *imperative*; a *verb* for a *noun*, or a *noun* for a *verb*, it is clear that verbal inspiration is as much overlooked as if it had no existence. THE WORD OF GOD IS MADE VOID BY THE TRADITIONS OF MEN.

* * * * *

For example, in Matt. ii. 4 Herod is presented as enquiring “Where Christ” (* - This is corrected in the R.V.) should be born. But “Christ” is the surname of the man Jesus, who was quite unknown to Herod, who could not consequently ask for a person of whose existence he was ignorant. The true explanation is, that King James’ Translators omitted the definite article which occurs in the original. The correct translation is where “the Christ” should be born. Herod knew of “*the* Christ” *the* Messiah, *the* long-promised Saviour and King of the Jews, and his enquiry was, where He was to be born, whose kingdom was to be over all. The simple article clears up the whole. There are about *two thousand* instances in the New Testament where these translators have thus omitted all notice of the definite article, not to say anything of the great number of passages where they have *inserted* it, though not in the original.”

While Dr. Young's Literal Translation has many excellent features, we feel that where it fails it but manifests the practical impossibility of the most faithful to present to the English reader a strictly literal translation. For instance, after having read what Dr. Young has to say about *inserting* and *omitting* the article, or the changing of the English translation of similar words in the same context, the reader is likely, at the first, to believe that in this literal translation such defects will be conspicuous by their absence. It is not so however. Take for example John i.

Dr. Young's Literal read,

"In the beginning was the Word." Yet there is *no* article before the word "beginning".

"And the Word was with God." Yet there *is* the article before the word "God".

"And the Word was God." Yet the *order* of the words in the original is "And God was the Word".

Dr. Young therefore tacitly admits that with the best intentions a strictly literal translation becomes unreadable. In verse 3 he translates "All things through him did happen", where the verb is *egeneto*. In verse 17, however, where the same verb is used, he translates is "did come".

These remarks are not made in an unkind spirit, nor with a view to detract from the faithful labours of Dr. Young, but only to show how well-nigh impossible a task a strictly literal translation is.

There can perhaps be no greater contrast between Dr. Young's translation and that of James Moffatt, D.D., D.Lit., and we do not introduce Dr. Moffatt's translation to commend it to the general reader, but for the sake of comparing Dr. Young's Preface regarding a literal version, with Dr. Moffatt's Preface concerning the almost insuperable difficulties that make such a literal version impracticable.

Dr. Moffatt's Preface opens as follows:--

"In his essay on Protestantism, de Quincey has a characteristic paragraph upon the popular delusion that every idea and word which exists, or has existed, for any nation, ancient or modern, must have a direct interchangeable equivalent in all languages. No one who attempts to translate any part of the New Testament is likely to remain very long under such a delusion This raises one of the numerous points of difficulty that beset the translator. How far is he justified in modernizing an Oriental book? I wish only to add this caution, that a translator appears to be more dogmatic than he really is. He must come down on one side of the fence or the other."

We do not expect any of our readers would readily accept Dr. Moffatt's rendering of Eph. i. 3:--

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ Who is Christ has blessed us with every spiritual blessing."

It will be observed that "in heavenly places" is entirely omitted, without even a footnote to explain why.

Passing to other translations, we draw attention to one simply entitled “A New Translation” but known to be the work of J. N. Darby. Every reader would benefit by carefully reading the Introductory Note and Revised Preface, especially the note on the problem of rendering the Greek Aorist into English. No one who reads that paragraph will underestimate the need for extreme caution in accepting “literal” renderings as being necessarily “true” translations. On the whole J. N. Darby is a wise and careful translator and the reader will often find great help in consulting him, giving especial heed to any footnote that may be added to elucidate the matter in hand.

Another Translation that must not be omitted is,

“The New Testament in Modern Speech. An idiomatic translation into everyday English from the Text of the Resultant Greek Testament.” By the late Richard Francis Weymouth, M.A., D.Litt.

In his preface, Dr. Weymouth says:--

“The translation of the New Testament here offered English-speaking Christians is a bona fide translation made directly from the Greek and is in no sense a revision.

The plan adopted has been the following:--

1. An earnest endeavour has been made (based upon more than sixty years’ study of both the Greek and English languages, besides much further familiarity gained by continual teaching) to ascertain the exact meaning of every passage not only by the light that classical Greek throws on the language used, but also by that which the Septuagint and Hebrew Scriptures afford But in the endeavour to find in Twentieth Century English a precise equivalent for a Greek word, phrase, or sentence there are two dangers to be guarded against. There are a Scylla and a Charybdis. On the one hand there is the English of Society, on the other hand that of the utterly uneducated, each of these *patois* having its own special, though expressive, borderland which we name “slang”. It is plain that this attempt to bring out the sense of the Sacred Writings naturally as well as accurately in present-day English does not permit, except to a limited extent, the method of literal rendering—the *verbo verbum reddere* at which Horace shrugs his shoulders. Dr. Wheldon, recently Bishop of Calcutta, in the preface (p. vii.) to his masterly translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* of Aristotle, writes: “I have deliberately rejected the principle of trying to translate the same Greek word by the same word in English, and where circumstances seemed to call for it I have sometimes used two English words to represent one Greek word”;—and he is perfectly right. With a slavish literality delicate shades of meaning for the influence of interwoven thought An utterly ignorant or utterly lazy man, if possessed of a little ingenuity, can with the help of a dictionary and grammar give a word-for-word rendering, whether intelligible or not, and print ‘Translation’ on his title page.”

Dr. Weymouth refers to his pamphlet “*On Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and perfect*”, as a justification for the translation offered. As a sample of this translation, the following rendering of Rom. iii. 22-24 must suffice.

“No distinction is made, for all alike have sinned, all consciously come short of the glory of God, gaining acquittal from guilt by His free unpurchased grace through the deliverance which is found in Christ Jesus.”

Dr. Weymouth's translation was published in 1902. In 1901, another translation with which it is sometimes confused was published entitled "The Twentieth Century New Testament", a work "undertaken as a labour of love by a company of about twenty persons, members of various sections of the Christian Church; our work has extended over ten years". As an example of this version we give the passage already cited from Dr. Weymouth's translation.

" and is for all, without distinction, who believe in Him. For all have sinned, and all fall short of God's glorious ideal, but, in mercy, are being set right with Him through the deliverance which is in Christ Jesus."

As we do not wish a subject that has, perhaps, a somewhat limited appeal, to occupy undue space, we must continue this survey in our next article. In closing, we would, however, add a word lest the reader should misunderstand our attitude towards the Word of God, which is that of whole-hearted allegiance to the "words which the Holy Ghost teacheth".

The reader may ask, "Believing as you do the verbal inspiration of Scripture, using the Scriptures as you do, and finding arguments and doctrine in its every word, particle and inflection, how is it that you do not enthusiastically advocate a Literal Translation?" Our answer is, that there can be no such thing. Any one who has read a strictly literal translation of the Greek N.T. will know that, left to himself, the result will be quite unintelligible. If, unassisted, the reader can make sense out of a strictly literal word for word translation, that reader does not need it; *he knows the Greek well enough to do without it*. The assumption that the English language, or any language, can provide a medium for such a literal rendering is a fallacy—no such language exists. A translation being a necessity, we must perforce accept it with all its limitations, basing no doctrine upon any of its renderings, but basing all our teaching upon the original itself.

TRUST.

#7. The removal of Fear (Psalm lvi. 3). pp. 19, 20

It is a far cry from the story of the men of valour of I Chron. v. 20, which formed the basis of the last article of this series, to the one we are now to consider, where the historic reference over Psalm lvi., “Michtam of David, when the Philistines took him in Gath”, sends us back to I Sam. xxi. 13, to find David feigning madness, scrabbling on the doors of the gate, and letting his spittle fall down his beard.

David was “sore afraid of Achish, the king of Gath” (I Sam. xxi. 12), and Psalm lvi. gives something of the hidden history of that period of David’s perilous life. The critics have not been backward in declaring that the title of the Psalm has nothing in it corresponding with history, but in this, as in many other judgments pronounced by them, their reading has been superficial.

De Wette alleges that in the record of I Samuel, it is not stated that the Philistines laid hold of David, but *Hengstenberg* draws attention to the words “in their hands” of I Sam. xxi. 13, and others have observed the “escape” of I Sam. xxii. 1. When we remember that David, in fleeing from Saul, had put himself into the hands of Goliath’s people, we may well understand his sense of peril, even though the historic account of I Sam. xxi. makes little or nothing of it. It is the Psalm written of that period that draws the veil aside, and where the words “sore afraid” (I Sam. xxi. 12) find an exposition:

“What time I am afraid, I will trust in Thee” (Psa. lvi. 3).

This trust in God is also a trust in His Word. God had made promises to David, and, although they were separated from fulfillment by years of wandering and persecution, David knew that God would honour His word. So, in verse 3, we read of David’s trust in the Lord when he was afraid, but in verse 4, as he trusts in His word, his fear departs:

“In God I will praise His word, in God I have put my trust; I will not fear what flesh can do unto me” (Psa. lvi. 4).

The structure of the Psalm shows how these items are repeated:

Prayer offered.

A1 | 1, 2. The antagonism of the enemy: “Swallowed me up.”

B1 | 3, 4. Trust and praise: In God and His word.

Deliverance Expected.

A2 | 5, 6. The antagonism of the enemy: “My words”, “my steps”, “my soul”.

B2 | 7-11. Trust and praise: In God and His word.

Prayer answered.

A3 | 12, 13. Deliverance from death and falling.

B3 | 13. Walk before God in the light of the living.

How different do the same things appear when viewed from the standpoints of man and of God. The attitude of the Philistines and other enemies of David was alarming. The figures used are those of the “thirst for blood”; the “snuffing” of animals close on their prey. Fighting was “daily”; his words were “wrested”; his steps “marked”; they waited for his “soul”. Over and above these things David was an exile, “Thou tellest all my wanderings”. These were in the menacing things that inspired fear in David. Then, as his trust in God and in His Word took hold upon his heart and mind, these ferocious enemies were seen to be but “flesh” and “man”, and concerning both David said, “I will not fear”, “I will not be afraid”. As trust in God and in His faithfulness to His word increases, so fear of man and all that he can do decreases.

To us, as to David and the disciples of old, comes the cheering call:

“Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid” (Matt. xiv. 27).

#8. The Fixed Heart (Psa. cxii. 7).

p. 100

Among the blessings consequent upon trust in the Lord is confidence or, in the language of the Psalmist, a “fixed heart” (Psa. cxii. 7). Of the wicked it is written, “The wicked flee when no man pursueth” (Prov. xxviii. 1). “There were they in great fear, where no fear was” (Psa. liii. 5).

The Psalm that supplies us with our text is Psalm cxii., which, by reason of its alphabetical structure, is bound together with Psalm cxi., with which it should be studied.

Psa. cxi.	1-8. Eight couplets, <i>Aleph—Ayin</i> .
	9, 10. Two triplets, <i>Pe—Tau</i> .
Psa. cxii.	1-8. Eight couplets, <i>Aleph—Ayin</i> .
	9, 10. Two triplets, <i>Pe—Tau</i> .

In both Psalms there are twenty-two lines, and the alphabet in both is complete. This artificial correspondence supports a correspondence of thought and idea.

“In Psalm cxi. We have the mighty deeds, the glory, the righteousness of Jehovah, celebrated in the assembly of the upright; in Psalm cxii., the righteousness, the goodness, the blessedness of the upright, themselves, is described and enlarged upon. The one sets forth God, His work and His attributes; the other tells what are the work and character of those who fear and honour God. Thus in Psalm cxi. 3 it is said of Jehovah that ‘His righteousness standeth fast for ever’; in Psalm cxii. 3 the same thing is affirmed of the man that feareth Jehovah. In cxi. 4 it is declared of Jehovah, that ‘He is gracious and of tender compassion’, in cxii. 4 the same character is given to the upright” (*Perowne*).

It is not therefore surprising to find that the words “Stand fast” of Psalm cxi. 8, “They stand fast for ever and ever”, and “Established”, of Psalm cxii. 8, “His heart is established, he shall not be afraid” are the same in the original. There is also a parallel between the word “Sure”, in Psalm cxi. 7, and “Fixed”, in Psalm cxii. 7.

This unmoved condition is thrice repeated in Psalm cxii.:

“Surely he shall not be moved for ever” (verse 6).
“His heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord” (verse 7).
“His heart is established” (verse 8).

As we all know, evil tidings can be very unsettling, and it is in connection with such disquieting news that “Trust” gives confidence.

“He shall not be *afraid* of evil tidings. His heart is *fixed*, trusting in the Lord. His heart is *established*, he shall not be afraid.”

We discover, both from our own experience, and from Psalm lvii. 6 and 7 that it is possible for one to say “My soul is bowed down”, while at the same time confessing, “My heart is fixed”, for our fixedness of heart finds its roots and base, not in ourselves, but in the Lord, His omnipotence, His faithfulness, His care.

#9. The Directed Way (Prov. iii. 5, 6). pp. 101, 102

We have considered together a series of experiences that the Scriptures associate with a trust that clings to the Lord, and it is fitting that the last of the series should relate to the *leading* of the Lord. This need of leading is recognized by all who seek to walk worthy in a world so far removed from the ways and will of God as it is to-day.

The passage that provides us with a message concerning the leading of the Lord and its relation to whole hearted trust is found in the book of Proverbs:

“Trust in the Lord with all thine heart;
And lean not unto thine own understanding.
In all thy ways acknowledge Him,
And He shall direct thy paths” (Prov. iii. 5, 6).

There is help for the reader in the correspondence of *thought* and *idea* that constitutes Hebrew poetry. “Trust” is amplified by the word “acknowledge” and “lean” is contrasted with His “direction”.

