

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 XXXVIII.

1955 - 1956

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

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

Since we penned the Foreword to Volume XXXVII two years ago, much has transpired to encourage us in our testimony to the Truth rightly divided.

Prominent among these encouragements must be placed the reception that was given to our ministry throughout the visit to America during May and June of 1955. Not least among the causes for thanksgiving was the abundant evidence we received that our literature was treasured and studied by a goodly number of ministering brethren.

Then too we would preserve in these pages the note already printed in the Editor's page. We repeat the comment made on our U.S.A. ministry that our testimony is essentially CHRISTO-CENTRIC. For this we humbly give thanks and pray that it ever be so.

The issue of the booklet "The Dispensational Frontier" encouraged us to continue this mode of providing literature that could be used for circulation, and a number have since been added which we commend to all who love the Word.

Adverse criticism has prevented us from settling on our leas, and has only deepened our convictions; and under the good hand of God, the work is extending that is in the care of our Assistant Principal, Stuart Allen.

So once again we rejoice to sign ourselves

Yours for the Truth Rightly Divided,

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

INDEX

EPHESIANS—	
The three prayers of Ephesians compared	7
An examination of the word translated “knowledge” (i. 17)	11
The Father of Glory	14
The prayer for perception	17
What is the hope of His calling	20
Ton hagion or “heaven itself”	23
“Mighty power inwrought” (i. 19)	28
“Far above all” (i. 21)	31
“All things under His feet” (i. 19 - ii. 7)	37
EMMANUEL, GOD WITH US--	
“With us.” “He was numbered with the transgressors”	41
“Reckoning”—the link that makes us “One”	43
FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF GOD--	
Our basis. The Inspired Word of God	45
“Beginning at Moses”	50
Creation and the purpose of the ages	52
Gen. i. 2. A judgment, not a mode of creation	55
The present creation likened to a tabernacle	58
Adam, image, likeness and dominion	61
The essential difference between a mechanical and a moral creation (Gen. i. and ii.)	66
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
GALATIANS: The argument for faith without works (ii. 15-20)	70
The Cross, life and law (ii. 19, 20)	74
Structure and argument of the section (ii. 21 - iii. 7)	78
Jesus Christ . . . Crucified (iii. 1)	80
Spirit v. flesh (ii. 21 - iii. 7)	83
The argument from the ministry of the Spirit (iii. 2-5)	86
The realm of faith (iii. 6, 7)	89
The appeal to the Scriptures (iii. 8)	92
“For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse” (iii. 10)	95
“GO YE AND LEARN WHAT THAT MEANETH” (Matt. ix. 13)--	
Meaning	98
How we learn. The pursuit of Meaning. Six processes	100
The senses and the parts of speech	102
Memory	105
Reason	107

Some logical particles	110
HEBREWS--	
Perfection or perdition. The evidence of Pauline authorship	114
The scope of the epistle decided by structure	119
An examination of the alternatives of vi. 1 and x. 39	122
“In Son”	127
“The brightness of His Glory”	132
SPECIAL ARTICLES--	
Key of Knowledge, The—or Dispensational Truth	137
Grapes of Eschol, The	156
Zion, the Overcomer and the Millennium	175
LESS THAN THE LEAST--	
Its sequel—“An Alphabetical Analysis”	5
RECKONING AND REALITY--	
The seven steps to reality	200
“Thou shalt be with me in Paradise”	202
The first reckoning—“Crucified with Christ”	206
The second reckoning—“To have died with Christ”	210
The third reckoning—with special reference to the word “baptism”	214
The third reckoning (con’td)—The first and last “baptism” of all Scripture	218
The fourth reckoning—“Quickened together with Christ”	224
TIMOTHY, THE SECOND EPISTLE TO--	
Paul and the Heavenly Kingdom (iv. 19)	228
The closing hours of a devoted life (iv. 9-22)	232
Hail and Farewell (iv. 19-22)	235
TOOLS FOR THE UNASHAMED WORKMAN--	
Commentaries with Greek text	240
Horæ Paulinæ and Horæ Apostolicæ	242
Some valuable books on the Septuagint	243
Some valuable books on the Septuagint (con’td)	244
TRUTH IN THE BALANCE--	
Prophecy and its fulfillment	246
CREATION OR CATASTROPHE (Gen. i. 2)	6

Less than the Least
and its sequel “An Alphabetical Analysis”.

p. 80

It was with some trepidation that we acceded to the suggestion to write a brief account of the early history of the movement that has grown out of the witness of *The Berean Expositor*. In the series entitled “Less than the Least” which commenced in Volume XXXV, the personal element could not be avoided, simply because the stewardship of the truth involved had been so evidently entrusted to a single person. Without the loyal and self-sacrificing fellowship of a devoted few this witness, speaking humanly, must have succumbed to the arduous circumstances of its birth. The final responsibility, however, has always rested from the beginning upon one frail and very earthen vessel.

The true object of this series, however, was not so much the story of the earthen vessel as to set forth the treasure that by grace had been poured into it, and as the peculiar character of that teaching is known, for good or ill, as “Dispensational Truth” we are glad to announce the completion of a work entitled “An Alphabetical Analysis” of some 1,000 pages which is devoted to “terms and texts” that relate to Dispensational Truth.

The first volume of this new work is now ready and covers the letters A to E and subsequent volumes will be issued at convenient intervals.

At first we limited ourselves to dispensational features, and much regretted that while we could stress the need for “Right Division” we could not at the same time set forth the claims of the “Word of Truth” to its divine inspiration. In the same way, while we could enlarge on the dispensational place of the “ACTS”, we had to pass without comment such a theme as “ATONEMENT”. This, however, we are in process of rectifying and the volume with which the series will close will be devoted to outstanding doctrines, without which dispensational truth is without basis.

We commend this series to the reader and trust that it may prove to be indeed a blessed “Tool” for the “Unashamed Workman”.

Creation or Catastrophe

Genesis i. 2

p. 160

We assume, in this series of brief notes, that the reader is acquainted with the arguments put forward to substantiate the translation of Eph. i. 4 “Before the *overthrow* of the world” and the arguments and evidences to prove that the condition “without form and void” (Gen. i. 2) is the “overthrow” referred to. In this series of one page notes a few subsidiary evidences will be brought to the reader’s notice, but if the matter should be new and strange, a fairly exhaustive treatment will be found in Volume XXXVI, pages 61, 81, 101, 121 and 141 to which he is referred

In the present study our attention is limited to the meaning of the Hebrew conjunction *vav*, generally translated “and”. It is found in its primitive use in the first verse of Genesis where it joins the two parts of the universe together “The heaven *and* the earth”. This same *vav* commences the second verse “And the earth was without form and void”, and it is taught by some that its presence necessitates the repetition of the verb “created” from verse one, revealing that creation was actually brought about in this chaotic condition, reading “And (God created) the earth without form and void”. Our translators however were well aware that *vav* has to do justice to a variety of meanings; where the English uses *or, then, put, notwithstanding, howbeit, so, thus, therefore* and *that*, the Hebrew has the simple *vav*. For example: “*But* of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt eat of it” (Gen. ii. 17); “*But* unto Cain” (Gen. iv. 5); “*But* Noah” (Gen. vi. 8) are sufficient to show the reasonableness of this translation. This rendering is enforced by the Septuagint, where the conjunction *kai* “and” is replaced by the disjunctive *de* “but”. Gen. i. 2 therefore can read:

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, BUT the earth was without form and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep.”

We do not, however, put this rendering forward as a translation of the whole verse, but only to indicate the meaning of the Hebrew *Vav*, which we have rendered “But”.

In another note on this verse we shall consider the translation of the two words printed “was” and “was” in the A.V. but this must wait a convenient opportunity.

EPHESIANS.

“To make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery”
(Eph. iii. 9, R.V.)

No.29. The Chapel of Acknowledgment (i. 15 - 19).

- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - - (BE-XXXVIII.7).

No.29. Three Prayers of Ephesians compared. pp. 7 - 11

In *The Berean Expositor*, Volume XXXV, page 142 is a drawing showing a house of some pretensions, having a central tower, and two wings, each wing having seven rooms, and these two wings with their seven rooms balancing one another on plan. This is explained as being a pictorial exhibition of the structure of the epistle to the Ephesians, in which seven doctrinal sections occupy chapters i., ii. and part of iii., while seven corresponding sections dealing with practice occupy chapters iv., v., vi. Our guide has broken into his description of the contents of the Muniment room three times, saying “to the praise of His glory”, he now conducts us to the next room in the building which we have called “The Chapel of Acknowledgment”* for here, he ceases to teach us and begins rather to pray for us.

[* - The reader may be interested to know that the illustration used at the head of this article is a drawing made in the Chapel of the Opened Book, from the vestry looking across the reading desk to the Pulpit.]

“Wherefore I also.” This little word “also” has occurred several times already.

“In Whom *also*”, that is, over and above the fact that Christ is to head up all things in heaven and in earth, “we also” said the Apostle have a part. “In Whom ye *also*” were sealed and given an earnest. “Wherefore I *also*”, I now come forward, says Paul, recognizing your position by grace, to pray for your enlightenment and appreciation of the grace so lavishly bestowed upon you. There are some matters that call for prayer, the only condition being man’s abject need of Divine grace. There are some matters, however, that cannot form the basis of true prayer, apart from the fulfillment of certain conditions. We are facing one such instance here. It would be useless to pray for these Ephesians, that they “may know what is the hope of His calling”, if they had received no instruction on the subject. Verses 3-14 which reveal the “calling” must come before verses 15-19 which lead on to its “hope”. There comes a moment also when teaching must stop. Unless there is response and acknowledgment of what has already been revealed, to add instruction would be an evil. “Then shall ye know if ye *follow on* to know the Lord” is a sound principle at all times. These Ephesian saints appear to have

fulfilled certain of these conditions for the Apostle told them that he gave thanks and prayed for them “After I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints” (Eph. i. 15).

EPHESIANS i. 15 - 19. PAUL’S PRAYER.

- A | 15, 16. Faith according to you in the Lord Jesus. *Kata.*
- B | *That He may give.* |
 - 17. Spirit of wisdom and revelation.
 - 17. Acknowledgment of Him.
 - 18. Eyes of heart enlightened.
- B | *That ye may know.* |
 - 18. What is the hope.
 - 18. What is the riches.
 - 19. What is the greatness.
- A | 19. To usward who believe. *Kata.*

This prayer leads on directly from the revelation given in the chapter (Eph. i. 3-14) and is particularly connected with the third portion, the Witness of the Spirit, where “faith” and “hope” appear, as well as the inheritance which is to be entered in the day of redemption. The whole of the previous section has been directed upward and outward. The believer’s attention has been turned away from self and experience, to the elective and redemptive purposes of grace, with its heavenly places and its spiritual blessings. At the close of the doctrinal section of the epistle we shall find another prayer (Eph. iii. 14-21) and yet once more when the practical section is nearly closed, a third prayer of the Apostle is recorded. These prayers are interrelated, and are an integral part of the teaching of the epistle. The following comparison, though it be only in outline, will show the connecting points, yet reveals the different aspects of the truth to which the attention is directed. In the first prayer, the direction is up, to where Christ sits, and away from self. In the second, the attention is focused upon “Christ in us”, “the inner man”, “at home in the heart” rather than being seated at the right hand of God. In the first prayer “every name that is named” speaks of the supreme exaltation of the Saviour. In the second passage it is “every family is named”, where high exaltation gives place to the figure of home.

THE TWO PRAYERS	
i. 15 - 19.	iii. 14 - 21.
THE PRAYERS ARE ADDRESSED TO	
The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory.	The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.
THAT HE MAY GIVE	
A spirit of wisdom and revelation.	Strength by the Spirit in the inner man.
THAT YE MAY KNOW	
Hope, riches, power.	Love.