The word translated “acknowledge” means to know in the sense of “recognizing” rather than acknowledging in the sense of “confessing”. Trust clings to One that is

known, One that is recognized, and the exhortation is to perceive and recognize, know and admit, the hand of the Lord in all our ways. Instead of following the inclination of our own hearts and leaning to our own understanding in order to discover for ourselves a plain path for our feet, those who trust in the Lord with all their heart find that the Lord Himself goes before them, leveling their path and marking it off from all that would side-track them.

Two aspects of this directing of our path are put before us, and both are profitable. First, the word translated “direct”. In the original the word means “straight” and readers will remember “The book of Jasher” (Josh. x. 13) which uses the word Jasher, “Straight”, or “Upright”, as a proper noun. When the word is used of a “Way” it is referred to as a way in which the people “shall not stumble” (Jer. xxxi. 9), which suggests evenness and the absence of obstacles. So, in Isa. xl., the command, “Make straight in the desert a highway for our God”, is followed by a description of the result of such a work in which it is stated that every valley is to be exalted, and every mountain and hill is to be made low; crooked places shall be made straight and rough places plain (Isa. xl. 3, 4). Again, speaking of Cyrus, Isa. xlv. 2 says, “I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight”, which is repeated in verse 13, in slightly different form, but, in the original, using the same word, “I will direct all his ways”.

While the passage before us (Prov. iii. 5, 6) turns our thoughts away from self, and wholly to the Lord, it must not be supposed that the leading of the Lord is purely mechanical, and that there is no intelligent participation on our part. The same book of Proverbs tells us that “The integrity of the upright shall guide them” (Prov. xi. 3), that is, that the Lord who leads them does so *in harmony* with the believer’s true desires after righteousness of those who are justified by faith, with the leading of the Lord. Yet further, while we are forbidden to lean to our own understanding, and encouraged to trust in the Lord with all our heart, that does not mean the blotting out of intelligent following, for Prov. xv. 19 and 21 says:

“The way of the righteous is made plain” and
“A man of understanding walketh uprightly”,

where the word translated “uprightly” is the same that is used in Prov. iii. 6, “He shall direct”.

Secondly, the fact that the Septuagint translates the word *yashar*, “direct”, by *orthotomeo*, “rightly divide”, as in II Tim. ii. 15, suggests that where we most need guidance is at the fork in the road. Which way shall we turn? Shall we take the right hand, or shall we turn to the left? Here, if anywhere, Prov. iii. 5, 6 most fully applies. Sometimes we can answer our own prayer for guidance by asking ourselves, as we ponder the path of our feet, “Can I acknowledge the Lord if I take this particular turning on life’s journey?” If there is any doubt in the matter, it is morally certain that however much we may “feel led” we shall not be justified in taking the step. “Straight” paths are paths that are under the direction of a “righteous” God, and are followed by “straight” people, who, though sinners by nature, and saved without works, recognize the fact that he who is righteous should do righteousness (I John ii. 29; iii. 7, 10), or, as the

Shepherd Psalm puts it, “He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name’s sake” (Psa. xxiii. 3).

Truth for the Times.

*(Being the substance of the first of two addresses
given by the Principal at a Scottish Conference
held in Glasgow on 21st September, 1946).*

#1. The Prison Epistles are and teach “The Truth”. pp. 3 - 7

The previous speaker made it clear to us that in the Acts of the Apostles the movement is from the Jew to the Gentile; from the kingdom to the church; from the fulfillment of O.T. prophecy to the revelation of a secret portion of the purpose of the ages, and that the Scriptures which reveal this secret or “mystery”, as it is called, are the “prison” epistles of Paul; epistles that were written after Acts xxviii., when the Jew was set aside, and the salvation of God “sent”, for the first time, to the Gentile, independently of Israel.

In the present address we are concerned with the question of “Truth”. That being established, we hope in a second address to see how these “prison epistles” are indeed “Truth for the Times”.

The epistles, written by Paul, that bear the mark of having been written in a Roman prison, are these: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and II Timothy. In Philippians (Phil. i. 19, 24, 25) and in Philemon (verse 22) the Apostle is confident that he will be both spared and liberated for further service, but in II Timothy he knows that his end has come. These five epistles constitute the scriptural basis for the Church of the Mystery, and while Philemon is very precious evidence of the gracious spirit of the Apostle and the nature of the truth he taught, it does not contribute anything in the way of a revelation of truth, and for the present purpose can be omitted. We therefore usually speak of “The four prison epistles”.

That this reference to “prison” is no mere accident is manifest, for in Eph. iii. Paul definitely associates his imprisonment with the dispensation of the grace of God to the Gentile, a claim which is supported and enforced in one way or another in each of these epistles.

Now our first object is to establish that these four epistles are “truth”, and this we can do in exactly the same way as we establish any part of Scripture.

It would be out of place in a meeting of this character to spend precious time discussing the question of canonicity, therefore let it suffice to say that from the earliest times these epistles have been well-nigh universally accepted as part of the inspired Scriptures, and objections that could be brought against any one of them could be brought against any other book in the N.T., thus rendering all study fruitless. There are other and more fruitful ways of demonstrating the truth of any portion of the Scriptures: these we will endeavour to compress into as brief a compass as is consistent with clarity.

First.—Any one book of the Bible is a part of the whole, and by its own fitness as well as by its individual structure it claims that it does form an integral part of Holy Scripture. Now, every reader of the Acts of the Apostles is conscious that something is necessary to carry the revelation of truth on to its goal; something that will bridge the gap made by the non-repentance of Israel and their present “lo-ammi” condition. Previous to Israel’s defection believing Gentiles were told that their dispensational position was as wild olives, graft, contrary to nature, into the olive tree of Israel, and that, humanly speaking, their inclusion at that time was for the purpose of provoking Israel to emulation. When however Israel failed, and their hope was temporarily suspended, the circumstances demanded either that nothing but confusion and darkness must be the portion of the believer during the ensuing two thousand years of Israel’s blindness, or, that God in His wisdom and grace had provided against such a foreseen contingency, and, when the moment arrived, was ready to make known further phases of His great purpose that should deal particularly with the Gentile believer as separated from Israel.

This, we know, is what is claimed by the Apostle in Eph. iii. 1-13 & in Col. i. 23-27. In the latter passage Paul says that the mystery of which he was the minister “completes the word of God” (Col. i. 25). The same Greek word is used in Col. iv. 17 where “fulfil” once again means “complete”, and is so translated in the phrase “complete in Him”, which occurs in Col. ii. 10 and iv. 12.

Here then is one evidence that these prison epistles are “The Truth”. They fit into their appointed place in all scripture, fully recognizing the dispensational change that the dismissal of the Jew must have made.

Secondly.—Not only is there a most evident fitness in this group of epistles in relation to the rest of Scripture—for they complete the record of that mighty purpose that embraces things in heaven and things on earth—but, when segregated and considered as a group by themselves, this same fitness and perfect correspondence is still observable. One of the characteristic features of any inspired book of the Bible is its literary structure. This has to be seen to be fully appreciated, but most readers of *The Berean Expositor* are acquainted with the phenomenon. It would therefore be a point against their inspiration were these four prison epistles not to exhibit this characteristic. That they do cannot be fully demonstrated now, but their detailed structures will be found set out in those of our writings that purport to give them an exposition; all that we can do now is to present the simplest analysis.

Ephesians.—This epistle is pivoted on the word “worthy” that comes in chapter iv. 1, and balances seven sections of doctrine with seven sections of practice: we indicate one such pair now:

DOCTRINE.—The temple “fitly framed together” (Eph. ii. 21).

PRACTICE.—The body “fitly joined together” (Eph. iv. 16).

What is true of these two corresponding sections is true of the whole seven.

Philippians.—

Fellowship in the gospel from the beginning (Phil. i. 3-26; iv. 11-20).
Conversation here, and there (Phil. i. 27 - ii. 5; iii. 20 - iv. 10).
Sevenfold humiliation of Christ, and loss of Paul (Phil. ii. 6-11; iii. 14-19).
Examples of Paul, Timothy and Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 17-30).

Colossians.—This epistle is built round the central section which is headed with the word “Beware” (Col. ii. 4-23). We exhibit one pair of correspondencies only here.

G | i. 15, 16. Creator, Image.
H | i. 20. Heaven and earth.
I | i. 17, 18. Christ pre-eminent.
J | i. 20. Peace. Forgiveness.
K | i. 22. Holy, blameless.
G | iii. 10. Created, Image.
H | iii. 11. Jew and Greek.
I | iii. 11. Christ all and in all.
J | iii. 13, 15. Peace. Forgive.
K | iii. 9, 12. Put off, put on. Holy.

The disposition of the subject-matter would need to be slightly re-arranged if the literary form were our object: the above however is sufficient to demonstrate the balance of parts.

II Timothy.—Here we have three pairs of correspondencies:

- (1) Paul and his message forsaken (II Tim. i. 8-18; iv. 9-18).
- (2) The good Soldier. The good fight. The Crown (II Tim. ii. 1-13; iii. 10 - iv. 8).
- (3) Approved (*dokimos*): Disapproved (*adokimos*) (II Tim. ii. 14-26; iii. 1-9).

This is not all. Not only has each epistle its own individual structure, but the four taken together make an indissoluble whole.

The Prison Epistles.

A EPHESIANS.	The dispensation (iii. 2 and 9 R.V.); Mystery (iii. 3).
Seated	The Church which is His Body (i. 22, 23).
together.	The fullness (i. 23; iv. 10); Christ the Head (i. 22).
	Principalities and Powers (i. 21).
B PHILIPPIANS.	Try the things that differ (i. 21).
The Prize.	Strive (i. 27); Press towards the mark (iii. 14).
	Prize (iii. 14); Depart (i. 23); Offered (ii. 17).
A COLOSSIANS.	Dispensation (i. 25); Mystery (i. 26).
Complete	The Church which is His Body (i. 24).
in Him.	Fullness (i. 19); Christ the Head (ii. 19).
	Principalities and Power (i. 16; ii. 10).
B II TIMOTHY.	Rightly dividing the word of truth (ii. 15).
The Crown.	Strive (ii. 5); Course finished (iv. 7).
	Crown (iv. 8); Depart (iv. 6); Offered (iv. 6).

Here it will be seen that these epistles deal with both sides of the Christian revelation. They reveal the doctrine and the standing of the church in grace, they also urge the believer to fruitful service. They speak of salvation by grace without works, but they also speak of a prize and a crown. They present, in themselves, a complete system of doctrine and practice, entirely and completely filling up the dispensation gap caused by the setting aside of Israel, and, with Israel, the suspension of the covenants and promises made unto the fathers.

Thirdly.—In the third place, we can allow these epistles to speak for themselves, and judge by what they say whether they are “the truth”. They range themselves on the side of truth as opposed to the lie, and on the side of light as over against darkness. Moral living is inculcated, and responsibility goes hand in hand with grace (Eph. i. 3; iv. 21, 25; vi. 14; v. 4-8; Col. iii. 23-25). Everywhere Christ is honoured as Lord, and the great fundamental doctrines affirmed. Let us note a few references that will show the place that fundamental truth occupies in them.

(1) *The inspiration of all Scripture.*—This fundamental doctrine is affirmed in them in language that cannot be surpassed in any other part of Scripture (II Tim. iii. 16).

(2) *The Deity of Christ.*—Such passages as Phil. ii. 6-11, and Col. i. 15-19 are sufficient evidence for their attitude to this most vital doctrine.

(3) *Redemption by blood.*—No part of Scripture reaches such spiritual heights as Ephesians and Colossians, yet it is in these epistles that redemption by the shedding of blood is emphasized (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14).

(4) *Justification by faith without works.*—The epistle to the Romans is confessedly *the* epistle to which we turn for this great doctrine of the gospel, but nowhere can there be found a more concise summary of its essential features than is compressed in the confession of Phil. iii. 7-9.

(5) *Sanctification*, both in its basic and progressive phases, is taught in them (Eph. i. 4; Col. i. 22; Eph. v. 25-27).

(6) *Salvation by grace through faith* (Eph. ii. 8-10).—Seeing that they are addressed to a company of saved people, and intended to lead them on the higher ground and into a new dispensation, it would not have been surprising if the gospel itself had not been mentioned. Yet in each of the four, the gospel finds a prominent place (Eph. i. 13; ii. 8-10; iii. 6; vi. 19; Phil. i. 5, 17, 27; Col. i. 5, 23; II Tim. i. 8, 10; ii. 8).

(7) *The pre-eminence of Christ (Apart from His essential Deity).*—This is perhaps the most marked of any peculiarity of these great epistles, namely, the glory, the pre-eminence, the position, “far above all”, that is ascribed to the Saviour (Eph. i. 20-23; iv. 9, 10; Col. iii. 11).

By every test therefore we are safe in making the claim, that those who proclaim the message found in these four epistles will be proclaiming “The Truth”. Our next proposition is that these epistles do not only contain “Truth”, but that they are “The Truth for the times”. This we will next consider.

#2. The Prison Epistles teach “Truth for the times”. pp. 27 - 31

In the first address we sought to establish the four great “prison” epistles as epistles of “truth”, taking their place with all Scripture, and given by inspiration of God. We submitted these epistles to three forms of examination:

- (1) Their relationship with the rest of Scripture.
- (2) Their inter-relationship as exhibited by Structure.
- (3) Their response to a seven-fold Doctrinal test.

We now pass to the second part of our proposition; that these epistles are not only epistles of inspired truth, but that they are “Truth for the times”. Now, in such a claim there is a challenge. First, it supposes that there can be “truth” in God’s word that is not “Truth for the times”. Secondly, that such a discrimination is proper and scriptural, and thirdly, that these four epistles minister truth for the present dispensation, as no other part of Scripture can.

Let us take these three divisions of our subject and examine them separately in the light of all Scripture.

First. Can there be “truth” that is true at one time and not true at another? In one sense, any word that God has said is eternally, unalterably, true. The law given through Moses is as true as to-day as when it was first instituted. Yet, not one of those who read these words has ever kept those laws, which are true, nor has he any intention of doing so. The law of Moses contains commands that were not only enjoined upon the people, but accompanied by severe penalties for non-observance. There is a series of commands accompanied by the threat for disobedience; that “He shall be cut off from his people”. Such are the rite of circumcision (Gen. xvii. 14); the eating of leaven during the days of unleavened bread (Exod. xii. 15); the keeping of the sabbath (Exod. xxxi. 14); the keeping of the day of atonement (Lev. xxiii. 29); the observance of the Passover (Numb. ix. 13); the purification upon touching a dead body (Numb. xix. 13, 20). Now either these passages are the truth of God, or they are not. We believe that they are truth, the words of Moses being endorsed by the Saviour Himself (Luke xxiv. 27; John v. 46, 47). Here therefore are words of truth, recognized as truth by believers, who nevertheless agree that they have not obeyed them, and do not intend to obey them, yet they have not suffered the penalties involved, nor do they expect to. Indeed, in the self-same Bible that enjoins, with such solemnity, circumcision or the keeping of the Sabbath day, we also read, “If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing ye

are fallen from grace” (Gal. v. 2 and 4). “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days” (Col. ii. 16).

How are we to reconcile these, apparently, conflicting statements? You must be circumcised; you must not be circumcised. You must keep the Sabbath day; you should not keep the Sabbath day. You will be cut off if you fail to observe these commandments; you will fall from grace if you do. Unless the whole of the revelation of God is to be reduced to a mass of contradictions, surely there is a key provided that will give an honourable and satisfying solution of the difficulty. There is, and that key is implied in the term “Truth for the times”. We therefore arrive at the next inquiry.

Secondly. Such a discrimination between one scripture and another is both proper and scriptural. When the Apostle enjoined Timothy “rightly to divide the word of truth”, or when he urged the Philippians to “approve things that are excellent”, or, as the margin indicates, to “try the things that differ”, he had this principle of interpretation in view. When the Apostle distinguishes between Jew and Gentile; between kingdom and church; between earthly promises and heavenly places; between the Bride and the Body; between the citizenship of the New Jerusalem and the seating together of some “in heavenly places”; each portion of scripture is recognized as “truth”, but not every portion referred to is “Truth for the times”.

This principle of discrimination is called “dispensational truth”, simply because all these differences are the result of changes in the developing purpose of God. The word “dispensation” is sometimes confused with the word “age”, but, while a dispensation must occupy a period of time, it is of itself to be distinguished from a period of time, inasmuch as two or more dispensations can run together. Paul declares that for preaching the gospel a “dispensation” had been given to him (I Cor. ix. 17), but, by consulting Gal. ii. 7, we discover that the gospel of the uncircumcision had been committed to Paul as the gospel of the circumcision had been committed to Peter; consequently two dispensations, the one directed to the Gentile, the other to the Circumcision (Gal. ii. 8), were in operation at the same time, and recognized as such by the Apostles (Gal. ii. 9).

In the Greek the word “dispensation” is *oikonomia*, and is derived from *oikonomos*, “steward” (Luke xii. 42; xvi. 1, 3, 8; I Cor. iv. 1, 2; Titus i. 7; I Pet. iv. 10); “chamberlain” (Rom. xvi. 23); and “governor” (Gal. iv. 2). The word is composed of *oikos* “a house”, and *nemo* “to deal out, distribute, dispense”. The word has entered into English in the form “economy”, and is used in such expressions as “political economy”, “domestic economy”, “economics”, as well as in the more popular meaning of wise and thrifty spending of money.

After Israel had been set aside, as recorded in Acts xxviii., we find Paul still a prisoner at Rome, but free to receive all who would come to him, and in that condition he remained for two years. From that prison he wrote four epistles, each indelibly bearing the marks of his imprisonment in the body of the epistle. These four epistles are Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Subsequently, he wrote the second

epistle to Timothy, in which he again refers to the fact and significance of his imprisonment.

“I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward” (Eph. iii. 1, 2).
“I am an ambassador in bonds” (Eph. vi. 20).

These words make it clear that Paul, as the prisoner, had a special stewardship regarding the Gentiles, and when we read further we find that this stewardship relates to “a mystery” revealed for the first time to men through Paul, and that it “completes” the Word of God (Eph. iii. 3-11; Col. i. 23-27). It is of the essence of a mystery that it should be “hid” until the time arrives for it to be revealed, and these scriptures, cited above, show that this mystery was “hid in God”, “hid from ages and from generations” but has “now” been made manifest through the exclusive ministry of Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ.

While the fundamental doctrines of Scripture regarding sin and salvation remain unchanged, many features that are distinctive and peculiar to the dispensation demand attention. Let us acquaint ourselves with some of them.

(1) *A distinctive and peculiar sphere of blessing.*

“In heavenly places” (Eph. i. 3).

While “heaven” and “heavenly” are terms found throughout the N.T., the expression *en tois epouraniois*, “in heavenly places”, is peculiar to Ephesians. It occurs five times in that epistle, namely in chapters i. 3, 20, ii. 6, and vi. 12. These five occurrences provide us with all that we can know at present concerning this sphere of blessing. We can add Eph. iv. 10 which reveals that Christ ascended up “far above all heavens”, and consequently we can perceive something of the high glory that pertains to the position of those who are said to be “seated together” there.

(2) *A distinct period when chosen.*

“Chosen in Him *before* the foundation of the world” (Eph. i. 4).

In the Gospels, Epistles, and the Revelation, we find the expression “from” or “since” the foundation of the world (Matt. xiii. 35; Heb. iv. 3; Rev. xvii. 8), but never do we read the words “before the foundation of the world” in connection with the redeemed, except in this one place. Where we meet with this same phrase elsewhere, the reference is exclusively to Christ. In John xvii. 24, we learn that Christ was “loved” before the foundation of the world, and in I Pet. i. 20, that He was foreordained as the Lamb “without blemish and without spot” before the foundation of the world, and, wonder of wonders, these two things are said to be true of the believer also (Eph. i. 3-5): “in love”; “holy and without blame”.

The word translated “foundation” in these passages is not *themelion*, the Greek word for the foundation of a building (Eph. ii. 20), but *katabole*, which, etymologically, means “A throwing down”, even as the verb *kataballo* is translated “cast down” (II Cor. iv. 9;

Rev. xii. 10). This is the consistent meaning of the word as used in the LXX, of which II Sam. xx. 15 is an example. This period, “before the overthrow” of the world, takes us back to before Gen. i. 2, when the earth became without form and void.

Here therefore are two links with the past that are peculiar to this dispensation. (a) A sphere of blessing that is associated with the heavens, before the present “firmament” was arranged; (b) A time period that goes back before the overthrow of the world, which, we find by comparing with other scriptures, reveals a judgment upon a fall that took place long before man.

(3) *A distinctive dispensation and steward.*

Paul claims to be the one to whom the revelation of the mystery was made known, and that through him alone must all receive enlightenment as to it. This dispensation is peculiarly Gentile in its approach, and the fact is further emphasized by the absence of reference to the Jew, to Abraham, to “The Fathers” or to the New Covenant in any of the “prison” epistles. Unlike the early epistles of Paul, which abound in references to the O.T. scriptures, such references in these later epistles are few and far between, and have no reference to the special revelation of the mystery. Paul calls the truth there elaborated “The *unsearchable* riches of Christ”. The absence of references to the O.T. Scriptures is not because Paul had ceased to believe them (for in II Tim. iii. 16 we have the fullest testimony to their inspiration that the Scriptures contain), but to the simple fact that he was dealing with a “mystery”, something hitherto “hid”, and something which he himself received by “revelation” (Eph. iii. 1-13).

(4) *A distinctive calling. The Body, not the Bride.*

The company of believers who are blessed under the terms of the dispensation of the mystery is called “The church which is His body, the fullness of Him, that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 22, 23). This must not be confused with the references to the body in I Cor. xii., which is clearly stated to be concerned with “spiritual gifts”, “miracles, healings, etc.” Moreover, this church is spoken of as “the perfect *man*” (Eph. iv. 13), the word used for man being the Greek *aner*, which is translated in Eph. v. 22, 23, 24 and 25 by the word “husband”. This fact alone makes it impossible that the church which is to become the perfect MAN, can at the same time be the “BRIDE, the Lamb’s WIFE”.

Of this company, the Body, Christ is the Head, and every member is on perfect equality with fellow-members (Eph. iii. 6). The church of the One Body, where “Christ is all and in all”, foreshadows the new creation where, in the consummation of the ages, God will be all in all.

Associated with these four distinctive features—sphere, period, dispensation and calling—are many important subsidiary doctrines. There are things that are conspicuous by their absence, as, for example, miraculous gifts, covenants, and ordinances. All these and more, must be weighed in the balances of the sanctuary if an all-round comprehension of the glory of this high calling is to be acquired. This conference will, however, have attained its object if the interest of believers has been aroused and

quickened, and, above all things, if the *Berean* spirit, that searches to see if these things are so, is emulated.

Truth in the Balance.

#5. Root and Fruit.

“The root of the righteous yieldeth fruit” (Prov. xii. 12).

pp. 17 - 19

“Doctrine and Practice”, which we considered in the preceding study of this series, are related to one another as “root” is to “fruit”. This is an analogy that all can appreciate, and one that is much used in Scripture. Both in the material and in the spiritual world, the relationship of root to fruit is that of balance and correspondence, and we must consider this in the series before us. The Book of Proverbs contains a passage which we might well choose as our text.

“The root of the righteous yieldeth fruit” (Prov. xii. 12).

In the same chapter we have the assertion that “The root of the righteous shall not be moved” (Prov. xii. 3). This is equivalent to the doctrine of Prov. x. 30, “The righteous shall never be removed”, and, as a result, “the root of the righteous yieldeth fruit”. There is no actual word for “fruit” in this passage, but the Hebrew verb *nathan*, “to give”, is often used in the sense of yielding fruit or increase, as for example:

“When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength”
(Gen. iv. 12).

“The land shall yield her fruit” (Lev. xxv. 19).

In different connections, this principle is frequently enunciated: nor is it confined to any one part of the O.T., being used alike in Law, Prophets and Psalms. This is brought out in the following passage:

“The remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall yet again take root downward, and bear fruit upward” (II Kings xix. 30).

Those of our readers who have had experience of fruit growing will know that, on occasion, it may be necessary to cut away the deep descending tap root in order to induce the tree to make less wood and more fruit. With this knowledge a superficial reading of II Kings xix. 30 might lead to the conclusion that one must not take these figures too literally. But for nearly forty years we have devoted ourselves to the patient investigation of the Scriptures, and it is our joyful testimony that never have we found it necessary to alter one word in order to bring it into line with truth. So here the word translated “downward” is the adverb *mattah*, which is rendered in the A.V., “beneath”, “underneath”, “very low”, “under”, “less”, “down” and “downward”. The verb from which this adverb is derived is *natah*, “To spread”, or “To stretch forth”, as a hand, as a tent. “He spread his tent” (Gen. xxxiii. 19). “Thou stretchest out thy right hand” (Exod. xv. 12). So we see that the tree contemplated in II Kings xix. 30 was to take root downward, but in the sense of *spreading out* underneath the soil, as all fruit bearing trees do.

The primary meaning of the word that gives us “upward” (*le-malah*) is “to ascend”. Here there is definite and intentional correspondence between the firm, spreading, root underneath, and the blossom and fruit that appears above, and what is true in the realm of nature is true also in the realm of grace.

Further association of root and fruit is found in such a passages as,

“Their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust” (Isa. v. 24).

The earlier verses of this chapter have likened Israel to a carefully tended vine:

“For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah His pleasant plant; and He looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry” (Isa. v. 7).

Again, Hosea uses the figure,

“Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit” (Hosea ix. 16).

One of the complaints made against Israel by Hosea was, “Israel is an empty vine, he brought forth fruit unto himself” (Hosea x. 1).

To complete our survey we now turn to the N.T. Here is our Lord’s own statement:

“Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them” (Matt. vii. 15-20).

This reiteration of the truth is emphasized by the Apostle in Romans, “If the root be holy, so are the branches” (Rom. xi. 16).

Both in the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians, the Apostle speaks of the rooting of the believer:

“Being rooted and grounded in love” (Eph. iii. 17).

“Rooted and built up in Him” (Col. ii. 7).

and from this root, and this blessed soil, the “fruit” of the Spirit or (the Light) was expected to grow (Eph. v. 9), and the “fruits” of righteousness to form (Phil. i. 11), and be “brought forth (Col. i. 6). Paul sought fruit as a result of his sowing and planting (Rom. i. 13), and it was as such that he looked upon the offering made by the Gentile church to the poor saints at Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 28); it was also his prayer for the Colossians, who had been “rooted” in Christ, that they should be “fruitful in every good work” (Col. i. 10).

Here then is truth in the balance. If we have believed in Christ, and become partakers of His rich grace, what a root-hold we have, and hence, what corresponding fruit should we not bear! Alas, sometimes we bring forth fruit simply for ourselves, and so are really empty (Hosea x. 1), whereas we should “bring forth fruit unto God” (Rom. vii. 4). Patience is needed (Luke viii. 15), continued fellowship (John xv. 4), and pruning (John xv. 2). Not only did the Lord speak of “fruit”, but also of “more fruit”, “much fruit”, and fruit that should “remain” (John xv. 2, 5, 16).

#6. The place of “works” before and after salvation. pp. 54 - 57

At the close of the preceding article we quoted part of the prayer of Col. i. 10: “Being fruitful in every good work.” Following up this thought of fruit, let us now consider, as a further example of truth in the balance, the way in which the Apostle deals with “works”, setting them aside when considered as factors in our salvation, but praying for their manifestation after salvation, as “fruit” giving evidence of a healthy “root” beneath.

Here, then, are some of the statements that show how resolutely and unreservedly the Apostle sets works aside, before salvation.