The Charter.	The Prayer.
The Will of the Father.	What is the hope of His calling?
The Work of the Son.	What is the riches of . . . inheritance?
The Witness of the Spirit.	What is the . . . power . . . who believe?

Paul tells the Ephesians that he had heard of their “faith” and their “love” and consequently proceeds to pray concerning their “hope”, these three often being brought together in his epistles.

The original wording of Eph. i. 15 is somewhat strange. Our version reads “After I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus” which is straightforward enough. Weymouth inserts the words “which prevails among you”. Darby adds “which is in you”, Rotherham has “on your part”. Each of these translators were endeavouring to express the intention of the Apostle who said:

Dia touto kago akousas ten kath' humas pisten
Because of this I also having heard of the according to your faith

“The according to your faith” is not English, and conveys no true meaning, yet the very fact that so strange a term should be introduced here is a challenge. In Acts xxvi. 3 we read “especially because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews”, where the original reads *ton kata Ioudaiou*. Again in Acts xviii. 15, “but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it”. Here again the Greek reads *kai nomou tou kath' humas* “and of a law that is according to you”. In these references we readily perceive that the Roman Gallio or in Paul’s speech to King Agrippa, laws, customs and questions that are peculiarly Jewish are in mind. The preposition *kata* is translated “according to” 108 times, and is found in Ephesians, so translated, 14 times. Let us observe its occurrence in the charter of the Church (Eph. i. 3-14). These believers were predestinated to adoption “according to the riches of His grace”. The revelation of the mystery of His will was “according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself”, and the taking of these believers for an inheritance was also “according to the purpose of Him Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will”. It is impossible to avoid the fact that the high calling of this church, its revelation at that time and all that pertained to it was “according to” plan. If the same word is used once more in verse fifteen, surely we are expected to continue this thought. Your faith, said the Apostle in effect, must not be confounded with the faith that is put forth by a believer in some other dispensation or calling. It may not be the “gift of faith” by which mountains are moved, it must be that aspect of faith that HARMONIZES (“accords”) with your calling. It is however only too true, that there may be a clear comprehension of the distinctive character of our calling with very little corresponding “love unto all the saints” and where this is lacking, growth must cease. Happily the Ephesians manifested both the true faith and the consequent love, and on this basis the Apostle goes forward with his unceasing prayer for them. What he actually prayed we must consider in the next article. Meanwhile let us not forget the connexion established here, between the revelation of truth, and its manifestation in life.

No.30. The Chapel of Acknowledgment (i. 15 - 19).

An examination of the word translated “knowledge” (i. 17). pp. 21 - 23

“That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him” (Eph. i. 17).

With these words, the great prayer opens. Before examining any of its parts or phrases, it is incumbent upon us to explain the reason why we have used the word “acknowledgment” in the heading of this article, where the A.V. uses “knowledge”. The word under consideration is the translation of the Greek *epignosis*. This word undoubtedly is used for “knowledge” in several passages, but it is also rightly translated “acknowledgment” in others. This is true also of the verb *epignosko*. In some instances the A.V. translators have used one word in one occurrence and the other word in a parallel passage thus. In II Tim. ii. 25 we read of “repentance to *the acknowledging* of the truth”, whereas in the next chapter we read “never able to come to *the knowledge* of the truth” (II Tim. iii. 7). Which is right? Why should the words be translated differently? The R.V. uses “knowledge” in both places.

Let us consider one or two passages where the word “knowledge” is used. Suppose we believe that *epignosis* means “full knowledge”. We read in Matt. vii. 16: “Ye shall know them by their fruits.” If we import “full knowledge” into this passage we rob it of its intention and we state an untruth. A peasant to whom the words biology and botany would be meaningless, would be able to “recognize” grapes, figs or thistles, not from any profound knowledge of the science, but by sheer “recognition”. When the Saviour, speaking of John the Baptist, said “That Elias is come already, and they knew him not” (Matt. xvii. 12), it is evident that He meant that they did not recognize him. In Mark vi. 33, it is evident that the people “recognized” the Lord at a distance and ran to meet Him. So in some passages the A.V. uses the word “perceive” instead of “know” (Mark ii. 8; Luke i. 22 and v. 22). The word “recognize” aptly suits Luke xxiv. 16, “their eyes were holden that they should not recognize Him”, so in Acts iii. 10, iv. 13, xii. 14, xix. 34, xxvii. 39, all these passages are better understood if the word “recognize” is substituted. *Epignosko* is translated “acknowledge” in the following passages in the A.V.: I Cor. xiv. 37 “Let him acknowledge”; xvi. 18 “therefore acknowledge”; II Cor. i. 13 “shall acknowledge (twice)”; i. 14 “ye have acknowledged”. So with the noun *epignosis*, the A.V. reads “acknowledgment” or “acknowledging” in Col. ii. 2; II Tim. ii. 25; Titus i. 1 and Philemon 6.

Writing in Titus, the Apostle seems to have followed much the same path as is indicated in the first chapter of Ephesians. After introducing himself as a servant and an apostle he stops, and in parenthesis says according to (1) the faith of God’s elect; this is comparable to the charter of the church; (2) the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness. The sequel is the prayer and the acknowledgment which follows in Eph. i. 15-19. Here too, is “hope” and “promise” and a period “before the world began”

and a period called “due time” for its making known, and a “committing” of the same to Paul. In Col. ii. 2 Paul writes, at the conclusion of another prayer, “that their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God—Christ (Revised text), in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col. ii. 2, 3). We believe that in Eph. iv. 13 and Col. i. 9, 10, the truth is better expressed by “acknowledgment” than knowledge. The verb *epignosko* occurs once in the epistle to the Colossians, namely, in the phrase “and *knew* the grace of God in truth” (i. 6) and the substantive, *epignosis*, occurs four times, as follows:

“That ye might be filled with the *knowledge* of His will” (i. 9).
“Increasing in the *knowledge* of God” (i. 10).
“To the *acknowledgment* of the mystery of God” (ii. 2).
“Which is renewed in *knowledge* after the image” (iii. 10).

It will be observed that whether it be the verb or the noun, each reference is practical in its character, and has growth as its goal.

In Col. i. 6, we read of “fruit bearing” and “increase”, although the A.V. here gives no translation of the second word, *auxanomenon*, an omission supplied by the R.V. which reads, “bearing fruit or increasing”. Now this growth and evidence of life is associated with “recognizing the grace of God in truth”. “The truth” may be conceived as the opposite of “the lie” (Rom. i. 25), or “the truth” may be conceived as the opposite of “type and shadow” (John i. 17). That which is “true” is often placed in contrast with the typical, as, for example, “the figures of the true” (Heb. ix. 24), or “the true bread” (John vi. 32). The Colossians did not merely “know the grace of God”, they “recognized, or acknowledged, the grace of God in reality”. This, as we saw in our last article, is essential to maturity, as it is here essential to growth and fruitfulness.

In the prayer that commences at Col. i. 9 the Apostle uses the word *epignosis* twice. Care must be exercised in translating these two passages, otherwise the precise meaning of the Spirit will be missed, and human ideas substituted. There is no preposition which stands for “with” in the first reference, but the case of the word permits the translation “filled with” or “filled as to”. *Ten epignosin* is in the accusative case, “the accusative of equivalent notion” (Jelf). *Ten epignosin* is the “fullness” implied in the preceding verb “to fill”. The reader will remember that “the fullness” comes in Eph. iv. 13 as part of the “measure” of the perfect man.

Paraphrasing the Apostle’s words, therefore, in order to bring out this meaning we suggest the following:

“For this cause, namely, that you have ‘recognized’ the grace of God ‘in reality’ and are manifesting this recognition by fruit-bearing and increase, we do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that you might be filled, and this fullness is none other than the ‘recognition’ of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding.”

This prayer is very much along the lines of that found in Eph. i. 15-19 where the Apostle prayed that in the sphere of this acknowledgment or recognition, the spirit of

wisdom and revelation would be granted. At the close of the prayer, the Apostle reverts to this “recognition”, and once again we must carefully examine the original in order to perceive the truth. In the first instance we must note that there are several readings of the manuscripts of Col. i. 10.

The Received Text reads *eis ten epignosin*, “unto the knowledge”. A few MSS read *en te epignosei* “in the knowledge”, but the bulk of the best texts read simply *te epignosei*, the dative case, without either the prepositions *eis* or *en*. Some of these readings can be seen in the footnotes of various editions of the Greek New Testament. “The Companion Bible” notes a few, but textual criticism is a specialized study, consequently we translate Col. i. 10: “Being fruitful in every good work, and increasing by the recognition, or acknowledgment, of God.”

It is “by” the acknowledgment of God, that we both “bear fruit” and “increase”, and apart from that acknowledgment or recognition growth ceases, sight becomes dim, and the keenness that once characterized our pursuit of the high truth of the Mystery wanes.

We believe that the Apostle in Eph. i. 17 is not concerned with “knowledge”, he, in effect, says “we must stop for a while. In the charter of the church there is enough knowledge to last a lifetime—what is needed is the grace and the willingness to acknowledge the wondrous truth”. It is just here that so many fail. We have met those whose intelligence was bright enough for them to see very clearly that with the passing of Israel a new dispensation was called for. They saw only too well that there were exceeding different conditions in the Mystery from that which obtained during the Acts, they drew back, not because they did not see, but because they saw only too well, and realized that a price would be exacted by christendom if they dared to step out into the full light and liberty of the Mystery. So, failing to “acknowledge” what they had seen, they soon failed to recognize the truth, and are now quite content with the ordinances and their appropriations of Pentecost. The fear of man bringeth a snare, and “repentance unto the acknowledging of the truth” (II Tim. ii. 25) is the only means of deliverance.

No.31. The Chapel of Acknowledgment (i. 15 - 19).

The Father of Glory.

pp. 61 - 64

Having shown the reason for using the word “acknowledgment” in verse seventeen, we now consider the prayer of the Apostle in detail. The prayer is addressed to “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Eph. i. 17). It will be observed that the second prayer is addressed to “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”. There are several occasions when the two titles are used together, as in II Cor. i. 3, which in the original is word for word with that of Eph. i. 3. At the resurrection it will be remembered, the Saviour said to Mary:

“Go to My brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father; and to My God and your God” (John xx. 17).

Immediately after this we read that He Who said “My God” was Himself acknowledged by Thomas with *the same words!* In the epistle to the Hebrews we have another extraordinary use of the term.