The first is from Rom. iii., and represents the conclusion of the argument that fills the three opening chapters of Romans:

“Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law” (Rom. iii. 27, 28).

Again, in the following chapter, we read:

“If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. iv. 2-7).

It is evident that Paul’s conception of “grace” will not permit the slightest suggestion of “a reward that is a debt”. This point is brought out very clearly in Rom. xi. Speaking of the remnant according to the election of grace, he says:

“And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work” (Rom. xi. 6).

The Apostle is equally emphatic on this aspect of truth in the smaller, but parallel epistle to the Galatians:

“Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. ii. 16).

What reiteration we have here. “Works of the law works of the law works of the law”—and these words are part of Paul’s personal testimony to Peter and the assembly at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11-21).

When he learns that the Galatians had been persuaded to attempt to make their salvation secure by the practice of circumcision, and the observance of “weak and beggarly elements”, the Apostle tells them that it looks as though someone must have “bewitched” them.

“This only would I learn of you, Received ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” (Gal. iii. 2, 3).

Notice that the Apostle places “works” and “flesh” together here, and “faith” and “spirit”.

So comprehensive is the law, and so weak is the flesh, that the Apostle can say without need for proviso or exception: “For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse” (Gal. iii. 10), and anyone who ponders the reason given in the remainder of the verse will be compelled to agree.

Turning to the epistles of the Mystery, the Apostle makes two clear statements that settle the matter once and for all:

“For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works lest any man should boast” (Eph. ii. 8, 9).

“Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began” (II Tim. i. 9).

These two passages from the prison epistles are supplemented by one from Titus:

“Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us” (Titus iii. 5).

Coming now to the other side of the question, are there any “works” that can be placed in the other scale? There are, and until we see both sides, our conception of the truth will be unbalanced and distorted. We need not go outside this same chapter of Titus for an example of balance. If in verse 5 the Apostle says “Not by works”, he follows with this statement in verse 8:

“This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works” (Titus iii. 8).

In fact, the structure of the whole epistle is written round this theme of “good works”. If no works are permitted by the Apostle before salvation, he insists upon their presence after.

“They profess that they know God; but in works they deny Him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate” (Titus i. 16).

The moment one speaks of “profession”, “good works” are to be expected. So, to Titus himself, the teacher of the Church, the Apostle writes:

“In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, which cannot be condemned” (Titus ii. 7, 8).

What the Apostle looked for in the teacher, the “pattern”, he also looked for in those who had believed, and were taught.

Later on in the chapter he writes:

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Titus ii. 13, 14).

Coming back to Eph. ii., the reader may remember that we only partly quoted from verses 8 to 10. After declaring that salvation is by grace and not of works, Paul immediately proceeds to add: “For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus *unto* good works” (Eph. ii. 10). The Apostle who so ruthlessly sets aside “works” as a means to salvation, insists upon good works as a manifestation that salvation is indeed a *possession* and not merely a *profession*.

We have another example of these two aspects of “works” in II Timothy. There, in the first chapter, “works” are repudiated as we have already seen (verse 9), but there are five passages further on where “works” are looked for as a normal result of salvation. We also read that Paul remembered with thanksgiving the “work of faith” of the Thessalonians (I Thess. i. 3), and prayed that they might be established in “every good word and work” (II Thess. ii. 17). So again we find that perfect balance that gives us the complete truth.

**#7. The scriptural relationship of the epistles of Paul
and the epistle of James considered
in preparation for the study of James ii.,
and its bearing upon justification by faith.
pp. 93 - 97**

When quoting the Apostle in the preceding article, there were almost as many occurrences of the words “justified” or “righteousness” as there were of the word we were examining, namely “works”. Had we attempted any notice of this at the time, it would have confused the issues, but now we turn to the matter of justification, for that also is a Truth in the Balance.

It is well known that Paul, when he uses Abraham as an example of justification by faith, goes to Gen. xv., where Abraham is said to have believed God, and where his faith had been counted for righteousness. Paul rightly stresses the fact that, there, in Gen. xv., “works” were inadmissible. But there is another side to this truth, and one, alas, which some of the best have misinterpreted. This other side is found in the epistle of James. It is false to teach that James propounded one way of justification and Paul another. Unless we maintain that the fruit on a tree “contradicts” the root in the soil, we cannot contend that the teaching of James contradicts the teaching of Paul. James stress the “fruit” aspect, the “good works”, whereas in Rom. i.-v. Paul emphasizes the “root” aspect and leaves the fruit for subsequent teaching.

The reader is probably aware that there are two very divergent points of view regarding the epistle of James. Luther’s designation of it as “an epistle of straw” on account of its alleged contradiction of Paul’s doctrine of justification by faith, is probably known to all readers, but few cite the famous dictum in its context, or remind the reader of the atmosphere of conflict in which the words were uttered. Here it is:

“St. John’s Gospel and first Epistle, the Epistles of St. Paul, especially those to the Romans, Galatians and Ephesians, these are the books which set Christ before you, and teach you every necessary thing for you to believe, though you never hear of any other book or doctrine. Therefore the Epistle of James is quite an epistle of straw *by the side of these*, for it has no true Evangelical character.”

Seen in its context, this reference to James as *an epistle of straw* can be apprized at its true worth. The expression is not used positively, but in comparison with those books of the N.T. which are “Evangelical” in purpose and which “set Christ before” the reader. We must remember that when Luther uttered these words he was engaged in his fight for justification by faith without works, and knew that the epistle of James had been perverted from its original intention, and had become the main prop of those who combated Luther’s distinctive doctrine. In such an atmosphere, the best of men are liable to exaggeration, if only to counterbalance the exaggeration of their opponents.

While we must remember that James write to the “twelve tribes scattered abroad”, he wrote to them not as Jews, but as believers. He does not “emphasize his physical kinship with Christ” (as one writer—whose name we withhold—says) but, like Paul, calls himself, “A servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (James i. 1) and speaks of Christ as “Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory” (James ii. 1). That James addressed *Christian* Jews is manifest, for they had been “begotten by the word of truth” (Jas. i. 18), and had been called by “that worthy name” (James ii. 7). The same writer who falsely accused James of “emphasizing his physical kinship with Christ” also says that James “drags the nation down into the sphere of the flesh, thus preparing the way for their repudiation by God”. We wonder if there is extant a worse example of the effect of prejudice than this, written, not in ignorance, but as a preparatory note to an examination or translation of the epistle of James from the original. One would conclude that Paul had never written such words as: “Faith which worketh by love”, or “the obedience of faith”. James says that those who have “respect of persons”, who are “partial in themselves”, blaspheme the worthy name by which they are called. Is that a doctrine that “drags down into the sphere of the flesh”? Does not Paul urge obedience to a master that the name of God and His doctrine be not blasphemed? (I Tim. vi. 1). Does he not speak against “partiality”? Does he not speak scathingly of “respect of persons”?

James says:

“If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well” (ii. 8).

“So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty” (ii. 12).

Paul says:

“Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Gal. v. 13, 14).

Can anyone detect the slightest divergence here? Does one lead up and the other drag down?

James supports his argument by saying:

“For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty” (James ii. 10-13).

Paul adopts the same method:

“Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law” (Rom. xiii. 8-10).

The argument that would deduce from James ii. 10-12 that James taught justification by the works of law, must deduce the same from Rom. xiii. 8-10 which, as Euclid says, "is absurd". Further, it has been repeatedly observed by students, that the teaching of the epistle of James is an application of the Sermon on the Mount. Shall we say that anyone, writing to the dispersion during the Pentecostal dispensation, was "thus preparing the way for their repudiation by God"? The question seems too fantastic for consideration, yet this is accepted by some as the last word on the subject!

The teaching of James.	The teaching of the Lord. (Matthew).
"My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations" (i. 2).	"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven" (v. 11, 12).
"Let patience have her perfect work" (i. 4).	"Be ye therefore perfect" (v. 48).
"What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, and have not works, can that faith save him?" (ii. 14, R.V.).	"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven" (vii. 21).
"Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God" (IV. 4).	"No man can serve two masters" (vi. 24).
"Your riches are corrupted, and your garments moth-eaten" (v. 2).	"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal" (vi. 19).
"But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation" (v. 12).	"But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by earth; for it is His footstool but let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (v. 34-37).

These parallels lie on the surface: doubtless, the earnest student could double their number.

Rightly understood, the Sermon on the Mount is, to believers of the Kingdom, what Philippians is to the dispensation of the Mystery, Hebrews, to the "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling", and James, to the dispersion during the Pentecostal administration.

We have found that there is a correspondence between the Sermon on the Mount and James; let us once more put truth into the balance, and see the correspondence that exists between Philippians and the Sermon on the Mount.

Philippians.	Matthew v. - vii.
"Look not every man on his own things but every man also on the things of others" (ii. 4).	"Seek ye first the kingdom of God" (vi. 33).
"Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife What then? Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (i. 15, 18).	"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for My name's sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad" (v. 11, 12).
"Let us therefore, as many as would be perfect, be thus minded" (iii. 15).	"Be ye therefore perfect" (v. 48).

“That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke” (ii. 15).	“Love your enemies that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven” (v. 44, 45).
“Shine ye (A.V. margin) as lights in the world” (ii. 15).	“Let your light so shine before men” (v. 16).
“Let your moderation (yieldingness) be known unto all men” (iv. 5).	“Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain” (v. 41).
“Be careful (<i>merimnao</i>) for nothing” (iv. 6).	“Take no thought (<i>merimnao</i>) for your life” (vi. 25).
“Many walk whose end is destruction (<i>apoleia</i>)” (iii. 18, 19).	“Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction (<i>apoleia</i>)” (vii. 13).
“If there be any virtue, if there be any praise, impute these things” (iv. 8).	“Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye?” (vii. 3).

The key that unlocks the Sermon on the Mount, the epistle to the Philippians, and the epistle of James, together with the epistle to the Hebrews, and the central teaching of the epistle to the Colossians, is the word “perfect”. No one who has comprehended the distinctive teaching of this word could confuse James’ teaching with Paul’s basic teaching of justification by faith, and whoever approaches James not thus equipped, will fumble on the threshold and mislead all who follow.

Let us not mistake the issue. It is not that James and Paul do not minister to entirely different companies, under different dispensational terms. This is acknowledged as self-evident truth. James wrote to the dispersion, the twelve tribes scattered abroad, who still worshipped in the synagogue (James ii. 2).

James, whose attitude towards ritual was as far removed from that of Paul as the poles are asunder, nevertheless administers a rebuke worthy of him who spoke of those who had “the form of godliness, but denied the power thereof”. The word translated “religion” in James i. 27, is *threskeia* and refers to external religions observances, or, as we call it, “ritual”, but not in a corrupt sense. James, however, says that “pure and undefiled religious service” (or ritual) does not consist in external rites and ceremonies, the products of a dead faith, but that it will manifest the hidden grace of the renewed heart. This is parallel with Paul’s repudiation of external circumcision, but retention and application of its inner meaning.

We commenced with the intention of putting Rom. iv. and James ii. into the balance of truth, but so many features and items had to be discussed in order to clear the mind of bias and provide a key, that our space is already exhausted. As a result, however, we shall be able to pick up the threads and pursue the theme the better in our next article.

**#8. By works was faith perfected,
and Gen. xv. “fulfilled” (James ii. 22, 23).
pp. 133 - 137**

We have now seen enough to enable us to set aside the aspersions that have been cast on the teaching of the epistle of James, and can next consider what the epistle actually teaches.

As we have already seen, a comparative study of James, Philippians and the Sermon on the Mount brings the word “perfect” into prominence. The Greek word is *teleios*, cognate with *telos*, “the end”, and expresses the idea of finishing one’s course. We will begin, therefore, by considering the passages in James that contain the words *teleios*, *teleioo*, *teleo*, and *telos*. Let us first see them together:

- Teleios.* “Let patience have here perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire,
wanting nothing” (James i. 4).
“Every perfect gift is from above” (James i. 17).
“But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty” (James i. 25).
“The same is a perfect man” (James iii. 2).
- Teleioo.* “By works was faith made perfect” (James ii. 22).
- Teleo.* “If ye fulfil the royal law” (James ii. 8).
- Telos.* “And have seen the end of the Lord” (James v. 11).

Let us now examine these references, and discover if possible the Scriptural meaning of the Greek words used and their bearing on the purpose of James’ epistle in general, and James ii. 22 in particular. The root of all the words is *tel*, and however far the various derivations may depart from this root meaning, there will always be in the background the idea of an “end” or “finish”. The words “finish” and “end”, have a double meaning in English—signifying either the termination or end of space or time, or the goal, or completion or issue of anything. It is obvious, however, that when James speaks of the “end of the Lord” he can only mean the end or goal that the Lord has before Him. This reference comes in the last chapter of James, and is in structural correspondence with the first chapter:

A | i. 1-4. Patience, and its perfect work. *Teleios*.

* * * * *

A | v. 7-12. Patience, and the end of the Lord. *Telos*.

In the second of these sections we read:

“Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh Behold we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy” (James v. 7-11).

The reference to Job in connection with the “end of the Lord” is enlightening, for in the experiences of the patriarch we see worked out the blessedness of temptation when, through it, patience has its perfecting work. Turning now to chapter i., we see there the lesson summed up in verse 12:

“Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love Him” (James i. 12).

The teaching of this verse is comparable with that of II Tim. iv. 7 and 8, where the apostle speaks of a “crown of righteousness”.

As a good example of the confusing of things that differ, we quote the following comment on James i. 12:

“Life, in James, is the result of endurance to the consummation. Hence it is figured by the victor’s wreath. We cannot boast of our life in Christ, but in the kingdom life comes to those that overcome.”

If this comment be true, we might just as well say of II Tim. iv. 7, 8:

“Righteousness, in Paul, is the result of endurance to the consummation. Hence it is figured by the victor’s wreath.”

Such a comment would be a monstrous perversion of the truth. Anyone who confuses “hope” with “prize”, or “gift” with “reward” cannot help but lose his way and mislead his followers. James deals with “perfecting”, as does Paul in some places, but Paul also gives basic teaching which James, in his one epistle, does not give.

Those to whom James wrote had been “begotten” (James i. 18) and to speak of their “life” as the “result of endurance” is unscriptural. “The crown of life” is the award granted to those who endure the test, and to those “who loved Him”, just as in II Tim. iv. 8 “the crown of righteousness” is for those “that love His appearing”. Life is a necessity before it is possible to exhibit love.

The law that James has in view is not “Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage” but “the perfect law of liberty”—“the royal law” (James i. 25, ii. 8). “The perfect law of liberty” means “the perfect law which is (the law) of our (Christian) liberty”. It is not the Gospel as contrasted with the Law, but the rule of life which obtains under the gospel dispensation, and which Paul and James declare to be the law of love (Gal. v. 13, 14; James ii. 8) or the state of being “under the law to Christ” (I Cor. ix. 21). If James actually teaches that those believers to whom he addressed his epistles were justified, while still sinners, by works, then we must believe that we have in view here a company that differs fundamentally from the rest of the redeemed, whether they be Jew or Gentile. Under Paul’s ministry the Jew, equally with the Gentile, was justified by faith without works. Those to whom Peter ministered were not justified by works, for he speaks of Christ as having died “the just for the unjust” to bring them to God (I Pet. iii. 18); and certainly no one can think of intruding justification by works into the epistles of John.

Israel also, according to the prophecies of the O.T., are justified without works, for they will acknowledge that all their righteousness are as filthy rags, and that Jehovah Tsidkenu is their “righteousness”. David, also, knew and taught the same blessed doctrine as Paul makes evident in Rom. iv. The believers addressed by James could no more attain to a righteousness by works than we can to-day. Both Paul and James appeal to the record of the justification of Abraham, and *both appeal to the same verse*. We are fully aware that in the *process* of his argument James goes to Gen. xxii. but this is not the *basis*; it is rather the “end” or “perfecting” of the faith *already manifested without works*. Referring to Gen. xv., Paul writes:

“For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness” (Rom. iv. 2).

In connection with the same passage James writes:

“And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness” (James ii. 23).

Paul carries us forward in Rom. iv. to Abraham’s further exercise of the faith he had already shown in believing God’s promise of a son to a man and woman “as good as dead”:

“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 God had promised, He was able to perform. *And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness*” (Rom. iv. 20-22).

Paul concentrates on the question of Isaac’s birth, and makes it clear that he has in mind the kind of faith that includes resurrection, and believes in “God Who quickeneth the dead”. James does not speak of the initial act of Abraham’s faith but takes us rather to the “end”, where we stand with the patriarch on Mount Moriah, and see him “tempted” and attaining “the crown”. James exposes the hollow mockery of a “faith” that is in name only. The A.V. reads:

“What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?” (James ii. 14).

The R.V. is closer to the true meaning here, and reads:

“Can *that* faith save him?”

The believers to whom James was writing, had been brought up as Jews to believe that the mere fact of being a child of Abraham was sufficient to guarantee their entrance into the kingdom—an evil doctrine that was rebuked both by John the Baptist and the Lord Himself, (“Think not to *say* within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father” Matt. iii. 9, John viii. 33-44). James saw that they were now slipping into the error of regarding “faith” in a similar way. “Though a man *say* he hath faith”, says James, “Can that kind of faith save him?” The answer is that it cannot, and the answer is illustrated by the two examples that follow. Try saying to a naked and destitute brother, “Be ye warmed” and “be ye fed” without implementing these words with necessary materials,

and ask the one who is sent empty away how much this “saying” has profited him (James ii. 15, 16). “Even so”, comments James, “faith, if it hath not works, is dead in itself”. He then goes on to the second illustration: “Thou believest that there is one God: and thou doest well.”

The word *hoti* (“that”) after *pisteuo* (“to believe”) expresses the highest form of faith (John vi. 69; xvii. 8, etc.). Yet what follows? “The devil believe [and thus far are ‘believers’] and shudder.”

Now comes the appeal to Abraham:

“Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only” (James ii. 21-24).

Note carefully what James actually says here. The supreme act of obedience on Mount Moriah “fulfilled” the Scripture which said that “Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness”, and showed to a demonstration that Abraham’s faith was “living” and not “dead”. Faith, says James, wrought with his works, and by these works faith was perfected—or brought to its goal or consummation. Wesley observes: “There is no contradiction between the apostle because: (1) They do not speak of the same faith; St. Paul speaking of a *living* faith, St. James here of a *dead* faith. (2) They do not speak of the same *works*; St. Paul speaking of works *antecedent* to faith, St. James of works *subsequent* to it.” Abraham had “gone on unto perfection”, he had reached his goal, he had finished his course, and attained to a crown, for he was called “the Friend of God”. It is all a matter of “right division”, for balanced truth is truth “rightly divided”.

We trust that the application of this thought of “perfecting” will be made by the Spirit of Truth, as the reader ponders the doctrine of “perfecting” in Phil. iii., with its “prize” (Col. i. 28) and its “reward” (Col. ii. 18), together with Heb. xii. with its “race” and “joy”, and James with its “crown of life”. Any teacher who builds an argument upon a false comparison of James, with his “perfecting” and “crown”, and Paul, with his justification of the ungodly, is building something which will not stand the test of “that day”.

**#9. The “presentation” and “inheritance” of Col. i. 22, 28
and Col. i. 12 & iii. 24 compared.
pp. 194 - 196**

We have shown that to attempt to compare the teaching of James, concerning the “perfecting” of the believer, with Paul’s concerning the justification of the ungodly, leads to confusion and false statements. The epistle to the Colossians provides an illustration of trying these “things that differ”, for the false principles that we have seen would rob the reader of the truth of the epistle of James will, if applied here, rob him of the truth as taught by Paul in Colossians. We might take the word “present” that occurs twice in Col. i. One could take his stand upon verse 22 and repudiate the apostle’s desire to present every man perfect that is found in verse 28. Another, coming upon verse 28 first, might conceivably criticize the doctrine of verse 22 as “dangerous”, yet who can fail to see that both passages teach glorious truth, but two passages in the balance, in order that our faith may comprehend truth as a whole.

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

“Warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus” (Col. i. 28).

Here are two separate statements. (1) Christ’s presentation of the believer. (2) Paul’s presentation of the believer. Christ’s presentation is “in the body of His flesh through death”, Paul’s presentation is by “warning and teaching”. Christ will present the believer “holy”, Paul desires to present the same believer “perfect”. These passages contain the only reference to *peristemi* in Colossians. Col. i. 22 is basic truth, and can give no place for “works”, Col. i. 28, is subsequent truth, and contemplates the believer as amenable to “warning”. Col. i. 22 is parallel with Paul’s basic doctrine of justification by faith without works, and Col. i. 28 is comparable with James’ teaching of the “perfecting” of faith by works, subsequent to salvation. In neither case is there contradiction, the subjects differ as do foundation from superstructure, or as root from fruit. Can “holiness” be perfected? The reader who is unacquainted with the epistles of Paul might conceivably answer this question with an emphatic negative. Yet he would be wrong, for Paul uses the very expression “perfecting holiness” (II Cor. vii. 1). If we turn aside for a moment to consider the context of this important expression, we shall better appreciate the intentions of the apostle in Col. i. 22-28.

II Cor. vi. 14 - vii. 1.

A1 | vi. 14, 16. No unequal yoke.

B1 | vi. 16. Reason. Ye are Temple. I will dwell.

A2 | vi. 17. Separation.

B2 | vi. 17, 18. Reason. I will receive, be a Father.

A3 | vii. 1. Perfecting holiness.”

Throughout this passage Paul is dealing with believers, in contrast with unbelievers, urging them to act in harmony with their calling. They were “saints” (I Cor. i. 2), and this sanctification was theirs through Christ Who had been made unto them “sanctification” (I Cor. i. 30). It was complete and unalterable, and rested upon no merit, growth or godliness of the believer; all this is most evident in the epistle to the Corinthians, for these “saints” in themselves were guilty of most “unsaintly” conduct. The apostle did not and could not take away from these Corinthians, their sainthood, but he could and he did urge them to “perfect holiness”, which in other words, was their own response to such a holy calling.

“Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God” (II Cor. vii. 1).

The position of the believer in Col. i. 22 is so gloriously complete, that the mind is overwhelmed at the very contemplation of that presentation which will place the erstwhile enemy and sinner “holy, unblameable and unproveable” in the sight of God. The apostle, however, was not content that the believer should be thus sanctified by the death of Christ. He longed to see the “fruit of holiness”, and so he warns them of the specious teaching, that is repudiated in Col. ii., which would beguile them of the reward which is associated with “perfecting” as in II Tim. iv., Phil. iii. and James. Supplementing the two “presentations” Col. i. 22 and 28, are the two “Inheritances” of Col. i. 12 and iii. 24. And again we have the same relationship and the same differences as we found in the two “presentations”, and the two aspects of “justification”, moreover we observe the same harmony when the principle of right division is applied.

“Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. i. 12).

“Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ” (Col. iii. 24).

In the first instance, the work of grace is already accomplished. The Father “hath made us meet”, He “hath delivered us”, He “hath translated us”. No works of ours can be admitted in any shape of form. In the second instance the atmosphere changes from acceptance through grace alone to that of the desirability of acceptable service. The words are addressed to “servants” who are exhorted to serve their earthly masters “as to the Lord”, and that recognition of faithful service would be “the reward” of or pertaining to the inheritance.

In the presentation of Col. i. 22, it will be remembered, the reconciled sinner is to be presented, not only “holy”, but “unblameable and unproveable”, but, the servant in Col. iii. is warned that

“He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons” (Col. iii. 25).

Here “blame” and “reproof” come within the radius of the possible, just as surely as they are entirely outside the blessed scope of Col. i. 22. Both doctrines are compatible, both are truth, and the conjunction of the two, reasonable, salutary and right. Why cannot

the same reasonableness be exercised when remoter comparisons are made, such as those between Romans and James, or between the doctrines of Hope and Prize?

#10. The Deity and Humanity of the Son of God. pp. 236 - 238

If the doctrines of justification, sanctification and salvation can only be seen faithfully and accurately when placed in the balance of the sanctuary, even so does the doctrine of the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, demand this even balance. Some of those who maintain the essential Deity of Christ, have gone beyond the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, and intrude the “sonship” of Christ into that sphere and time, when He is denominated “The Word”, “The Image” and “the Form” of God. Those who have emphasized His perfect Manhood have at times done so to the sacrifice of His essential Deity. Some, to maintain His Deity, have rendered His bodily presence unreal, others, in order that His humanity shall be fully perceived have sacrificed His sinlessness, and sought to make Him but another son of Adam. All these are aberrations from the truth, and the doctrine of the Lord’s Person like all other doctrines of the Scriptures can only be perceived and understood when truth is seen in the balance. The subject, necessarily, is vast, and an adequate examination demands a study far transcending anything we can give, or the space we have available. This, however, must not deter us from pointing out some obvious passages, which show how balanced is this teaching of the Scriptures.

Let us open our study by a reference to the first chapter of the Gospel according to John. Suffice it for the moment to indicate the balance that is found in this one Gospel.

John’s Gospel.	
DEITY.	HUMANITY.
“The Word was God” (i. 1).	“The Word became flesh” (i. 14).
“God . . .”	“ . . . Only begotten” (i. 18, R.V. marg.).
“Before Abraham was, I am” (viii. 58).	“Jesus therefore being wearied with His journey sat <i>thus</i> on the well” (iv. 6).
“My Lord and my God” (xx. 28).	“Behold My hands . . . My side” (xx. 27).

If John’s Gospel only were before us, this list could be doubled and trebled. What has been given are examples of the mighty twofold truth. The Deity of the Lord is revealed without reserve or ambiguity. When John fell down at the foot of an angel in the attitude of worship, the angel said,

“See thou do it not worship God” (Rev. xix. 10).

yet the Saviour not only did not rebuke Thomas for ascribing full deity to Himself, He positively accepted it, granting a blessing upon all who “believe” though they may not have “seen”. The Epistle to the Romans declares the same twofold truth.

R o m a n s.	
DEITY.	HUMANITY.
“Who is over all, God blessed for ever” (ix. 5).	“The Seed of David according to the flesh” (i. 3). “Of Whom as concerning the flesh Christ came” (ix. 5).

Here again our present purpose prevents us from entering into a detailed examination of these passages. The reader will find Rom. ix. 5 discussed more fully in the series on the epistle to the Romans (Volume XXVII, pages 196-198). That Christ had a real humanity is proved by the two references given where the relationship of Christ is established between Israel, David and Himself “according to the flesh”. The sinlessness of this humanity is safeguarded by the language used in Rom. viii. 3 where the apostle says that God sent “His Own Son in *the likeness* of sinful flesh”. The epistle to the Hebrews, likewise balances this great doctrine.

H e b r e w s.	
DEITY.	HUMANITY.
“Thy throne, O God” (i. 8).	“Therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows” (i. 9). “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil” (ii. 14).

Here again, as in John i., He Who is “God” and the Maker of all things, was made “flesh” for our sakes and for our sins. The fact that Christ as “God manifest in the flesh” is the pivot upon which His Deity and His Humanity balance, is well illustrated by the structure of I Timothy.

B | i. 17. The King, incorruptible, invisible (i. 17).
E | iii. 15, 16. The MYSTERY of GODLINESS.
B | vi. 15, 16. King, immortal, unseen (vi. 15, 16).

I Timothy.	
i. 17. “The King . . . incorruptible, invisible, the only God.”	vi. 15, 16. “King of kings . . . Who only hath immortality . . . Whom no man hath seen, nor can see.”
iii. 16. “The mystery of godliness God was manifest in the flesh.”	