“Unto the Son He saith, Thy throne O God is for ever and ever”, yet in the very next verse He Who is addressed as God is now said to have a God “Therefore God, *even* Thy God hath anointed Thee above Thy fellows” (Heb. i. 8, 9). This same One has already been called “Lord” and the work of creation attributed to Him. Evidently the writers of Scripture saw no inconsistency in ascribing the title “God” to the Saviour, and yet of speaking of the Father, as “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ”. When the Lord took upon Him the form of a servant and the fashion of a man, He stooped from the high status of Creator, to the lowly status of creature. As such He acknowledged One Who sent Him, One Whom He obeyed, One Whose doctrine He taught, One Whose will He delighted to do. He acknowledged that His Father was greater than Himself, even when He claimed that He and His Father were one. In the status of a true servant, and in the fashion of a man, He must either have refused to acknowledge God which is inconceivable, or He must have acknowledged God, which He most blessedly did. He never said “Our Father”, that He left for His followers. He went out of His way to say “My Father and your Father”, thus while one with them in the common humanity, He was for ever separated from them by His essential Deity. The most solemn and awful occasion when the Saviour used the words “My God” was on the cross, forsaken as the bearer of our sin. He said “My God” on the cross. He said “My God” on the resurrection morning, and the Apostle speaks of the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, when he speaks of His ascended glory. There is therefore a definite reason for the introduction of this title. God is God, whether man believes or does not believe. “Even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God” (Psa. xc. 2). Yet on occasion He says “I will not be your God” (Hos. i. 9). It is evident therefore that when we read “The God OF”, as we do in Eph. i. 17, there is something more intended than that God is, and that Christ was in the form of a servant. Throughout the Scriptures we read “I am the *God of* Abraham, the *God of* Isaac, the *God of* Jacob” by which we understand that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob

were in covenant relationship with God. He is called the God of Israel and the God of our fathers, but where does He ever say “I am the God of Moses”? “I am the God of Isaiah?” When we come to the epistles of the Mystery, the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, is temporarily suspended, inheritance of the land postponed, the high honour of being a kingdom of priests, for the time being forfeited. The members of the One Body, being Gentiles, had no “fathers”, no “covenants”, no “promises”, only one promise, and that made before the world began. Consequently when we read that Paul prayed to “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ” we lose its significance if we begin to argue about His Deity; to us, He is more than Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were to Israel, and when we give the title to the Father, “*the God of our Lord Jesus Christ*”, we are claiming the same intimate relationship on higher ground and with richer blessing, than Israel claimed on their lower ground and with lesser blessings, when they called on *the God of their Fathers*. It is especially used when the Son of God is peculiarly associating Himself with His people. The strong doctrinal element of the first prayer is associated with the title “God”, the mellow experimental nature of the second prayer is associated with the title “Father”. In the former, we have high exaltation, all things under His feet and universal sovereignty, in the latter we have family and home. In the former it is “power” that is exceeding, in the latter it is “love”. In the former it is revealed that this church will be “the fullness of Him that filleth all in all”, a statement of fact, wonderful beyond our wildest dreams. In the latter we are urged so to comfort ourselves that we “might be filled up to (*eis*) all the fullness of God”. It is “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ” in the first prayer, it is “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” in the second. In the first prayer we look up. In the second He comes down. The fact that both “God” and “Father” are employed in these prayers, shows that the Lord Jesus is still viewed in His mediatorial capacity. There in the highest glory He sits, “the MAN Christ Jesus”, and as “the Son” He reigns until the goal is reached (I Cor. xv. 28). As “the Man” He sits on high as the Head of the Body the Church, as in Him, the Man, all fullness dwells, as the Man He will be manifested with His church in glory, as the Man all Principality and Power are beneath his feet, a glory faintly foreshadowed in Adam as revealed in the eighth Psalm. We may not fathom all the reasons why, after choosing the church IN CHRIST, before the foundation of the world, it was necessary that every member of this company should first come into existence “IN ADAM” but some glimmerings of the mighty purpose are here to be seen.

Following the title “The God of our Lord Jesus Christ” is another of like import, “The Father of glory”. We must resist all efforts to turn this into a figure of speech that would make it mean “the glorious Father”. There is more here than appears at first. A parallel is found in II Cor. i. 3 where we read “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort”. When we read Eph. i. 17 for the first time “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ” it appears to put the Lord in a strange position, seeing that He, too, is most definitely given the same august title. But no such feeling is aroused when we read “The God of all comfort”. Comfort is not worshipped, but is the possession or attribute of God, “Who comforteth us” as the Apostle goes on to say. So in Ephesians “the Father of glory” like “the Father of mercies” is the author and dispenser of both “mercies” and “glory”. What that term “glory” implies here, must be gathered from the context. It is no more introduced suddenly and with no association

with the theme of Eph. i. than are the parallel titles of II Cor. i. 3 introduced without reference to the “comfort” and “consolation” with which the chapter abounds. If we know what aspect of “glory” appears in the context of Eph. i. 17 we shall be able to appreciate the use of the title here in this prayer.

The threefold charter (Eph. i. 3-14) already examined is divided into its parts by the recurrence of the word “glory in a note of praise. Thus:

The Will of the Father	Unto the praise of the glory of His grace.
The Work of the Son	Unto the praise of His glory.
The Witness of the Spirit	Unto the praise of His glory.

Grace appears but once, and that at the close of the will of the Father, where the blessings of His will and choice are summed up as “accepted in the Beloved”. Here, in this word “accepted”, the word “grace” is buried from sight in the English translation, but appears when the two Greek words are placed side by side. Grace—*charis*, accept—*charitoo*. It is the glory of this grace that is first spoken of. Following the redemption and liberating of the heirs of God comes the next reference to glory, with the extraordinary feature which we have already noted, that the believer has been taken by God as HIS inheritance, and finally, in view of the completion of the whole purpose in the redemption of the purchase at the last, once more His glory is uppermost. Then in the prayer that follows, comes the petition “that ye may know what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints” (Eph. i. 18). It is in the capacity of “the Father of glory” (*tes doxes*) that God grants the spirit of wisdom and revelation. Neither wisdom nor revelation are sought after here for their own sakes, but as a means to an end, “that ye may know”. These introductory steps must be distinguish from the actual goal. They are:

- (1) The grant of wisdom and revelation.
- (2) In the acknowledging of Him.
- (3) Taking for granted that the eyes of your heart having been enlightened.

It will help us if we pause here, so that we may devote all space available in the next article to the examination of these three essential steps to the attainment of the three items of knowledge that constitute the mode of the Apostle’s prayer. These three items are:

What is the HOPE of His calling.
What the riches of the GLORY of His inheritance in the saints.
What the exceeding greatness of His POWER to usward.

The Hope contemplates the goal before it is reached. The Power guarantees that the goal shall be reached. The glory reveals what the goal will be when it is reached.

Surely the very contemplation of these things should set our hearts aglow, and turn our worshipping faces to the throne of heavenly grace.

No.32. The Chapel of Acknowledgment (i. 15 - 19).

The Prayer for Perception.

pp. 81 - 83

Let us consider the three steps indicated by the Apostle in his prayer.

(1) The spirit of wisdom and revelation. Strictly speaking we should omit the article “the” and speak of “a spirit of wisdom and revelation”—a gift, not exactly the same as the supernatural gift of “knowledge” and “wisdom” (I Cor. xii. 8) which was enjoyed during the Pentecostal period, but “a gift” nevertheless. No amount of human learning, study or training, no amount of reading or erudition can attain to the goal before us. As in other days, so now, God reveals many things to the babe that are hidden from the wise and prudent, and a chastened spirit bows before the Lord and makes no demands, but quietly waits, and realizes that all that is asked for of the Father of “glory” will be granted by Him as the God of “grace”.

When writing to the Colossians, the Apostle has recorded a similar prayer, saying:

“Since we heard For this cause we also, since the day we heard it do not cease to pray for you, and desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding” (Col. i. 4-9).

The reader may remember that in article No.30 of this series we have examined Col. i. 9, 10 and suggested a slightly different meaning.

“We do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that you might be filled, and this fullness is none other than the ‘recognition’ of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding.”

What are we to understand by a “spirit of wisdom and revelation?? J. Armitage Robinson says: “It is a teaching spirit, rather than a teachable spirit, which the Apostle asks that they may have.” Our thoughts travel to the book of the Revelation, where we read: “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy” (Rev. xix. 10). This is not the testimony borne by our Lord, for the angel said: “I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus”; it is this testimony that is the spirit of prophecy. So, the “acknowledgment” which is the essence of the Apostle’s prayer for the Ephesians is the vehicle by which this spirit of wisdom and revelation is received. Wisdom, in the book of Daniel, is related particularly with the unveiling of Divine secrets (Dan. i. 4, 17, 20; ii. 20, 21, 23, 30; v. 11, 14). The term “the wise men” which occurs in Dan. xiv. fourteen times, is used with particular reference to the unveiling of mysteries. “Wisdom” in Ezekiel is confined to chapter twenty-eight. The only reference to “wisdom” in Romans is in chapter xi. 33, where the *unsearchable* ways of God are spoken of. So in Ephesians the three occurrences of “wisdom” (Eph. i. 8, 17 and iii. 10) are linked with the Mystery, even as the title “The only wise God”

(Rom. xvi. 27; I Tim. i. 17; Jude 25) is associated with the Mystery and the working out of the purpose of the ages. All the wisdom in the world, however, can never discover what God hides. Until He is pleased to remove the veil, wisdom may lead to a consciousness of the need of a revelation, but it cannot provide it. The two together however, “wisdom and revelation”, are what the Apostle prayed for and what we all must receive. This spirit of wisdom and revelation, we have already discovered is related to “acknowledging” Him (see the previous article).

(2) We come therefore to the next preparation:

“The eyes of your understanding being enlightened” (Eph. i. 18).

This is not another gift, it is rather a presupposed condition “having been enlightened”. The Apostle uses the word *photizo* “to enlighten” three times in his earlier epistles, and three times in his later epistles. The three in the later Prison epistles are:

Eph. i. 18	“Eyes of understanding having been <i>enlightened</i> .”
Eph. iii. 9	“To make all men <i>see</i> what is the dispensation.”
II Tim. i. 10	“Hath brought life and immortality to <i>light</i> .”

“Understanding”, *dianoia* “a thinking through”, is the faculty of reflection, and is found in Eph. ii. 3, iv. 18 and Col. i. 21. The Revised Text however reads *kardia* “heart”. It is important to remember that that critical passage Isa. vi. 9, 10 that marks the failure of Israel both in Matt. xiii. 15 and Acts xxviii. 27 speaks of understanding with the heart, as though the blindness of Israel was the result of willfulness than poorness of intellect.

The relation of “the eyes” to understanding is a constant figure in the Scriptures. We read of the single eye and the evil eye, and Israel closed their eyes before they failed to understand with their heart. When Paul made known that he was about to enter his prison ministry, he gave a summary of its characteristics and among them he placed “to open their eyes” (Acts xxvi. 18). This threefold preparation, the spirit of wisdom and revelation, the acknowledging, and the illumination of the eyes of the heart, leads on to the knowledge which is the burden of this prayer. This knowledge also is threefold, thus:

That ye may know

1. What is the hope of His calling.
2. What the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints.
3. What the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe.

Notice too, the thrice repeated “His”. In this prayer as we have already seen our thoughts are directed away and upward and outside of ourselves, and it is only when the glorious teaching of chapters ii. and iii. has been received, that the Apostle in his second prayer turns the believer’s attention to “the inner man” to Christ dwelling “in your hearts by faith”, to the saints being “filled”. Strange spiritual aberration may follow the reversal of this divine order. To be taken up with the “inner man” apart from the power of the risen Christ is dangerous in the extreme.

Let us pause before we proceed to the question of “Hope”, “Riches” and “Power” to acquaint ourselves with the meaning of this word “know”, for there are two Greek words, which between them supply the thought of knowing in the N.T., namely *ginosko* and *oida*. The former when prefixed with *epi* provides us with the word “knowledge” in Eph. i. 17 or, as we have translated, “acknowledgment”. *Oida*, the word we are considering, is associated with mental vision, and is so linked with this conception of sight, that Dr. Young, in the Index of his Analytical Concordance, gives two cross references. We look at *oida*, and we are referred to *eidon*, we consult *eidon* and we are referred to *horao*, we refer to *horao*, and we find it is translated “see” eighty-six times, and “behold, look, appear”, etc., every rendering being referable to vision or sight. We should not, perhaps, be quite correct to translate Eph. i. 18 “that ye may see what is the hope”, but we should, I think, be nearer the truth if we rendered the passage “that ye may perceive”. Vision rather than knowledge is in the Apostle’s mind. This too would harmonize with the enlightenment of the eyes of the heart, and even find an echo in the original meaning of revelation, namely “unveiling”. We have already preferred to the relation of eyes and heart in the prophecy of Isaiah which speaks of Israel’s terrible failure, and just as the willful closing of their eyes resulted in the hardness of their hearts, so judicial blindness came as an awful sequel “If thou hadst known, even thou at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes” (Luke xix. 42). The Apostle who knew only too well the relation of eyes, heart and rejection (Acts xxviii.) would pray the prayer for the Ephesian saints with an intensity of meaning and a reality of concern.