The reader will be aware that there is a great controversy as to the true reading of I Tim. iii. 16. This matter is discussed in a separate series of articles in the *Berean Expositor*, which should be consulted by the interested reader. For our present purpose it will be enough to see how the truth of chapters i. and vi. find their true resolution in the Person of Christ “God manifest in the flesh”, for in both chapters i. and vi. He is declared to be “invisible”. Paul therefore can teach that there is “One God” and “One

Mediator”, the “Man” Christ Jesus, when he writes to Timothy (I Tim. ii. 5), and nevertheless declare in the contemporary epistle to Titus, that the Lord Jesus Christ is “The Great God and our Saviour”.

T i t u s.	
GOD.	JESUS CHRIST.
“The commandment of God our Saviour” (i. 3).	“The Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour” (i. 4).
“The doctrine of God our Saviour” (ii. 10).	“Looking for the blessed hope, and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ” (ii. 13, 14, R.V.).
“The love of God our Saviour” (iii. 4).	“Through Jesus Christ our Saviour” (iii. 6).

This essential Deity and perfect Humanity, in the Person of Jesus Christ, is implied in the title “The Son of God”. So, John, who opens with the twofold revelation of the Word “Who was God”, “Who became flesh” (John i. 1, 14), tells us that the purpose he had when writing his gospel was,

“That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (John xx. 31).

Romans declares Him to be “The Son of God” (Rom. i. 4); Hebrews, which gives Him the title of “God” in chapter i., tells us that He partook of flesh and blood in chapter ii. and emphasizes the glory of His title “The Son” a title intended to combine both phases of truth (Heb. i. 2, 5, 8).

The very unity of the faith, is the acknowledgment or recognition of the Son of God (Eph. iv. 13)*. The Deity and the Humanity of Christ are pivoted upon His Sonship, which must not be considered independently of the Deity on the one hand, for that makes Him a mere man like ourselves, nor of the Humanity on the other hand, for that removes Him entirely from our sphere and we are left without a Redeemer or a Mediator. Truth in the balance is the only truth that honours the Scriptures and their revelation concerning the person of our glorious Lord.

[NOTE: * - For an examination of *epignosis* and Eph. iv. 13, the reader is directed to a series of studies entitled “Acknowledgment”.]

To take the word “My Father is greater than I” as a “proof” that the speaker was not “our great God” as well as “our Saviour”, is to take truth out of the balance, and to misapply the relationship of the “Son” with the “Father” in order to demonstrate an entirely different relation, namely that of both the Son and the Father to essential Deity. It is equally possible having commenced with a text which taught that Christ is God, to prove, though erroneously, that as there is “one God”, the Father must be excluded. This terrible possibility is happily not attempted and the converse misunderstanding concerning “The Son” is illuminated by keeping this blessed “truth in the balance”.

Worship.

#5. Worship due to God as “Our Maker” (Psa. xcv. 6). pp. 57 - 60

We have seen something of the nature of the worship that was offered by Israel, and we have learned from the testimony of the New Testament to shun all “carnal ordinances” because of their inability to touch the conscience or to please the Lord. We have also seen that true worship can be offered only by the free. With this knowledge in head and heart, we can now turn to the Old Testament, and learn some of the essential features of true worship, for there were, even in O.T. times, men of God who saw beyond the shadows and perceived the more excellent way.

It cannot be accidental that the first reference to “worship” found in the Bible is far removed from ceremonial. If the place where this worship was offered be deemed a holy place, it is only so because of what transpired there, not because it was holy in itself. Here we have a sacrifice without a priest, and an altar without a temple. The offerer is a father, and the offering his beloved and only son. This first reference to worship is a record of perfected faith, offered to God in a place far from the haunts of men, far from the courts of a temple, and yet a worship as near to the true and the ideal as the Old Testament can shew.

“I and the lad will go yonder and worship” (Gen. xxii. 5).

A priest and a sacrificial victim are essential for Israel’s worship, but here at the beginning the place of the priest is occupied by a “Father”, and the place of the sacrifice by a beloved “Son”.

For further light on the spiritual elements in Old Testament worship we turn to the Psalms, which record experiences too deep for ritual to reach, and too high for ceremonial to clog. In Psalm xcv. 6 we have the thought of worship rendered to God as our MAKER:

“O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker”
(Psa. xcv. 6).

We sincerely hope that not a few of our readers will be critical enough to pause at this passage, and wonder why we did not include it in Articles 2 and 3 of this series in the list of references connecting “worship” with “bowing”. The reason is this. *Qadad* means to “bow the head”, but the word used in Psalm xcv. 6 is *kara*, meaning “to bow the knee”. In its verbal form it is used in I Kings viii. 54 for the act of “kneeling”, and in the plural form *keraayim* it is translated “legs” in Exod. xii. 9. The plural form also occurs in the curious definition in Lev. xi. 21—“which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth”. *Parkhurst* renders the phrase: “Which have benders or crouching joints above their feet or lower part of their legs.” The verse that follows in Lev. xi. speaks of

such creatures as locusts and grasshoppers, the “knees” of which are very prominent. To “bow the knee” is an act of worship (I Kings xix. 18; II Chron vi. 13), and it is this act of adoration that shall one day be paid by all to the Lord (Isa. xlv. 23, Phil. ii. 10). The Apostle Paul, too, writes, “I bow my knees unto the Father” (Eph. iii. 14). We must not, however, allow ourselves to be diverted to the question of attitude in prayer; this we may perhaps consider later in these studies.

The call in Psalm xcv. is to worship and kneel before the Lord our Maker. This is worship in its most fundamental aspect. Because God is our Maker, man is a responsible being. Because man was made in the image of his Maker, worship becomes possible. To withhold worship at this initial step is to commence the downward path indicated in Rom. i. 19-23. Worship of the Creator constitutes the “everlasting gospel” that will be preached at the time of the end (Rev. xiv. 7).

Eliphaz the Temanite ascribes “purity” to his Maker (Job iv. 17), while Elihu, the son of Barachel confesses that, if he gave flattering titles to man, his Maker would soon take him away (Job xxxii. 22). The titles “Maker” and “Holy One of Israel” are linked by Isaiah and he declares that in the day that is coming “a man shall look to his Maker and shall not look to the altars, the work of his hands” (Isa. xvii. 7, 8). Again, the Lord through Isaiah says:

“I, even I, am He that comforteth you; who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass; and forgettest the Lord thy Maker, that hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth?” (Isa. li. 12, 13).

When at last Israel are restored, and shall not remember the reproach of their “widowhood” any more, the reason given is that

“thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is His name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall He be called” (Isa. liv. 4, 5).

Ecclesiastes exhorts the young man to remember his Creator in the days of his youth (Eccles. xii. 1), and Peter encourages the persecuted believer with the words: “Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to Him in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator” (I Pet. iv. 19).

The recognition of these things constitutes the first step in a worship that advances in spirituality as the relationship to God grows closer, until it eventually becomes the worship of the Father by His emancipated children. This worship is not without its temple, its songs, and its celebrants. The floods “clap their hands”, as do “all the trees” (Psa. xcvi. 8; Isa. lv. 12). The heavens are called upon to sing, and the earth to be joyful (Isa. xlix. 13). When David brings the Ark to “the city of David”, he sings to the Lord a Psalm of praise, in which not only Israel are called upon to join, but the heavens also are said to be “glad”, the earth and the fields to “rejoice”, the sea to “roar”, and the trees of the wood to “sing out” at the presence of the Lord (I Chron. xvi. 31-33). Psalm cxlviii. is a call to the heavens, the angels, sun, moon and stars, the earth, dragons and all deeps, fire and hail, snow and vapours, stormy wind fulfilling His word,

mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars, beasts, cattle, creeping things and flying fowl, to swell the anthem of praise that ascends to God our Maker.

A sense of awe, and of personal insignificance is never far removed from the worship associated with the wonders of “Nature”. This is very evident in the closing chapters of the book of Job.

“Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding” (Job xxxviii. 4).

With these words the Lord begins to answer Job, and for four lengthy chapters, Creation in its height and depth, its wonder and its variety, the stars that form the distant Pleiades, the crystals that form the tiny snowflake, the ordinances of day and night, the wonders of storm and rain, the animal creation with its marvelous instinct, all these are brought before Job by his Maker, and at the conclusion he has to say, “I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes” (Job xlii. 5, 6).

There are some who affect an indifference to the wonder and beauty of “Nature”, feeling perhaps that they belong to a sphere that lies outside that of redeeming love. For a Christian to rise no higher than the wonders of “Nature” in his praise of the Lord is certainly to be deplored, but for a Christian not to be moved by the evidences of the hand of the Lord in creation means that God is deprived of some of the glory due to His name. Let the believer but begin to examine any part of the great creation around him, and he will soon be compelled to bow before the Lord his Maker. A busy hive of bees, the development of the chick in the egg, the wonders of crystallization, the marvels of chemical affinity, the use of light in vision, the phenomena of colour, of spectrum analysis, of therapy, of chemistry—all these things provide an endless cause for praise and worship.

“The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork” (Psa. xix. 1).

“The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein He hath made His wonderful works to be remembered He sent redemption unto His people: He hath commanded His covenant for ever: holy and reverend is His name” (Psa. cxi. 2, 4, 9).

Here there is a most evident connection between Creation and Redemption: “He hath given meat unto them that fear Him; He will ever be mindful of His covenant” (Psa. cxi. 5). His covenant may include much more than the “meat that perisheth”, but it includes no less, for without the basic things of life all other and higher things would be impossible. The twenty-four elders before the rainbow-circled throne may sing their new song of redemption, but this is followed by another song, of which part might well have been sung by the morning stars at Creation’s dawn:

“And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever” (Rev. v. 9-14).

“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).

Without a Creator in full control, the glorious consummation of the ages could not be reached. The Book of the Revelation, which reveals some of the steps towards this goal, speaks of a new heaven and a new earth (Rev. xxi. 1), which demand the great Creator as surely as they did “in the beginning”. The same book also speaks of the “everlasting gospel” that will be preached at the time of the end:

“The everlasting gospel Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters” (Rev. xiv. 6, 7).

Returning to the Psalm which supplied our text (Psa. xcv.) we observe that it falls into two parts. The first part (verse 1-7) is a call to worship “our Maker”; the second part (verses 8-11) a reminder of Israel’s failure in the wilderness—two aspects of truth that at first do not seem very closely related. The link is found in the words, “Your fathers proved Me, and saw My work”, for unless the Lord had been also the Creator, how could Israel have survived that forty years’ ordeal? Who but God could have fed the multitude for such a time in the wilderness?

We will conclude this article with the full quotation of Psalm xcv. 1-7:

“O come, let us sing unto the Lord: let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation. Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise unto Him with Psalms. For the Lord is a great God, and a great King above all gods. In His hand are the deep places of the earth: the strength of the hills is His also. The sea is His, and He made it: and His hands formed the dry land. O come, let us worship, and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker. For He is our God; and we are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand.”

#6. Worship in the beauty of holiness. Psa. xcvi. pp. 97 - 99

Psalm xcv. opens with a call to “sing”; Psalm xcvi. begins with a call to “sing unto the Lord a new song”. The call to worship in the second of these two Psalms is given in verse 9: “O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.”

There is an intended contrast here with the “gods of the nations” in verse 5, and in verse 4 we read: “The Lord is great, and greatly to be praised: He is to be feared above all gods.”

The expression “the beauty of holiness” is one of the gems of the A.V., and at first sight is so crystal-clear, that it almost seems sacrilege to examine it. The Margin gives as an alternative rendering, “In the glorious sanctuary”, and the expression is found in Psalm xxix. 2, II Chron. xx. 21, I Chron. xvi. 29, and (in the plural: “The beauties of

holiness”) in Psalm cx. 3. How then are we to construe this phrase? Do the words pertain to God? Do they imply that when we worship Him, we must remember His essential holiness? It is certainly true that we must do this, but this may not be the meaning intended in this particular passage.

The Septuagint translators render the passage: *Proskunesate to Kurio en aule hagia autou*, “Worship the Lord in His holy court”. A very similar version is given in I Chron. xvi. 29, but in Psalm cx. 3, where the word “beauty” is in the plural, their translation is *En tais lamprotesi ton hagion sou*, “In the splendour of Thy saints”. In II Chron. xx. 21 the translation is different again: “And he took counsel with the people, and set appointed men to sing psalms and praises, to give thanks, and *sing the holy songs of praise* in going forth before the host”. It is evident from this variety of renderings that the words of the original need careful attention.

The word translated “beauty” is the Hebrew *hadarah*, a feminine form of *hadar*, which meant primarily “to adorn, decorate or deck”, as in Isa. lxiii. 1: “*Glorious* in His apparel.” The idea of “clothing” comes again in Psalm civ. 1: “Thou art clothed with honour (beauty) and majesty”, and also in Ezek. xvi., where the word is translated “comeliness” (verse 14). In this chapter of Ezekiel we have an extended use of the figure of clothing:

“I clothed thee also with broidered work, and shod thee with badgers’ skins, and I girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk. I decked thee also with ornaments, and I put bracelets upon thy hands, and a chain on thy neck and thy renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty: for it was perfect through My comeliness (Hebrew *hadar*, ‘beauty’) which I had put upon thee, saith the Lord God” (Ezek. xvi. 10-14).

In Exod. xxviii. we read of the “holy garments for Aaron”,—garments “for glory and for beauty”—comprising “a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat, a mitre, and a girdle” for ministering in the priest’s office (Exod. xxviii. 2-4). The word translated “beauty” here is different from the word used in Psalm cxvi., but the intention is much the same.

Throughout Scripture, clothing is symbolic. We read of “garments of salvation, and the robe of righteousness” (Isa. lxi. 10), while in Isa. lii. 1 restored Jerusalem is exhorted to “put on” her “beautiful garments”. The bridegroom is expected to deck himself with ornaments, and the bride to adorn herself with jewels, and these are used as symbols of higher things. Job speaks of putting on righteousness—“and it clothed me” (Job xxix. 14), and the Lord Himself is said to “put on the garments of vengeance for clothing”, and to be “clad with zeal as a cloke” (Isa. lix. 17).