The three things he desired that they should thus “perceive” must form the subject of future studies. Let us examine ourselves afresh and see how we stand in relation to the great necessity of “acknowledging” Him, knowing full well that vision will fail and perception will be dim if that great clarifying attitude be not willingly and readily maintained. If the Proverb says:

“In all thy ways acknowledge Him
and He shall direct (rightly divide LXX) thy paths.”

the epistle in effect says:

“In all thy ways acknowledge Him
And He will give you vision and perception.”

No.33. The Chapel of Acknowledgment (i. 15 - 19).

“What is the hope of His calling” (i. 18).

pp. 101 - 103

The first petition of the threefold prayer offered by the Apostle for these Ephesian believers is concerning “hope”, but not hope in general, it is “the hope of His calling”. Apart from a few occasions where the word hope is used in a secondary sense, such as the reference to ploughing in hope (I Cor. ix. 10), and “hope of gain” in Acts xvi. 19 the remaining fifty occurrences have to do with resurrection, the Second Coming, one’s calling and related themes. Here the prayer is specific, “the hope of His calling”. While the threefold petition of the prayer does not rigidly follow the threefold subdivision of the preceding section (The Charter of the Church, Eph. i. 3-14), The Will of the Father (Eph. i. 3-6) is most certainly closely connected with a “calling”, even as the second petition, which speaks of an inheritance in the saints, picks up the theme of Eph. i. 1.

Paul had written at least seven epistles, before he wrote Ephesians, and the subject of “hope” is given a fairly comprehensive survey. There is a great passage in I Thess. iv., the equally great passages in I Cor. xv., Rom. xv. 12, 13 and Heb. xi. When all that is revealed in these portions is assembled, a fairly comprehensive picture of the hope of the church of that period is obtained. There we find such references as “the voice of the archangel”; “the last trump”; “the rise (of Christ) as the root of Jesse to reign over the Gentiles”, and “the heavenly Jerusalem” to give colour and background to the hope thus entertained. These Ephesian had been evangelized by the apostle, and a church with elders flourished at the time when Paul had revealed to them that he was about to enter a new phase of ministry. He had spent, subsequent to Acts xx., two years in Caesarea and probably one year in Rome before this epistle to the Ephesians was written. Yet he prays that they may “perceive” “what is the hope of His calling”. Had he said that he hoped they would “remember” what he had already told them, had he said to them as he had earlier to the Thessalonians “You yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night” it would be understandable, but here he appears to be approaching this question of “hope” as though it were something new.

Of course the reader appreciates the fact that this is exactly the state of the case. *Something new had been revealed.* A calling going back before the foundation of the world (Gen. i. 2), and up above the firmament of Gen. i. 6, to the heaven of Gen. i. 1. No calling had ever been associated by Prophet or Apostle in Old Testament or New with such remote spheres. Now “hope” is the anticipation of the fulfillment of the promises that make up any particular calling, and because hope and calling are so related, we find the two positive references to hope in Ephesians linked with calling:

“What is the hope of HIS calling” (Eph. i. 18).

“Called in one hope of YOUR calling” (Eph. iv. 4).

This, of course is the true order. Unless He has called us, we have no calling. There may be no intentional connexion, but the use of the interrogative *tis* in Eph. i.-iii. is suggestive:

What is the HOPE?	What is	BREADTH?
What is the RICHES?		LENGTH?
What is the POWER?		DEPTH?
What is the DISPENSATION?		HEIGHT? (Eph. i. 18, 19; iii. 9-18).

Most certainly is it true, that only as we comprehend these four great subjects, will we comprehend what is the breadth, length, depth and height of the mighty purpose of grace.

What is the hope of His calling? Hope looks forward in expectation, but it is intimately related with faith. Coming for a moment to another calling, namely the heavenly calling of Heb. iii. 1, we learn that all they who entertained this calling and its hope died, not having received the fulfillment of the promises; they died in “faith” (Heb. xi. 13), so, we read in verse one:

“Now faith is the substance of things hoped for.”

This must not be construed as a definition of faith as though Paul were writing a doctrinal treatise. He is speaking to those who had suffered the loss of their goods, and needed encouragement to persevere. Faith, he says is the “substance” of things hoped for. The Greek word translated “substance” is *hupostasis*, a word which has come into English in connexion with scientific, philosophic and theological statements. In medicine it means a sediment. In theology it means personality, especially when speaking of the three Persons in the Trinity, and in metaphysics, it refers to that which subsists, or underlies anything, as opposed to attributes or “accidents”.

Take a crude illustration of the metaphysical usage. Let us imagine we have before us a brick. Its shape is philosophically an “accident”; it is not of the nature of essence, for a brick can be reduced to powder without altering its chemical composition or its weight. Its colour too is reflected light, and if the light be changed, its apparent colour too will change too. In this way we may remove one after another of the “attributes” of a brick until the mind begins to inquire “what IS then a brick?” and we are brought face to face with the fact that even in the world of such palpable stuff as “brick”, a world with which we are acquainted, we are after all only acquainted with the superficial; the underlying reality of matter is still beyond our ken. It is for this reason that we find the word *hupostasis* in Heb. i. 3, where it is translated “Person”. Here again is a word in common use. Yet here again we use a term that is highly significant. The word “person” comes from the Latin *persona* “to speak through” and means a mask, especially one worn by play actors. So Jeremy Taylor writes:

“No man can long put on *persona* and act a part but his evil manners will peep through the corners of his white robe.”

In Heb. i. 1-3 Christ is said to be “the Express Image of His Person”. Here we have two suggestive Greek words in apposition, *character* “express image”, and *hupostasis*

“person”. *Charakter* comes from a word which means “to engrave”. Wycliffe uses it in his translation of Rev. xiii. 16. The word character also means “a letter” and in natural science, the essential marks which distinguish a mineral, plant or animal, and so the ordinary use of the term to indicate personal qualities. God is Spirit. God is invisible, and Christ is “God manifest in the flesh”. He is the “character” of God made evident. The invisible *hypostasis*, that which “stands under” the substance, being in Him made visible and expressed. Faith therefore is the underlying reality, the substance, of things hoped for. In a legal document, the “Petition of Dionysia”, the word is used as a technical term for the “title-deeds” of a property which was the subject of litigation. We can therefore translate somewhat freely, Heb. xi. 1, “faith is the title deeds of things hoped for”.

This brings us back to Eph. i. 18. “The hope of His calling” cannot be severed from the faith, from things believed. Things believed must refer to the revelation made in Eph. i. 3-14, which received the seal and the earnest of the Spirit; we are therefore contemplating something new. A new calling, a new sphere, calls for a corresponding hope, and instead of actually teaching what that hope will be, the Apostle rather prays, knowing that an understanding of its distinctive features will grow out of the believer’s acknowledgment of the truth already believed. In some things we ourselves answer our own prayers. The hope of His calling therefore must be closely related to the quality of our blessings “all spiritual”; the sphere of our future inheritance “in the heavenly places”, and the period of our election “before the foundation (or overthrow) of the world”.

Our hope therefore will be far above “the earth” which in the millennium and in the New Earth will blossom as the rose and be “Paradise restored”. Our hope will be realized “in heavenly places”, anything lower than this highest of all spheres, would introduce a discrepancy between what we now entertain by faith, and what we should actually enter by hope, which cannot be. The fact that our election antedates Gen. i. 2 removes this calling from any covenants subsequently entered into either with Adam, Noah or Abraham. What is true regarding the hope, will be found to be true when considering the two remaining petitions of this prayer. These however are too important to be surveyed in the limited space now available, we accordingly propose to give them a consideration in the next article of this series.

No.34. The Chapel of Acknowledgment (i. 15 - 19).

Ton hagian or “Heaven itself”.

pp. 121 - 125

The first petition, “what is the hope of His calling”, looks back to the will of the Father (Eph. i. 3-6), the second, “what is the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints”, looks back to the results of redemption, as set forth under the heading “the work of the Son” (Eph. i. 7-12), where the inheritance is first mentioned. When we were examining Eph. i. 11 we discovered that the true teaching of this passage was not so much that WE had OBTAINED an inheritance, as that WE had been TAKEN to be an inheritance. This translation is discussed in No.24 of this series. The possibilities that such a calling opens up are overwhelming. To *obtain* an inheritance in the high glory of heavenly places, where Christ sits far above all principality and power, staggers the imagination, but “what is the riches of the glory of HIS INHERITANCE in the saints” is left unexplained. The Apostle transfers the question to the section dealing with prayer. We cannot appreciate it while remaining in the “Muniment Room”, we can only learn something of its wonder in “The Chapel of Acknowledgment”.

The answer to the question “what the riches” is not found written on the page of Scripture, but is rather written on the tables of the heart. The eyes of the “heart” must be enlightened, the renewed mind must readily “acknowledge” if this truth is to be received. While “inheritance” is the theme in general, it is the “riches of the glory” of the inheritance that is the particular burden of the prayer. The following are all the references to “riches” in the Prison Epistles.

- Plousios* “God Who is rich in mercy” (Eph. ii. 4).
- Plousios* (adverb) “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly” (Col. iii. 16).
- Ploutos* “Forgiveness according to the riches of His grace” (Eph. i. 17).
- “What (is) the riches of the glory of His inheritance” (Eph. i. 18).
- “The exceeding riches of His grace” (Eph. ii. 7).
- “The unsearchable riches of Christ” (Eph. iii. 8).
- “According to the riches of His glory” (Eph. iii. 16).
- “According to His riches in glory” (Phil. iv. 19).
- “What is the riches of the glory” (Col. i. 27).
- “Unto all riches of the full assurance” (Col. ii. 2).

It will be seen that we have riches of mercy and of grace issuing in salvation, and riches of glory, related to our inheritance, to the spiritual anticipation of some of its glories even now (Eph. iii. 16), the supply of all needs, and the special character of the Mystery (Phil. iv. 19; Col. i. 27).

Three passages out of this series stand out as a unit. The prayer of Eph. i. 18, the prayer of Eph. iii. 16, and the making known of the peculiar character of the Mystery (Col. i. 27). These we will set out more fully.

“What is the RICHES OF THE GLORY of His inheritance in the saints.”

“That He would grant you according to the RICHES OF HIS GLORY to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.”

“The Mystery now made manifest to His saints, to whom God would make known what is the RICHES OF THE GLORY of this Mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you the hope of glory.”

If we take these passages in the reverse order, we shall have the following logical progress:

- (1) Col. i. 26, 27. The riches of the glory of this Mystery is explained, as “Christ in you the hope of glory”.
- (2) Eph. i. 18. The appreciation of this high glory as the outcome of spiritual enlightenment.
- (3) Eph. iii. 16, 17. The indwelling of Christ in the heart, the experimental echo of Col. i. 26, 27.

The words of Col. i. 27 “Christ in you the hope of glory” need careful treatment. Does the Apostle mean by this, the indwelling that is the theme of Eph. iii. 16? Some say yes, some say no. Moffatt renders Col. i. 27, 28 “in the fact of Christ’s presence among you as your hope of glory. This is the Christ we proclaim”. The Companion Bible draws attention that “in” is the same word as “among” in this verse. The grammatical rule is, that where *en* “in” is used with a plural, the meaning is generally expressed by “among” not “in”. We could pour the contents of a gallon jar into another gallon jar, and say that the liquid was “in” the other jar, but if we poured the contents of a gallon into four separate quart pots, we could not so truthfully use the word “in” for the gallon would be distributed “among” the four rather than “in” them”. So Matt. ii. 6 “among the princes of Juda” not “in”. “His sepulcher is *with* or *among* us unto this day” (Acts ii. 29) not “in”. So in I Pet. v. 1, 2 “the elders among you the flock among you”. So therefore we must read “This Mystery *among* the Gentiles, which is Christ *among* you” in Col. i. 27. What does the Apostle mean by “Christ among you”? Before the revelation of the Mystery the ministry of Christ was limited, first to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. x. 6), and then to those Gentiles who were joined to Israel under the New Covenant as branches in the olive tree. Gentiles as such were alien, without God, without Christ, and consequently without hope. When Israel were set aside, as they were in Acts xxviii., the salvation of God was sent to the Gentiles, and in the preaching of Christ by the one appointed Apostle of the Gentiles Christ is said to have come “and preached peace” to those who were far off as well as to those who were nigh (Eph. ii. 17).

The preaching of Christ “among the Gentiles” therefore was a sufficient pledge of their “hope of glory”, for it indicated a change of dispensation, and a change in their favour. Col. i. 26, 27 links the two petitions of the Ephesian prayer together: “what is the hope what the riches of the glory.” “What is the riches of the glory of this Mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ among you the hope of glory.” Something of the peculiar nature of these riches of glory is expressed in the phrase “of His inheritance in the saints”. It is not their inheritance, but His, and we have already seen this is the revelation made in verse eleven. His inheritance is “in the saints”. This is

blessedly true as Eph. i. 11 reveals, but there is more in this expression than meets the eye. In No.5 of this series, the distribution and general usage of the words “saints” is considered, and it was there promised that a more extended examination of the clause “in the saints” would be given when we reached Eph. i. 18.

Ton hagon, in the Greek, may be either masculine, feminine or neuter, and it must be kept in mind that while the English language would not permit us to speak of a “place” as a “saint”, the Greek does. Consequently we read in Heb. ix. 23, 24 of the “Holy Places” which by a figure known as “the plural of majesty” mean “The Most Holy Place”, even as the better sacrifices can only mean the “infinitely better sacrifice”. The following passages in Hebrews employ the word *hagon* “saint” in the neuter, and in the plural:

Hagon.

Heb.	viii. 2	A minister of the <i>sanctuary</i> .
	ix. 1	Divine service and a worldly <i>sanctuary</i> .
	ix. 2	Which is called the <i>sanctuary</i> .
	ix. 3	Which is called the <i>Holiest of all</i> .
	ix. 8	The way into the <i>Holiest of all</i> .
	ix. 12	Entered in once into the <i>holy place</i> .
	ix. 24	Into the <i>holy places</i> made with hands.
	ix. 25	Into the <i>holy place</i> every year.
	x. 19	To enter into the <i>holiest</i> by the blood.
	xiii. 11	Brought into the <i>sanctuary</i> .

The antitype of these Holy Places is “heaven itself”, the true sanctuary pitched by God and not man. It is where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, and it is there the inheritance of the church of the Mystery will be enjoyed. In Eph. ii. 19 we read “now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints” which presents no grammatical problem until we realize that *ton hagon* should be rendered “of the saints”, and then the question arises “how can we ever become fellow citizens OF the saints”. We can hardly be fellow citizens *of* one another. If we allow the lead set us in Hebrews, we shall translate this passage “fellow-citizens of heaven’s holiest of all”, and begin to realize “*what is the riches of the glory of this inheritance*” indeed. So, when we come to Eph. iv. 12, we shall have to revise the translation “the perfecting *of the saints*”. Again, Col. i. 12 which uses this word *hagon*, should be rendered “partakers of the inheritance of the Most Holy Place in the Light”. The reader who may not possess copies of *Things to Come*, may appreciate the following comment written by Dr. Bullinger in April 1910.

“Now if we take Mr. Welch’s interpretation that it means, or at any rate refers to ‘The MOST HOLY PLACE’ or ‘the Holiest of all’ into which Christ has entered (Heb. 9:24), then we can understand and grasp more clearly what is meant by the somewhat special usage of the word in Ephesians.”

Dr. Bullinger then proceeded to translate the passages in Ephesians where the words “in heavenly places” occur, as follows: Eph. i. 3 “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings, in the holiest of all, in Christ” and so on through the remaining passages. “Believers cannot have ‘saints’ for

their inheritance, but they can have, and thank God they do have what answers to the Holy of holies—even Heaven itself. There, ‘in THE Light’, in the presence of what answers to the Shechina of the tabernacle and temple, even the light of the glory of God they find their inheritance.”

As the believer “acknowledges” this most wondrous aspect of the high calling of the Mystery, the second petition of the Apostle’s prayer in Eph. i. 18 will be answered: “Hope”, “Riches”, “Power”. These three items are the basis of the threefold prayer of Eph. i. 15-19. We now give attention to the third petition found in verse nineteen.

“And what the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe.”

If the preceding petitions are associated with the two subdivisions of Eph. i. 13, 14 “The Will of the Father” and “The Work of the Son” this third petition is definitely linked with the third division “The Witness of the Spirit”, for it is in this section alone that we find any reference to “believing”. Note too that it is HIS calling, HIS inheritance and HIS power, with which we are concerned, and only as we know these shall we be ready and able to understand what is OUR calling, OUR inheritance, and OUR power; they will then be held in their right relationship.

The word “exceeding” is the first of three occurrences of the Greek word so translated, namely *hyperballo* “to throw beyond”, and a figure of speech called *hyperbole* is so named because it often over-shoots or exaggerates to heighten the sense, as the spies heightened their report, saying that cities of the giants were “walled up to heaven” (Deut. ix. 1). When Paul compared the Old and the New Covenant, he used the word *hyperballo* when he spoke of the “glory that excelleth” (II Cor. iii. 10). The three occurrences in Ephesians are:

The exceeding greatness of His power (i. 19).

The exceeding riches of His grace (ii. 7).

The love of Christ which passeth knowledge (iii. 19).

We are called upon in Eph. i. 19 to consider the surpassing “greatness” of His power. Greatness is the Greek *megethos* from *me gas* “great”. This word enters into the make up of the word translated “majesty” (Heb. i. 3); it is used in Eph. v. 32, I Tim. iii. 16 and Rev. xvii. 5 of a “great” mystery. It is to be noted that the first occurrence of *megethos* “greatness” is in the triumphant song of Moses, at the overthrow of Pharaoh and the safe transit of Israel across the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 16). Here in Ephesians, it refers to a greater overthrow of a greater enemy, followed by a greater translation (Col. i. 13). This exceeding great power is “to usward who believe”. The “believing” is not the consequence of this mighty power, rather it is the essential condition for its reception. The occurrences of *dunamis* “power” in Ephesians are interlinked and this relationship can be most readily seen if we print the occurrences in structure form.

- A | i. 19. The exceeding great of His *power*.
Note it is “exceeding”; it “worketh in us” and is “to usward”.
It leads on to “the fullness of Him that filleth all in all”.
- B | i. 21. Far above all principality and power and *might*.
- A | iii. 7. The effectual working of His *power*.
Note “less than the least” and it “worked” in Paul.
It leads on to “all the fullness of God”.
- B | iii. 16. Strengthened with *might* by His Spirit.
- A | iii. 20. The *power* that worketh in us.
Note “exceeding” abundance of the answer.
It “worketh in us” and flows from the references to “fullness”.

The witness of the Spirit, the ministry of Paul, the answer to prayer, all alike are the outcome of the exceeding greatness of His power to usward that believe. The word “believe” occurs in Ephesians only in the two corresponding passages, Eph. i. 13 where “after ye believed” comes “the seal” and “the earnest” of the Spirit, and Eph. i. 19, the passage before us. Faith however occurs eight times as follows: Ephesians i. 15; ii. 8; iii. 12, 17; iv. 5, 13; vi. 16, 23.

The remainder of verse nineteen “according to the working of His mighty power” belongs to the next section of the epistle, and must be considered in relation to the whole division: Eph. i. 19 - ii. 7. This we must consider in our next article.

No.35. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).

“Mighty power inwrought” (i. 19).

pp. 141 - 144

We have now followed our guide through the Muniment Room (articles Nos.6-28) and the Chapel of Acknowledgment (articles Nos.29-34). We now enter “The Throne Room” where the high exaltation of the Saviour, together with the exaltation of the members of His Body, is to occupy our wondering attention. Our first concern is the inspired disposition of the subject matter which is revealed by the structure, this being the exhibition of the essential features of the passage which are thrown into prominence by the correspondence of part with part.

Eph. i. 19 - ii. 7.

- A | a | 19. Energy (*energeia, energeo*) Mighty power.
 - b | 20. Wrought in Christ.
- B | 20. Raised HIM - - - Heavenly places.
 - 20. Seated HIM - - - Age to come.
 - 22, 23. Gave HIM.
- C | 23. The Church. Body and Fullness.
- A | a | ii. 1, 2. Energy (*energeo*). Prince of power.
 - b | ii. 3. Wrought in sons of disobedience.
- B | ii. 4, 5. Quickened US.
 - ii. 6. Raised US - - - Heavenly places.
 - ii. 6, 7. Seated US - - - Ages to come.

Before we take note of the terms “working”, “power” and the like, let us not fail to observe one essential feature. We read a threefold “HIM” before we read a threefold “US”. This order can never be reversed when we are dealing with grace. Of what value would it be to be told that I was destined to sit at the right hand of God in heavenly places, unless I am already assured that Christ is there, and there on my behalf? Consequently we observe in the next place that when we read the threefold “US” we read at the same time a threefold “together”, not one of these blessings can be enjoyed apart from this union with the ascended Christ. Possibly it is already beginning to dawn upon us “what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward” if such a destiny and such a fellowship are indeed ours. The first thing to consider is that this exceedingly great power is “according to” something. It is the outworking of a purpose.

Kata, the Greek preposition translated “according to”, when it governs the genitive case retains its primary meaning “down”, but when it governs the accusative case, as it does in the passage under review, it often has the meaning of conformity and is translated “according to”. It would be outside the range of these studies to attempt a lengthy disquisition on the origin, development and character of prepositions, but the reader may be helped if he remembers that prepositions are associated with movement or rest, each

one having its own direction, *ek* moving “out”, *eis* moving “into” and the like. *Kata* in its two modes represents either a movement that is vertical, “down” when used with the genitive, and horizontal “along” when used with the accusative. Whatever is the subject under consideration if it be in the accusative, *kata* is conceived as going “along” with it, hence the term “according to”. *Kata* occurs twenty-four times in Ephesians, always with the accusative. The following are the occurrences in the first chapter of Ephesians, and this horizontal movement “going along with” should be supplied mentally as each passage is considered.

verse	5	According to His good pleasure.
	7	According to the riches of His grace.
	9	According to His good pleasure.
	11	According to the purpose of Him.
	11	Who worketh all things after (or according to) the counsel.
	15	After I heard of your faith (the faith according to you).
	19	According to the working of His mighty power.

It will be seen that where it is used of God, *kata* is associated with pleasure, purpose and power, or the riches of His grace, and in two passages it is further allied with “work”. In the first case God is represented as One Who worketh all things according to the counsel of His own will, in the other the great power to usward who believe is said to be according to the working of His mighty power. We can therefore only hope to receive an answer to the prayer “what is the power to usward” when we know with what it is in “accord”. There is in this passage a multiplying of terms that denote power. *Dunamis*, power, miracle, dynamic; *energeia*, energy, inworking; *kratos*, strength, in the sense of ability to hold fast, and *ischus*, strength in its prevailing power. All these terms are focused upon one tremendous event, the resurrection of Christ. When the Scripture speaks of the great act of Creation, both power and wisdom are ascribed to God, but no such combination of these terms for strength is used as is used of the resurrection. In creation “He spake”, it was “done”. When He commanded it stood fast, but resurrection is in another realm. Sin, redemption, righteousness, moral evil and spiritual antagonism call for power beyond that demanded by creation. This power is defined as that which He “wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places far above all” (Eph. i. 20, 21). It will be seen that even “resurrection” does not complete the statement. It is resurrection, ascension, seating, pre-eminence and fullness (Eph. i. 19-23) that necessitates such a display of mighty power. When it is realized that what has been written in these verses is to reveal the kind of power “that is to usward who believe”, the mind falters in its attempt to comprehend either the wonder of the gift or the marvel of the power that is at our disposal. Paul himself realized something of this mighty enabling. Speaking of the ministry which he had received as the prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles, he said:

“Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual WORKING of HIS POWER” (Eph. iii. 7).