When we come to the N.T., we find this figure in full use. *Enduo*, often translated “put on”, is also translated “clothe with”, “be clothed”, and “be arrayed”; while *enduma* is translated “clothing”, “garment” and “raiment”. So, the believer is said to have “put on” Christ (Gal. iii. 27), and to have “put on” the new man (Eph. iv. 24). He is also exhorted to “put on” the armour of light (Rom. xiii. 12), to “put on” the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. xiii. 14), and to “put on” the whole armour of God (Eph. vi. 11). These are the

spiritual equivalents of the garments described in the O.T., and when the Psalmist speaks of worshipping “in the beauty of holiness”, he approximates to the Lord’s own words when He declares that the “true worshippers” must worship the Father “in spirit and in truth”.

Acceptable worship can only be offered by those who are clothed with the righteousness of God which is by faith and, as Peter says, “clothed with humility” (I Pet. v. 5)—boasting in Christ, but finding no grounds of boasting in themselves.

The “beauty” in which the worshipper is clothed is “the beauty of holiness”, for the God he worships “sitteth upon the throne of His holiness” (Psa. xlvii. 8), and has declared that “holiness becometh His house” (Psa. xciii. 5). Twice the Psalmist calls upon the worshipper to “give thanks at the remembrance of His holiness” (Psa. xxx. 4 and xcvi. 12).

Qodesh, the Hebrew word translated “holiness”, is also rendered “consecrated”, “dedicated”, “hallowed”, “saint” and “sanctuary”. All true worship recognizes the significance of the opening sentence in “the Lord’s prayer”—“Our Father, Which art in heaven, *hallowed* be Thy name”. All acceptable worship must involve “dedication”, even as in the type and shadow (I Chron. xxvi.20). All true worship must be offered in the Sanctuary; not in a sanctuary that could be called “worldly” (Heb. ix. 1), but in that sanctuary which is the “true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man” (Heb. viii. 2). All that Israel had in type and symbol, we have in its perfection in Christ. Our “place of worship” is where Christ sits at the right hand of God, our garments are of His blessed provision, and are all of grace. He Himself takes the place of altar, sacrifice, priest, incense, vestments: to introduce any of these shadows now in our worship would be to ruin its spirituality.

Psal xcvi. calls upon us to worship the Lord our “Maker”; Psalm xcvi. calls upon us to worship Him in the “beauty of holiness”. Between these two conceptions of worship lies the cross of Christ, His death, His burial, and His resurrection. We must be “new creatures” before we can have any place where holiness dwells, but, blessed be God, we know that Christ has been made unto us “wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (I Cor. i. 30).

#7. Worship and the exaltation of the Lord.

pp. 137 - 140

In Psalm xcix. 5 and 9, we read:

“Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at His footstool; for He is holy.”

“Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at His holy hill; for the Lord our God is holy.”

This Psalm is one of a series that speak of the coming King, and find their fulfillment in that day when “The kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ” (Rev. xi. 15). Psalms xciii., xcvi. and xcix., open with the announcement, “The Lord reigneth”. Psalm xcix. says, “The Lord is a great God, and a great king above all gods” (verse 3). Psalm xcvi. would have the good news of the kingdom proclaimed among the nations: “Say among the heathen that the Lord reigneth” (verse 10). In Psalm xcix. all the earth is called upon to make a joyful noise unto the Lord, “With trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King”.

There is an emphasis in Psalm xcix. on the awful holiness of God:

“The Lord reigneth; *let the people tremble*. He sitteth between the cherubim, *let the earth be moved*” (Psa. xcix. 1).

He has a “terrible name” for “it is holy” (verse 3). Again at the end of verse 5 and verse 9 there is an insistence upon His holiness. His almighty power is allied to and always used with judgment. With God “right is might” and never “might is right”. His mercy is great, for He is a God that forgives, yet at the same time He took vengeance upon the inventions that, at times, even the best of His servants superimposed upon the ordinances which they had received (verse 8). The correspondence of verses 5 and 9 indicates that “His holy hill” is His footstool. In I Chron. xxviii., “the ark of the covenant” is called the footstool of God, and in Psalm cxxxii. 7 “His footstool” is found “in His tabernacles”, the plural form of majesty being used here, as in Heb. ix. 24, “the holy places”. In Isa. lxvi. 1, the earth is said to be His footstool. These are not contradictions, but revelations. In connection with His manifest presence “between the cherubim” the ark would be His footstool, but when we learn that the Lord’s throne is heaven, then the wide earth itself becomes His footstool: it is a matter of proportion in the particular sphere concerned.

In this Psalm the special feature in connection with worship is the twice-repeated call to “exalt” the Lord. In verse 2 the psalmist says “He is high above all people”, where the words “high above” translate the same Hebrew word that is translated “exalt”. This word is *Rum*, and enters into the name Abram, “high or exalted father”. False worship ends in the exaltation of self, true worship in the exaltation of the Lord. This element of false worship can be seen in the import of such a passage as Isa. xiv.:

“For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will *exalt* my throne above the star of God . . . I will ascend . . . I will be like the Most High” (Isa. xiv. 13).

Even so is it written of the “man of sin”, the “son of perdition”:

“who opposeth and *exalteth* himself above all that is called God or worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God” (II Thess. ii. 4).

We have a foreshadowing of this blasphemous worship in Dan. iii. 1, where we read of the image made by Nebuchadnezzar, whose height (*rum*) was three-score cubits. The same word is repeated in Dan. iv. where the figure changes to a green tree. Its “height” (*rum*) is spoken of in verses 10, 11 and 20, its “height reached unto the heaven”. It is comforting to remember the sequel, however. Nebuchadnezzar was brought to recognize the truth, for he said after his restoration:

“I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol (*rum*) and honour the king of heaven” (Dan. iv. 37).

Belshazzar is reminded of this by Daniel:

“When his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him And thou his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this; but hast lifted up (*rum*) thyself against the Lord of heaven” (Dan. v. 20, 23).

Worship, false or true, is never far from the record of Scripture, and, here, worship and “exaltation”, both false and true, are what is stressed.

Leaving such extreme cases, let us look at one or two references in the Psalms that may help us to see the way in which the exalting of the Lord in His varied relationships with the redeemed is related to worship.

1. *Worship and a sense of utter need.*

“Hear my cry, O God; attend unto my prayer. From the end of the earth will I cry unto Thee, when my heart is overwhelmed: lead me to the rock that is higher (*rum*) than I” (Psa. lxi. 1, 2).

Here all ground of boasting in self has disappeared. Prayer is a “cry”; the place of prayer is “the end of the earth”; the condition in which prayer is made is a heart “overwhelmed”; the one desire is to be led to the Rock that is higher than man. There follow words like “shelter”, “strong tower”, “abide” and “refuge” (margin) which show that the prayer has been answered. After the pause, “selah”, comes worship. Instead of “Hear my cry”, the Psalmist now says, “Thou hast heard my vow” and the Psalm finishes with the words, “So will I sing praise unto Thy name for ever; that I may daily perform my vows” (Psalm lxi. 5-8).

2. *Worship and deliverance.*

“O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt His name together” (Psa. xxxiv. 3).

This exaltation of the name of the Lord is called for because of the deliverance experienced by the Psalmist.

“I sought the Lord, and He heard me, and *delivered* me from all my fears This poor man cried, and the Lord heard him, and *saved* him out of all his troubles. The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them the righteous cry and the Lord heareth, and delivereth them out of all their troubles” (Psa. xxxiv. 4, 6, 7, 17).

3. *Worship and lowliness of heart.*

“Though the Lord be high (*rum*) yet hath He respect unto the lowly; but the proud He knoweth afar off” (Psa. cxxxviii. 6).

Here the exaltation of the Lord, and the humility of the worshipper are brought together, and worship is the result.

“I will praise Thee with my whole heart; before the gods will I sing praise unto Thee. I will worship toward Thy holy temple, and praise Thy name for Thy lovingkindness and for Thy truth” (verse 2).

This meeting of extremes in grace, is found in other places of Scripture. For example Isaiah says:

“For thus saith the high (*rum*) and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high (*marum*) and holy place, *with him also* that is of a contrite and humble spirit” (Isa. lvii. 15).

4. *Worship, goodness and the wonderful works of the Lord.*

Psalm cvii. has a refrain that comes four times over:

“Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, and for His wonderful works to the children of men” (Psa. cvii. 8, 15, 21 and 31).

This fourfold call to praise, follows a fourfold description of human need and Divine deliverance. First we have “wanderers” seeking a city to dwell in, but, finding none, in their trouble they cried to the Lord and He delivered them out of all their distresses (verses 4-7). Next follows a reference to “rebels” so reduced that there is none to help, shut in by gates of brass, and bars of iron. These, too, cried to the Lord in their trouble, and they, too, were saved out of their distresses (verses 10-16). The third company are “fools”, whose folly brings them near to the gates of death. These, too, are healed by His word and delivered. It is noteworthy that the word “distresses” is here exchanged for “destructions” (compare verses 6, 13, 28 with 20). Fourthly, “They that go down to the sea in ships”, who “are at their wits’ end”.

Gathering up this fourfold call to praise, the Psalmist adds, “Let them exalt Him also in the congregation of the people”.

5. *Worship and the exalted Saviour.*

“In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high (*rum*) and lifted up, and His train filled the temple” (Isa. vi. 1).

Above this throne stood the seraphim, with veiled faces. The prophet heard the *Trisagion*, “Holy, Holy, Holy”, and cried, “Woe is me”. John, writing later, assures us that when Isaiah saw this vision he spoke of the Saviour:

“These things saith Isaiah when he saw His glory, and spake of Him” (John xii. 41).

True worship must ever have, in perfect combination, this sense of utter unworthiness and inability on the part of the worshipper, and the exalted position and high glory of the Lord. The Saviour Who died for us, not only rose again from the dead, but has been “highly exalted” and it is the purpose of God that, one day, at that exalted name, “every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil. ii. 10, 11). Let us anticipate that day by honouring Him, by exalting Him in our hearts, for He indeed is worthy, and worship, as we have seen, is the ascription of “worthy-ship” to the Lord as His due.

“Thy mercy is great above the heavens Be Thou exalted, (*rum*), O God, above the heavens: and Thy glory above all the earth” (Psa. cviii. 5).

“Seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God” (Col. iii. 1).

#8. References to Worship in the Gospel.

pp. 196 - 199

While there are further lessons awaiting us in the O.T. settings of the word “worship”, it is time we turned to the N.T., for while there are certain basic truths concerning worship that no dispensational changes can alter, the worship that is now acceptable differs in many ways from that enjoined by Moses, David and Solomon. There are several words translated “worship” in the N.T. but it is worth remembering that *Proskuneo* is never translated in any other way, and as this is the word we are considering, there will be no alternative renderings to keep in mind. Christ is the object of worship in the Gospels on eleven occasions, but this fact must not be misunderstood. While the same word is used each time, the intention of the worshipper varies considerably and it is both useful and necessary to our study for us to examine these references. One passage we can dismiss immediately, is Herod’s request to the wise men concerning their quest for the infant Christ, “When ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship Him” (Matt. ii. 8). The only contribution this passage makes is that Herod realized that “worship” was not too high a word to use of this new-born King. Of the other acts of worship recorded in the Gospels, we have:

- (1) The wise men from the East (Matt. ii.). Three references.
- (2) The leper (Matt. viii.).
- (3) The ruler (Matt. ix.).
- (4) The disciples (Matt. xiv.).
- (5) The woman of Canaan (Matt. xv.).
- (6) The mother of Zebedee’s children (Matt. xx.).
- (7) The women (Matt. xxviii.).

- (8) The disciples (Matt. xxviii.).
- (9) The man born blind (John ix.).
- (10) In the parable of the unforgiving servant, the Lord depicts the approach of that servant to the king in the words "the servant therefore, fell down and worshipped him" (Matt. xviii. 26).

In this last case, the word means that the servant "did homage" before the king, not that he offered idolatrous worship. The same thing may be said of some of the occasions when worship was offered to Christ. In the case of the cleansing of the leper, recorded in Matt. viii., the leper calls the Saviour "Lord" and "worships" Him. In the same chapter the centurion calls Him "Lord", but does not worship Him, though he exhibits a faith such as had not, till then, been seen in Israel. We have no warrant from Matt. viii. 2 for believing that the leper pierced the veil of His flesh and perceived the Saviour's deity. He merely offered the customary act of homage that a Jew would make but which a Roman soldier would probably withhold. The same must be said of the worship offered by the woman of Canaan. Again, when the mother of Zebedee's children came to make her request, she naturally did homage, but there is no reason to believe that her act of "worship" was of a deeper character.

There are, however, a few instances of worship offered to the Son of God, that go beyond this mere token of respect. These are the worship of the wise men, the worship of the disciples after the resurrection, and the worship of the man born blind. Let us examine these. The wise men who came from the East declared that they had come to seek Him Who had been born King of the Jews, for they had "seen His star in the East" and had come "to worship Him" (Matt. ii. 2). They stood by while their guidance by the star was confirmed by the quotation from the prophet Micah, and then, following the star, came to the house where they saw the young Child with Mary His mother. There they fell down and worshipped Him, and opening their treasures, presented Him with gifts, gold, and frankincense and myrrh (Matt. ii. 11). Being "warned of God in a dream" not to return to Herod they departed to their own country another way.