Here, as in Eph. i. 19, 20, we have *energeia* and *dunamis*, and not only so, there is a reference to “principalities and powers in heavenly places”, not this time subjected beneath the feet of the Saviour, but learning through the Church the manifold wisdom of

God. This energizing power is again introduced at the close of the central prayer, Eph. iii. 20. This prayer asks that the believer may be “strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man” this time combining the words *dunamis* and *krataioo* which form a part of the combination of power revealed in Eph. i. 19, 20. Then, having included in his request such a glorious possibility as that of Christ dwelling in the heart by faith, the comprehension with all saints of what is the breadth, length, depth and height, the “knowledge surpassing love of Christ” (using the word *hyperballo* as in Eph. i. 19), and having nothing less as a goal than being “filled with (*eis* unto, or up to) all the fullness of God”, introducing the word *pleroma*, as in Eph. i. 23 the Apostle comes to the question of what possible guarantee can there be for an affirmative answer to so mighty a petition. That guarantee, once again is “the power that worketh in us” (Eph. iii. 20).

The word “power” is veiled from the English reader, who may not realize that the verb *dunamai* is translated “able” not only in Eph. iii. 20, but in iii. 4 “may” and vi. 11, 13 and 16 “able”. When the Apostle wrote the parallel epistle to the Colossians, he employed the words “strengthened with all might according to His glorious power” (Col. i. 11). Here the words are *dunamis*, *dunamoo* and *kratos*, and when referring to his own ministry he again attributes any success he may have achieved to “His working, which worketh in me mightily”, using the words *energeia*, *energeo* and *dunamis* (verse 29). In Philippians there is but one occurrence of *dunamis*, namely in Phil. iii. 10 “the power of His resurrection” which the Apostle was most eager to know, and one occurrence of *dunamai*, in connexion with the same theme, “the out-resurrection”, where in view of the transfiguration of this body of humiliation to a body of glory like unto that of the risen Lord Himself, he once again falls back upon the same mighty power “according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto Himself” (Phil. iii. 21). Here there is not only the recurrence of the words *energeia* and *dunamai*, but a further reference to the exaltation of the Lord, with all things in subjection beneath His feet, that we have found already at the close of the first chapter of Ephesians.

Finally this same mighty power was the basis of the Apostle’s confidence, even in view of desertion and death. “I am persuaded”, he said, “that He is *able* to keep that which has been entrusted, against that day” (II Tim. i. 12). Had we confined our reading to the closing verses of Eph. i., we should have been impressed with the tremendous power at our disposal who believe, but as we contemplate its application both to the Apostle and to the believer in view of ultimate glory, we must surely exclaim “what manner of persons ought we to be”, upheld and energized by such a wealth of power!

Before proceeding to the examination of the closing verses of Eph. i. we are reminded by a glance at the structure that there is another reference to inworking power in Eph. ii. 2; we therefore include this passage, in order that the intended contrast shall be appreciated. We will not attempt to deal with Eph. ii. 1; this will come better in its place in the exposition, but go straight to the terms “the Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now *worketh in* the children of disobedience”. Here, by antithesis, this mighty power, this “Ruler of the authority of the air” is set over against the exalted Lord, his sphere of activity being “the course or age of this world” and “now”. He too employs a

mighty energy “the spirit that now worketh in (*energeo*) the sons of disobedience”. It may be well to tabulate the seven references to *energeo* found in the Prison Epistles.

Energeo.

Him Who *worketh* all things. (Eph. i. 11).
Which He *wrought in* Christ. (Eph. i. 20).
The spirit that now *worketh in* the sons of disobedience. (Eph. ii. 2).
The power that *worketh in* us. (Eph. iii. 20).
God which *worketh in* you both to will and
to *do* (work) of His good pleasure. (Phil. ii. 13).
Which *worketh in* me mightily. (Col. i. 29).

Lest we should imagine that the fact that there is a mighty spirit power energizing the unbeliever suggests that the unbeliever is at the mercy of a power and not responsible for his actions, we are reminded that those in whom he works are “children of *disobedience*” and that they are fulfilling the *desires* of the flesh and the mind. So, in like manner, while we may at first be overwhelmed with the display of power that is to *usward*, we must remember, also that it is to *usward who believe*. Intelligent and responsible co-operation is by no means ruled out, but rather encouraged. When the Philippians were assured that it was God Who worked *IN* them, they had already been exhorted to work *OUT* their own salvation.

We can now return to the original passage that was before us, and attempt to understand what is involved in the exaltation of the Lord set forth in verses 20-23.

No.36. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).

“Far above all” (i. 21).

pp. 181 - 186

In the sequel to the Apostle’s reference to the mighty power that is “to *usward who believe*”, our attention is directed to four great movements, all in connexion with the Saviour, as follows:

“He *raised Him* from the dead.”
“He *set Him* at His own right hand.”
“He *put* all things under His feet.”
“He *gave Him* to be Head over all things to the church.”

In verse seven we have the record of redemption “through His blood”, after which nothing is said of the death of Christ until the passage before us which speaks of His resurrection from the dead. Every section of the purpose of the ages depends for its fulfillment on the exaltation of the Saviour. At first, remembering the opening chapters of Matthew and of Luke, we might have imagined that it was the Divine intention that the

Lord, born at Bethlehem and declared to be the son of David and heir to his throne, should at *that* time in *those* circumstances ascend the throne and introduce the reign of peace. That this was not the Divine programme both the events themselves and also the Scriptures make clear. Psa. ii., which speaks of the earthly rule and the earthly inheritance of the Son of God, nevertheless refers to Him as raised from the dead; otherwise what do the words of verse seven mean:

“Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee”?

They cannot refer to the miraculous begetting that preceded the birth at Bethlehem for the words “this day” could not be thus spoken. They refer, as the N.T. declares, to the Resurrection.

“He hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee” (Acts xiii. 33).

To the same effect, Peter refers to other prophetic statements of David saying:

“Therefore 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. 30).

“The God of our fathers raised up Jesus Him hath God exalted, to be a Prince and a Saviour” (Acts v. 30, 31).

If we turn to the book of the Revelation, the title that stands out in the opening of the book is “the Prince of the kings of the earth”, and the whole apocalyptic imagery, involving heaven as well as earth is made to bear upon the moment when the seventh angel sounds, and:

“The kingdoms OF THIS WORLD” become “the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ” (Rev. xi. 5).

What is true in the earthly sphere, is true of the heavenly calling of which the epistle to the Hebrews is an exposition (Heb. iii. 1). When the Apostle at the opening of chapter eight would sum up his teaching, he said:

“Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (Heb. viii. 1).

Without the risen, ascended, seated Christ, Abraham and his seed would look for the heavenly city in vain. So, when we come to the third and highest sphere of blessing, that of the Mystery, we still find that the risen, exalted, seated Christ is the one and all comprehensive guarantee for the access and acceptance into that most wonderful of all spheres of blessing for the believer. We have touched lightly upon Psa. ii., Acts xiii. Rev. xi. and Heb. viii., but we must look more carefully at the statements of Eph. i. 20-23, for they are vital to the high calling of the church of the One Body of which we are members. Christ is said to have been set at the right hand of God “in the heavenly places” (Eph. i. 20). This phrase has been considered with some degree of fulness in Article No.8 of this series. It was there shown to be unique, being found only

in this epistle and in association with the Mystery. The Apostle proceeds at once to explain this term, revealing by his language something of the scope that is envisaged in this sphere “heavenly places”. He says it is “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. 21).

Before we proceed to the worshipping consideration of the Saviour’s high glory here revealed, let us pause at the statement “set Him at His own right hand”, for we are going to read presently of believers who are “seated together” in these self same heavenly places (Eph. ii. 6). The act of “sitting” means ever so much more than resting; it means the assumption of *authority*. Thus Matthew was “sitting” at the receipt of custom (Matt. ix. 9). In the same way when Christ answered the high priest He said “Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power” (Matt. xxvi. 64) which was immediately denounced as blasphemy. Pilate sat down on the judgment seat (Matt. xxvii. 19) in the exercise of authority. The passage that is often quoted in the N.T. to this effect is Psa. cx., “Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool”, and in the Revelation we are not only directed to consider the throne, but He that sat thereon (Rev. iv. 2, 3). The number of references in the Apocalypse to this seating is too great to transcribe here, but they should be considered. The seated Priest, is the glory of the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12 and xii. 2) even as the seated Lord is the glory of the epistles to the Ephesians. The fact that He is seated THERE indicates a finished work, the displacement of the Accuser, and His investment with all authority. Without the Ascension and Session of our Lord, the revelation of the Mystery would be a mockery. Because He sits there, the members of His Body can look forward to the blessings of this calling with confidence and joy.

“Far above all.” These words are the translation of the Greek *huperano*, a compound made up of *huper* above, and *ano* up. It will be seen that either word means up or above, consequently the compound must be expressed with some intensity, and the English “far above all” is as good a rendering as any. *Huper* can sometimes only be fully expressed in this way. In Eph. iii. 20 the presence of *huper* is indicated by the word “exceeding” as well as the word “above”. So, also in II Thess. i. 3 “groweth exceedingly” and Eph. i. 19 “exceeding greatness” or in Gal. i. 13 “beyond measure”. In Eph. iv. 10 we learn that Christ ascended up far above all heavens, even so we are all only too conscious of the poverty of language to indicate the high exaltation of the Son of God. Isaiah seems to have expressed this when he used not one, not two, but three words to indicate the high glory of the ascended Saviour “He shall be EXALTED and EXTOLLED and be VERY HIGH” (Isa. lii. 13).

Had the Apostle Paul simply stated that Christ now sits at the right hand of God in the heavenly places, we should know that He was occupying the highest conceivable pinnacle of glory in the wide universe, but this is enlarged and emphasized when we consider the realms that are placed beneath His feet. He is 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. 21). Let us take this opportunity of acquainting ourselves with these heavenly powers, among whom our future lot is cast. Principality is

the Greek *arche*. The primary meaning of this word is beginning, in order of time, and then of dignity, the first place, government. We will not occupy space by recording the passages which speak of time; there are a number of which Luke i. 2 is a sample. Coupled with *arche* in Eph. i. 21 and elsewhere, is the word translated power, *exousia* which is bettered rendered “authority” and which we shall more fully consider presently. They occur together in Luke xx. 20, where we read of “the power (*arche*) and authority (*exousia*) of the governor”. In like manner, Luke xii. 11 translates *arche* by “magistrate”. Turning our attention now to those heavenly and spiritual spheres with which Eph. i. 21 is concerned, we read in Jude 6 that angels kept not their “first estate” (*arche*), “abandoned their own domain” (Moffatt); in the book of the Revelation *arche* is never used except as a title of Christ.

“I am Alpha and Omega, *the beginning* and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty” (Rev. i. 8).

Here it will be observed the title “beginning and ending” is placed in correspondence with the great name Jehovah, the name of God in covenant, redemption and purpose, thereby revealing how it is that a word which primarily indicates time, can be a title of the Lord, for He gathers all time to Himself, “Jesus Christ, the same, yesterday and today, and for ever”. In the second occurrence, the Lord is called “*The beginning* of the creation of God”, a title that cannot be ignored when reading Gen. i. 1. This takes us to our epistles and in Col. i. 18 we read of Christ “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 pre-eminence.”