The translation "wise men" is insufficiently specific. The word thus translated is usually *sophos*, but here, in Matt. ii., *Magos*, a word of Hebrew origin, is employed. This name is used throughout the east, especially in Persia for a sect of philosophers who studied astronomy and natural philosophy; who abhorred the adoration of images and worshipped but one God. Their doctrines are said to have been derived from Abraham, and, also, from Daniel, who received the title "Master of the Magicians" (Dan. iv. 9). Historians indicate there was at the time a feeling of expectancy in the east of the near advent of an extraordinary personage. These *magi* declared that they had "seen His star in the east", but it is evident from the record in Matthew that they had temporarily lost sight of the star, hence their questions, and their outbreak of joy when the star once more become visible. Many different explanations have been offered to account for this heavenly phenomenon. Some make elaborate calculations and show that about this time significant conjunctions of the planet took place, but no conjunction of the planets can be made to harmonize with the words of verse 9, that the star "went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was". Movement and rest are most definitely predicated of this star, which would therefore appear to have been a celestial luminary of

a special order provided by God for the guidance of these men, hence its appearance in such a way as to confirm their expectations, and lead them to the feet of the Saviour. Although Mary was present on the arrival of the magi, their worship is offered to the Babe, and not the mother. The offering of gold, frankincense and myrrh anticipates Psalm lxxii. 10 and Isa. lx. 6. Men thus divinely led; who heard the confirmation of their quest from one of the prophets of old and who “fell down and worshipped” a babe—these men rendered no ordinary act of homage; their worship was deeper; they must have recognized in this Child of Bethlehem, not only a future King of the Jews, but heaven’s King, yea, the King of kings, and by their act of worship anticipated the submission and offering of the Gentile world in “that day”. While all this may be true, there is little guidance in the record as to what constitutes Christian worship to-day, so we pass on to other references.

The worship of the Magi was offered soon after the birth of Christ; the worship of the disciples recorded in Matt. xxviii. was offered after His resurrection.

“And as they went to tell His disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him.”

“And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him: but some doubted” (Matt. xxviii. 9, 17).

Bengel’s comment on verse 9 is:—“Before His passion, Jesus had been worshipped by strangers, rather than by His disciples”. It is evident that this prostration at the feet of the risen Christ marks a new attitude on the part of the disciples, but there is no evidence from the context that His deity was then recognized and acknowledged. Thomas reached that stage of conviction when at length he exchanged his doubts for a full recognition of the Lord’s deity, saying, “My Lord and my God” (John xx. 28) and we can but believe that, subsequently, those who “doubted” (Matt. xxviii. 17) were, also, likewise, convinced. Personal conviction is more evident in the case of the man born blind, as recorded in John ix. Under the stress both of the miracle which had been wrought, and the consequent opposition which it aroused in the hearts of the religious leaders, he advanced from the simple recognition that his Healer was “A man that is called Jesus” (John ix. 11) to a higher recognition. Upon being pressed, his faith grew, for his next answer to the question “What sayest thou of Him, that he hath opened thine eyes?” he said, “He is a prophet” (John ix. 17). Opposition now intensified, and the Pharisees charged the Saviour with being a sinner. This, with the growing conviction of faith, the man born blind rebuts, and reasons “If this man were not of God, he could do nothing” (John ix. 33). For so speaking, the man was cast out. The Lord then found him and put to him the question, “Dost thou believe on the Son of God?” It is a splendid tribute to this man’s clear sightedness, that he did not immediately fall down at the feet of the Saviour, but, rather, desired fuller knowledge that his faith might be rational. The Lord recognized this and supplied the needed information, saying, “Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee”. This was plain testimony. He Who had opened the eyes of the man’s physical nature, now illuminated the eyes of his understanding. The response was immediate and complete: “Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him” (John ix. 35-38).

This incident brings us nearer to Christian worship than any passage we have hitherto considered. This act of worship was not the product of sudden fear or great joy in the presence of some awe-inspiring spectacle. It was slowly built up, steadily approached, and calmly acknowledged. The steps in it are indicated by the growing acknowledgment, “A man”, “A prophet”, “The Son of God”. One more passage in John’s Gospel speaks of worship, but we reserve consideration of John iv. for the next article.

**#9. “Neither in this mountain,
nor yet in Jerusalem” (John iv. 21).
pp. 242 - 246**

It is extraordinary at first sight to think that the Saviour condescended to discuss the matter of “worship” with a poor sinful Samaritan woman, but said nothing about it to “the master of Israel”, Nicodemus, who would have been so much better qualified to discuss the matter. When, however, we remember that the flesh profiteth nothing, that Nicodemus was no more able to appreciate the nature of true worship than the Samaritan woman we recognize the workings of grace and with bowed hearts prepare to read once more concerning true worship in a truer frame of mind.

The revelation of the Samaritan woman’s private life, caused her to pause and to say “Sir I perceive that Thou art a prophet”, but whether the sudden introduction of the highly controversial subject of worship was made by her in an attempt to prevent any further reference to her private life, or whether being convinced both of her own sinfulness and the fact that she stood in the presence of One Who could enlighten her on such a subject, we may never know; possibly the woman’s motives, like so many of our own were mixed.

Whatever be the truth of the matter, the Saviour most graciously allowed the new subject full scope, and the subsequent record made by John has provided us with, perhaps, the most comprehensive statement as to the nature of true worship that the New Testament contains. The thought uppermost in this woman’s mind was the correct “place” where worship should be offered.

“Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship” (John iv. 20).

As readers of the New Testament unconsciously adopt the attitude of the Jew when thinking of the Samaritans, it may be useful to record a few outstanding features concerning them, especially those bearing upon the matter of worship. The Samaritans have four basic tenets of belief.

I. That Jehovah alone is God. II. That Moses alone is the Law-giver. III. That the *Torah* (the five books of Moses) is the only divine book, and IV. Mount Gerizim is the only house of God.

The Samaritans observe the Sabbath and the rite of circumcision. They do not observe all the feasts of Israel, but do observe Passover; Unleavened Bread; Pentecost; The *Rosh hashanah* the commencement of the civil year (Lev. xxiii. 24); *Yom Kippur*, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Tabernacles. Mount Gerizim is *the* holy place in the estimation of the Samaritans, and it is spoken of with reverence, and always with some such title as “the house of God”, “the house of Jehovah”, “the mountain of the world”, “God’s mountain”, “The Sanctuary”, “The mountain of the Divine presence”. We can perhaps the better understand the words of the woman of Samaria when she said “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain”. She had already claimed Jacob as her “father” (John iv. 12), and knew the coming of the Messiah (John iv. 25).

Before discussing the relative merits of Samaria and Jerusalem as the “place” where worship should be offered, the Saviour set both aside by saying,

“Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father” (John iv. 21).

By so replying, the whole matter was raised to a higher plane. It would have been easy to have cited passages from the Old Testament to prove that Jerusalem had been chosen by the Lord, but the Samaritan woman would have refused to accept this authority—for her Bible consisted only of the five books of Moses. The Prophets and the Psalms were rejected by the Samaritans. Here, in the Lord’s attitude we have a divinely given method when dealing with parallel problems. Think of the interminable debates that the introduction of “British Israel” brings! The erections built upon such crazy foundations as Berith-ish; of Isaac-son; of Union Jacks and Gates of enemies! Far simpler and more in line with the Saviour’s attitude is to turn *at once* to Phil. iii. there to see that an undoubted Israelite, discarded undoubted blessings for the fullness to be found in Christ. This being so it is vain to tempt one who after all may not be an Israelite to set aside such superlative blessings for those discarded by Paul. The same principle is true in dealing with such subjects as the gift of tongues, the various modes of observing the Lord’s supper, the controversies as to infant sprinkling v. adult believer’s immersion; into these controversies we have no call to enter, they lie on the other side of Acts xxviii., have no place in the present dispensation, and are legitimate controversies only among those that practice them.

However, after having taken this high ground, the Saviour can now descend to details without adopting the attitude of a partisan.

“Ye worship, ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews” (John iv. 22).

In this utterance the Lord brings to light two essential elements in all true worship. First “knowledge” which stands in severe contrast with blind tradition, superstition and unreasonable practices. Now knowledge in such matters as worship must come as a revelation, and while the Samaritans possessed the five books of Moses they were denied the light and leading of the rest of the Old Testament. Here therefore emerges another

essential principle. True worship must be based upon revealed truth. This we can see is expressed negatively in Matt. xv., “In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men” (Matt. xv. 9).

Secondly, the Lord associated together “worship” and “salvation” implying that worship could not be understood, and would not be acceptable apart from salvation. This salvation, said Christ, was “of the Jews”, because to them had been committed the oracles of God, to them pertained the promises and the covenants and the service of God, and most important of all, from them must come, as regards the flesh, the long promised Saviour. True worship therefore is regulated according to divine revelation, is at the heart evangelical, and is intimately associated with the person and work of the Saviour. Judaism itself drew all its power from these sources. It was a divinely given religion of types and shadows, it was given only to one people Israel, it found its fulfillment in the person and work of the Saviour whose person and work alone made its rites, ceremonies, sacrifices and observances of any value.

“But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him” (John iv. 23).

On two occasions the Gospel of John records the statement “The hour cometh and now is” (John iv. 23; v. 25), and once in a slightly different form “The hour cometh, yea is now come” (John xvi. 32). Weymouth rightly translates John xvi. 32, “The time is coming, nay has already come”, for *eleluthen* is the perfect of *erchomai*. In John iv. 23 and v. 25, the original reads *Kai nun estin* which unfortunately, Weymouth translates exactly as he does the different words of John xvi. 32. *Kai nun estin* can only be translated correctly by the words “and now is”. How are we to understand this expression, “and now is”? In John v. 25 it is seen to be the present spiritual equivalent of the future physical resurrection. In John iv., however, the temple at Jerusalem still stood, and the prophetic words “Your house is left unto you desolate” had not been pronounced. In chapter ii. the temple had been referred to as “My Father’s house” and even in the period covered by the early part of the Acts of the Apostles, it was not inconsistent evidently, for Peter and John to go up to the temple at the hour of prayer.

It is therefore possible that what the Saviour said when he spoke to the woman of Samaria, was “The hour cometh when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth”, but when John came to write this gospel, he was able to interpolate for the benefit of the reader the information that this hour had now come. For us, to-day, the question of “place” so far as worship is concerned, has no meaning. Chapels and Churches are convenient meeting places where the saints can assemble, but if they know the truth, whatever the architecture, and whoever it may be who made the building “sacred” one of the hymns they will surely sing will be:--

Saviour, where’er Thy people meet,
There they behold Thy mercy seat;
Where’er they seek Thee, Thou art found,
And every place is hallowed ground.

For Thou, within no walls confined,
Inhabitest the humble mind;

Such ever bring Thee where they come,
And going, take Thee to their home.*

[* - This hymn is included in *Hymns of Praise*,
compiled for the use of meetings where dispensational truth is discerned.]

What are we to understand by “true” worshippers? What are we to understand by worship that is “in spirit and in truth”?

Alethes is used when truth as opposed to falsehood is in view. Thus in John iv. 18 where it is translated “truly”. *Alethinós* is truth when opposed not so much to a lie, but as substance is opposed to shadow. So we have such expressions as “the true tabernacle” (Heb. viii. 2); “the figure of the true” (Heb. ix. 24) obviously in contrast with the typical tabernacle and its furniture. So in John’s gospel we read of “the true light”, “the true bread” and “the true vine” as fulfillments and contrasts with their respective types. So “true” worshippers are not placed in contrast with idolators, worshippers of *false* gods, but they are contrasted with Old Covenant worshippers whose worship was typical and shadowy “which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 10).

The expression “in spirit and in truth” without the preposition “in” repeated, should be taken as a figure of speech, known as *hendiadys*, where one thing is meant, but two statements are made—hence *hen* = one, *dia* = by means of, *dys* = two, the “One-by means of two” figure. “Truly i.e. antitypically in Spirit”. Two reasons are given for thus worshipping the Father:

(1) He seeks such worship. This is a unique passage. No other passage of scripture uses the word “seek” in this way. It is a common thing for worshippers to be bidden “to seek” the Lord, but here, it is the Father that seeks! If He thus seeks, shall He not find? If He thus finds shall He not be pleased? If He thus finds, must not blessing be the result? Is not therefore true worship near the heart of all true acceptable and fruitful service? (2) The second reason resides in the very nature of the God we would worship.

“God is Spirit.” *Pneuma ho theos*. It is no more necessary to insert the indefinite article here and read “God is a spirit” than it would be to translate the similarly constructed passage of John i. 1 and read “The Word was a God”. To this Samaritan woman a statement concerning the essential Being of God is made that transcends every other revelation found in the Scriptures! All titles under which God is pleased to make Himself known in the O.T. scripture are really gracious accommodations to our finite capacity to understand. The God Who is spirit is beyond our powers of experience. We do not know the mode of being of One who is not conditioned by time and space, who is invisible, inaudible and intangible (John i. 18; v. 37). Now if our Saviour had intended to teach this woman the essential nature and being of God, our comments would constitute a criticism of His words, and we should stand condemned. He was teaching this woman, and all who will learn, not the nature of the absolute and unconditioned, but what the nature of that worship must be that is offered to, and is acceptable to, a being of such a nature. To obtain but a glimpse of the Divine nature, is to forego for ever all the

trappings of ceremonial, all rites and all observances as being essential to true worship—a God who is “spirit” must be worshipped “in spirit and in truth”.

The pursuit of this theme has already led us to occupy more space than was originally allotted, so with one further observation we must close the present article.

In the O.T. worship is offered to “The Lord” who is referred to as “The Lord thy God”. In the N.T. (The Revelation), worship is offered to “God”, and to “Him that made heaven and earth”, but here in John iv. it is the “Father” that is worshipped, it is the “Father” that seeks worship—and surely none but “children” can worship the “Father”, none but children can offer to Him His due. And will “children” who seek thus to render homage to a “Father” feel under any necessity to pay such reverence in a temple? need such adopt priestly vestments? need such perform an elaborate ritual? No title of God is so intimate, so near to the heart, so far removed from ritual and ordinance as the title “Father” and worship that is offered to Him in that capacity must of necessity participate in the same essentials.