From the way in which these principalities and powers are introduced in the N.T. it appears that most of them are evil powers, but whether we can say as Dr. Bullinger does in his Lexicon,

“Used of supra-mundane powers, *probably* evil powers.”

remains to be seen. The first reference is that of Rom. viii. 38, which arises out of the fact that there can be no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus. “Who is even at the right hand of God, Who also maketh intercession for us.” These principalities and powers are classed with angels, and are included among those invisible powers like death itself, which shall not be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. From this it would appear that these principalities and powers may be inimical to the believer. In I Cor. xv. 24, we are taken to “the end” or to the goal of the ages, when “all rule and all authority and power” shall be “put down” (a term yet to be examined), and to continue the quotation from Dr. Bullinger’s Lexicon commenced above:

“In I Cor. 15:26 we read of *eschatos echthros*, the last *enemy*, which may imply that these names (Col. 1:16, etc.) designate the material rank of evil supra-mundane powers, so far as they relate to men.”

This brings us to the prison epistles where these supra-mundane powers are mentioned six times. The six references are distributed as follows and their inter-relation is made evident by the parallelism here exhibited:

- A | Eph. i. 21. Christ above all principality and power.
In this world and world to come.
The church His Body and fulness.
He the Head.
- B | Eph. iii. 10. Some principalities and powers are learning
through the church the manifold wisdom of God,
and so do not appear to be “evil powers” or “against us”.
- C | Eph. vi. 12. These principalities and powers are spiritual wickedness,
rulers of the darkness of this world against whom we wrestle,
and because of whom we must “put on” the whole armour of God.
- A | Col. i. 16-19. Christ before all; principalities and powers were created
by Him and for Him, and He is before all things.
Fulness dwells in Him.
He is the Head of the Body the church.
- B | Col. ii. 10. In association with the church which is “complete in Him” are
these principalities and powers, for Christ is here said to be their “head”.
This balances Eph. iii. 10 above.
- C | Col. ii. 15. Here, however, are “enemies” again.
These use “the rudiments of the world”.
The Saviour spoiled or “stripped off”
these principalities and powers at the cross.

The one other occurrence of *arche* in the prison epistles, namely Col. i. 18 is suggestive. Christ is “the *arche*” the beginning, *the* principality, all others were created by Him and for Him and by Him all consist (Col. i. 16, 17). In the realm of the first creation these powers appear to have been delegated, but in the new creation of which the church is the first great foreshadowing, these principalities lose their authority, which is exercised by Christ alone. This will continue until the last enemy is destroyed and the goal of the ages is reached. To the above six references therefore, this seventh outstanding and separate reference should be associated swallowing up all such rule, even as He will swallow up death in victory.

It is interesting to note that in I Pet. iii. 22, Peter says of Christ “Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him”. He substitutes angels here for principalities. Angels are only mentioned once in the prison epistles, and then only to be set aside, namely in the passage which speaks of “worshipping of angels”. The Church of the Mystery is not concerned with heaven’s “messengers” and “ministers” (Heb. i. 4), but with heaven’s aristocracy “thrones” and “dominions”. The high exaltation of Christ as Head of the church is the better realized when we perceive the high order of spiritual beings that are placed beneath His feet.

“Powers.” The word “power” should strictly be reserved for the translation of *dunamis*, and the word “authority” be used for the Greek word *exousia* which is found

here in Eph. i. 21. *Exousia*, is derived from *exesti* “It is lawful” (I Cor. vi. 12; x. 23; II Cor. xii. 4). In Matthew, *exousia* is translated “authority” in six passages, and “power” in four, Matt. vii. 29 being the first occurrence, and Matt. xxviii. 18 the last. In addition to the six occurrences of the phrase “principality and power” already noted above, there are two occurrences in the prison epistles where *exousia* is used alone. These are:

“The prince of the *power* of the air” (Eph. ii. 2).

“Delivered from the *power* of darkness” (Col. i. 13).

The “authority” of the prince of the power of the air, will ultimately be given to the great antichristian “Beast” at the time of the end (Rev. xiii. 2, 4) which gives some idea of the nature of the foe beneath the Saviour’s feet. Dominion is the Greek *kuriotes* “lordship”, a position which seems to have been abused and forfeited, and which is to be exercised in the fulness of its meaning by Christ, when in the day of His exaltation, every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is LORD (*kurios*) (Phil. ii. 11).

Alford says of these four words:

“The most reasonable account of the four words seems to be thus: all principality gives the highest and fullest expression; authority is added filling out *arche* in detail, *exousia* being not only government, but every kind of power, primary and delegated . . . Then in the second pair *dunamis* is mere might, the raw material, so to speak, of power, *kuriotes* is that pre-eminence or lordship which *dunamis* establishes for itself. So that in the first pair we descend from the higher and concentrated to the lower and diffused; in the second we ascend from the lower and diffused to the higher and concentrated.”

Then follows a general statement “and every name that is named not only in this world but also in that which is to come” (Eph. i. 21) comparable to a similar expansion in Rom. viii. 39 “nor any other creature”. The word translated “world” in Eph. i. 21 is *aion* and should for consistency be rendered “age”.

The universality of the Saviour’s dominion can at least be appreciated if not comprehended, as we survey these dignities that are beneath His feet, this will be enhanced when we come to the O.T. reference that follows, but this we must leave for our next article.

If the reader is not acquainted with the place that Psa. viii. has in making known “The mystery of Christ”, he is directed to Volume XXXVI, page 54.

No.37. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).

“All things under His feet.”

pp. 223 - 226

The exceeding greatness of the power that is to usward has been brought before us in Eph. i. 20, 21 focusing our attention on the resurrection, the session in heavenly places and the exaltation of Christ “far above all” rule and authority. We now find that this is enforced by a quotation from Scripture, a quotation which has this peculiarity, namely, that Paul alone of all the writers of the N.T. makes it. It is found in I Cor. xv., Heb. ii. and in Eph. i. These quotations we must examine together, as they are closely related to the goal of the ages. Turpie, in his analysis of O.T. quotations in the New, does not include Eph. i. 22, presumably because it is not specifically “quoted”, the words “and hath put all things under His feet” being embodied in the epistle. This feature we will consider after the other references have been before us.

First of all let us turn to the Psalm from which the quotation is made. Most of our readers know that the Psalms consist of five books which correspond with the five books of the law, each book of the Psalms ending with a double Amen. For a full exhibition of this feature the Companion Bible should be consulted. The first book of the Psalms corresponds with the book of Genesis and refers back to Adam and forward to Christ. The reinstatement of the Psalm titles, through the labours of Dr. J. W. Thirtle, removes the heading “Upon Muth-labben”, which in the A.V. is at the commencement of Psa. ix., and places it at the conclusion of Psa. viii. This feature is set out in Appendix 64 of the Companion Bible, showing that the complete Psalm is constructed as follows:

- (1) The *super*-scription and the title proper.
- (2) The body of the Psalm itself.
- (3) The *sub*-scription.

Psa. viii. therefore has the super-*scription* “A Psalm of David” and the sub-*scription* “To the chief Musician upon Muth-labben”. In No.57 of this series the bearing of the words “upon Muth-labben” will be discussed as they are also in an article entitled “The Secrets of the Son” published in Volume XXXVI, page 54 which the reader should consult.

The passage under immediate consideration reads as follows:

“What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?
And the Son of man, that Thou visitest him?
For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels,
And hast crowned him with glory and honour.
Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands;
Thou hast put all things under His feet” (Psa. viii. 4-6).

The quotation of this passage in Heb. ii. is luminous when seen in its setting. For this we need the structure, which reduced to simpler elements is as follows:

HEBREWS i. & ii.

- A | i. 1, 2. God once spoke by prophets. Now by His Son.
- B | i. 2-14. BETTER than angels.
- A | ii. 1-4. God once spoke by angels. Now by the Lord.
- B | ii. 5-18. LOWER than angels.

It will be seen that the quotation of Psa. viii. in Heb. ii. is part of a consistent comparison of the ministry of the Son of God with that of angels. It appears from Heb. ii. 5 that a former “world” was under the rule of angels, but that “the world to come” will not be, and the proof is found in the reference to Adam in his capacity as a figure of Him that was to come. The Psalm enumerates the orders that were put under the feet of the first man, Adam, they were:

“All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas” (Psa. viii. 7, 8),

but, when the Apostle uses this in Heb. ii., he says “Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet” and instead of referring to sheep and oxen, fowl and fish, he draws the extraordinary conclusion “For in that He put all in subjection under Him, He left nothing that is not put under Him”. Here is universal dominion, “nothing” that is not put under Him. Using the same argument in the epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle safeguards the truth by saying:

“But when He saith, all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted, which did put all things under Him” (I Cor. xv. 27),

for the Corinthians by reason of their original paganism, their “gods many and their lords many” may have stood in need of this reminder. The One glorious exception however but emphasizes the universal nature of the Saviour’s dominion. Here too is the one occasion where Christ is called the last Adam and the second Man.

We have elsewhere given our reasons and submitted proofs of the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, and this peculiar handling of Psa. viii. in both Hebrews and Corinthians bespeaks a common author according to the accepted rule of higher criticism. The rule and authority and power that is placed beneath the feet of the Son are “enemies” as the context reveals:

“For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet” (I Cor. xv. 25),

the last being death. This leads on to the great goal of the ages when “God shall be all in all”, and it is anticipated in Eph. i. 22, 23 by the headship of Christ over the church:

“And hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.”

God all in all in the future; Christ all in all in the present—the church of the Mystery being the clearest and fullest exhibition and foreshadowing of that glorious goal. “Where Christ is all, and in all” (Col. iii. 11).

Returning to I Cor. xv., we observe that the word translated “put down” in verse 24 and “destroyed” in verse 26 is the one Greek word *katargeo*. This has a variety of renderings in the N.T. Abolish, bring to nought, make of none effect, make void, destroy, cease and fail, give a fairly clear idea of its primary meaning which is “to render inoperative”. *Katargeo* is used in Luke xiii. 7 “why *cumbereth* it the ground?” Paul uses it in Romans six times as follows:

Shall their unbelief make the faith of God *without effect*? (Rom. iii. 3).

Do we then *make void* the law through faith? (iii. 31).

Faith is made void, and the promise made of *none effect*. (iv. 14).

That the body of sin might be *destroyed*. (vi. 6).

If the husband be dead, she *is loosed* from the law. (vii. 2).

But now we are *delivered* from the law. (vii. 6).

The way in which the Apostle uses *katargeo* in I Cor. xiii. 8, 10, 11 where it is translated “fail”, “vanish away”, “done away” and “put away” must be remembered when we come to the next occurrences, namely in I Cor. xv. 24 and 26. All rule, all authority and power will be “done away”, will “vanish away”, will be abrogated, repealed, dissolved, the last of these enemies thus to be repealed, abrogated and done away being death itself. The only occurrences of *katargeo* in the Prison Epistles are:

“Having *abolished* in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.” (Eph. ii. 15).

“Who hath *abolished* death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” (II Tim. i. 10).

In Eph. i. 22 this aspect of truth is not made prominent, “He hath put all things under His feet” precedes and prepares the way for the great abolition. Principalities and powers are not yet “abolished”, indeed armour is provided and warning given concerning their animosity (Eph. vi. 12), but the first great step has been taken. These spiritual enemies are now “under His feet”. The rapid transition “feet Head” in Eph. i. 22 reminds us that there is a blessed side to this exalted position of the Lord. He has been given as Head, *not* over all things universally yet, *but* Head over all things so far as the church is concerned, a blessed forecast of things to come. This church has a double title, it is now “the Body”, it will then be “the Fullness”. The title “the Body” must be used with discretion. Paul was a member of that Body, but the members of that Body now living were, at the time of the writing of Ephesians, unborn. Consequently there never has yet existed a company of believers on earth that has comprised every member, the term “Body” being used of the existing company to set forth their relationship one with another as fellow-members, and with the Lord as their Head. When however every member is gathered in and the number of the elect is complete, the title changes. From being called the Church which is His Body, it will then become “The Fullness of Him that filleth all in all”. This is so far reaching that we do not feel that justice could be done

to it in the space at our disposal, and so we defer consideration of this glorious title until the next article.

The reader who sees the incomparable position of the seated Christ will not need a lengthy argument to prove that, to teach that He is seated “*among* heavenly beings”, instead of “in heavenly places”, is utterly untenable.

Emmanuel, God with us.

No.5. “With us.” “He was numbered with the transgressors.” pp. 15 - 17

The fact that the Saviour “bore our griefs and carried our sorrows” long before He ultimately “bore our sins in His Own body on the tree”—in other words lived out the implications of the blessed name Emmanuel, God with us, is warp and woof of the four Gospels. He came to reveal the Father, He came to manifest His love, He came to seek and to save that which was lost, but the first fact to note is that in all these things, “He came”. Had he sent a messenger to reveal the Father, doubtless that revelation would have been glorious, but it could not have partaken of the essential character of that revelation made by Him Who is Emmanuel. We leave this phase of our study to the reader to follow out as time permits, and pass on to other and deeper aspects of this same great theme. The believer’s hope is summed up in the word “with Him”, whether it be expressed in John xiv., I Thess. iv. or Col. iii. The great doctrine of the believer’s identification with the Saviour irradiates the central portion of the epistle to the Romans (chapters v.-viii.) with its wondrous grace, and these blessed fruits of Emmanuel’s land must yet be examined and enjoyed. Before all this, however, one solemn aspect of Emmanuel’s association with us as sinners needing salvation, demands consideration. Before ever we could think of “reckoning” ourselves to have “died with Christ” another reckoning had to be made, a reckoning foreshadowed in the types of the O.T. sacrifices, foretold in the Prophecy of Isa. liii., and fulfilled when Christ died the Just for the unjust that He might bring us to God.

“And with Him they crucify two thieves; the one on His right hand, and the other on His left: And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, And He was numbered with the transgressors” (Mark xv. 27, 28).

“When I sent you without purse lacked ye anything? But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in Me. And He was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning Me have an end” (Luke xxii. 35-37).

The preposition *meta* “with” that is used in Matt. i. 23, is employed here, translated “with” in Mark xv. 28, and “among” in Luke xxii. 37.

It will be seen that the accounts given in Mark and Luke are not identical. One refers to the actual crucifixion; and one to the events leading up to it. One is the comment of Mark, the other the words of the Saviour Himself. Let us consider these two passages in their historical order, and commence with Luke.

The first thing that we observe is that the quotation of Isa. liii. made by Luke is flanked on either side with the word “temptation”.

“Ye are they which have continued with (*meta*) Me in My temptations Satan hath desired to have thee.”

“Pray that ye enter not into temptation” (Luke xxii. 28, 31, 40, 46).

The quotation from Isaiah is introduced in answer to the question put by the Lord concerning “purse” and “scrip” and “sword”. Up till that moment, the Lord’s personal protecting care had been sufficient, but a change was imminent, introduced by the words “but now”. If Christ Himself was to be reckoned among transgressors, His followers would necessarily be reckoned among them too. True, He was to “fulfil” this great prophecy in a sense that no sinful man ever could fulfil it. He was holy, harmless, undefiled and “SEPARATE from sinners”, yet was “reckoned among them”. “He Who KNEW NO sin, was made sin for us”; He “died the JUST for the unjust”.

The gathering point of the age was near. This that is written must yet be accomplished (*teleo*). The things concerning Him have an end (*telos*). Here we have an anticipation of John xix. 28, 30, “all things were now *accomplished it is finished (teleo)*”.

He Who was born at Bethlehem and given the name Emmanuel, God with us, now faced the cross, and was numbered with us transgressors.

The quotation from Isa. liii., is made in Mark’s Gospel at the crucifixion itself. It comes after a long and dreadful series of indignities, cruel treatment and bitter spite.

How was it that an earthly governor like Pilate could sit in judgment upon the Son of God? The answer is He was numbered with transgressors, and stood in their place.

How was it that the Son of God permitted the Roman soldiers to handle Him, mock Him, spit upon Him, and crucify Him? The same answer will suffice. He, Emmanuel, was numbered with the transgressors. He was treated exactly like any other criminal. The accusation and superscription were put over His sacred head, and on either side of that cross, there were crucified WITH HIM two thieves. The verb *sustauroo* “to crucify with” occurs nowhere else in the N.T. than in the records of the actual crucifixion of Christ (Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32; John xix. 32) and in the two great passages of Paul’s epistles:

“I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live” (Gal. ii. 20).
“Our old man is crucified with Him” (Rom. vi. 6).

We shall learn upon examining the epistles of Galatians and Romans, that this crucifixion with Christ, is by “reckoning” and we now perceive the Divine reason why He, the Substitute and Sacrifice, should be “reckoned” with transgressors. At the cross we not only see that Emmanuel means “God with us” in wondrous love, but that by amazing grace, it contains the doctrine expressed in the words “with Him”, with Him in His death right on by a series of steps until manifested with Him in glory.

Our path therefore is indicated, we must follow these steps that link the cradle, the cross and the crown as the great name Emmanuel is fulfilled before our wondering eyes.

No.6. “Reckoning” the link that makes us “One”.
pp. 24, 25

It will now be necessary to pause, and consider what has passed before us and what lies ahead, and to observe any changes that are of importance. At first we may be so overwhelmed by the grace exhibited at the coming of Christ at Bethlehem, as to be ready to endorse the teaching, put forth by some, that at the Incarnation God not only came to be “with us” but that we also came to be joined “with Him”. Before we go further into this line of teaching we must pay attention to the meaning of two Greek prepositions, the use of which in this teaching is of vital importance. The word translated “with” in the name “God with us”, is the Greek preposition *meta*, and this is the word translated “with” and “among” in the two passages that tell us that “He was numbered with the transgressors”.

Meta “with” is a preposition of association, and not of actual oneness. It consequently is sometimes translated “among” and “after” indicating association rather than union. When the angel said “Why seek ye the living *among* the dead?” (Luke xxiv. 5) the word “among” is *meta*. There can be no idea of “union” with the dead being read into this question. When we read that the Lord was “with” the wild beasts while enduring the forty days testing in the wilderness (Mark i. 13) it is “association” not “unity” that is implied. It will be remembered that Aristotle named a treatise “Physics” and followed it by a second which he called “Meta-physics”, those things that follow, and go beyond the range of mere physical science. *Meta* means “with”, but with in association, with in a series, not with in union and oneness.

At the Incarnation God was manifested in the flesh, but even though Christ was perfect MAN, that did not make all mankind “one” with God, for the fact that Christ was PERFECT Man, sinless, holy, harmless, undefiled, made Him, at the same time, “separate from sinners” not “one” with sinners. The very Incarnation that brought Him so near to man, emphasized the gulf that existed, and which could not be bridged by the fact of His human birth. The good Samaritan came where the wounded man was, and he showed what the word “neighbour” implied, but the good Samaritan did not, and could not, take the place of the wounded man, he could not be “wounded for” him, and in this lies the problem which we are now facing. Consequently, we are prepared for a further movement by the God of all grace. In the second chapter of Philippians, we see the Lord coming down from the heights of equality to the “form of a slave” and the “fashion as a man”, down *beyond Incarnation* to “death, even the death of the cross”. It is here, where true union begins, and the exactness of Scripture in its choice of prepositions is demonstrated. In Mark xv. 28, we arrive at the last use of “*meta*” so far as the Person and Work of Christ is concerned, until after His resurrection. He was numbered “with” the transgressors. The verse which precedes this passage in Mark introduces the new preposition, *sun* “together with”, in the statement “and WITH Him they crucify two thieves” (Mark xv. 27).

Meta indicates “proximity”, but *sun* indicates “conjunction”, and implies something in common union, and the compound verb *sustauroo* “to crucify with” meets us for the first time (Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32; John xix. 32). Be it noted, this same word *sustauroo* is used by the Apostle Paul to indicate the first of a series of links that unites the believer for ever with His Lord: “I am crucified with Christ” (Gal. ii. 20), “Our old man is crucified with Him” (Rom. vi. 6).

At the birth at Bethlehem Christ became Emmanuel, “God with us”, where *meta* indicates the limits of this blessed proximity of God to man, but at the cross, the believing sinner becomes one “with Christ” and now the preposition of union and oneness is employed, *sun*.

From this initial union there arises a wonderful doctrine, found only in the epistles of Paul, the first rung of the ladder being “crucified with Christ”, the last being “manifest with Him” in glory. The Emmanuel aspect of Christ’s association with man was by “birth”, but the closer union at the cross was by “reckoning”. The same word is translated “numbered” in Mark xv. 28, and “reckoned” in Luke xxii. 37. It is the Greek *logizomai*. The only way in which the Holy Spotless One could be “one” with sinful men was being “reckoned” so. The only way in which corrupted sinful man could be “one” with Christ, was by being “reckoned” so. Apart from James ii. 23, I Pet. v. 12, the Gospels and Acts xix. 27, *logizomai* is found thirty-five times in Paul’s epistles. The epistle of this reckoning is Romans, where *logizomai* occurs nineteen times.

In the fourth of Romans we read “It was *counted* unto him for righteousness”, a reward not being “reckoned of grace” but of debt, and God is seen “imputing” righteousness without works, and “reckoning” faith for righteousness. In the sixth chapter the whole blessed teaching is found expressed in two verses: The new bond of union “crucified WITH” (6) and the link “reckon ye also yourselves to be dead” (11). Because He was sinless, He could only be reckoned with (*meta*) sinners, but inasmuch as His sacrificial death put away our sin, we, the sinners, can be reckoned with (*sun*) Him, not in His birth, but in that new relationship made possible first by reckoning and then by substitution. At present our union with Christ is by reckoning only, for we are still in ourselves mortal and sinful. However, in resurrection, what is ours only by reckoning will be ours in glorious reality. All barriers to complete union will then have gone and we shall indeed be One.

After what we have seen, it will be misleading to pursue this new line of teaching under the heading “Emmanuel, God with us”, we shall have to adopt a new title and commence a new series, but the reader will not forget that had the Lord never condescended to the birth at Bethlehem, He could never have descended further to the death of the Cross. He became “God with us” in order that it might be possible for us to be made one “with God”.

The First Principles of the Oracles of God

(A series especially addressed to new readers)

No.1. Our Basis. The Inspired Word of God. pp. 1 - 6

At the time of writing these lines, *The Berean Expositor* has been in existence for over forty-five years, and it is not to be wondered that during that period changes in the presentation of the truth made known should have taken place. Where once every term used was explained, as time went on and readers became aware of the main lines of teaching, lengthy explanations became unnecessary. Readers who have lately become interested in the truth naturally find themselves facing articles which, by their very nature, assume a fair acquaintance with the terms employed. We continually use the term "Dispensational Truth" but cannot lengthen every article to provide a definition or to give examples. We assume in every article an endorsement of the basic principle of "Right Division", without explanation or without actually quoting the text. As the early bound volumes of *The Berean Expositor* are out of print and practically unobtainable, even at second hand, we have already re-written the early expositions on the epistle to the Ephesians and the epistle to the Hebrews, which are either now appearing, or will appear in this magazine shortly. We are becoming aware through our mail, that another generation of readers must be catered for, and feel sure that the most mature of our readers will welcome a new presentation of basic truth, and feel thereby more willing to introduce the magazine to younger readers. The nature of our witness, must ever render the writing and reading of such articles "difficult" and what may be now labeled "elementary" by some readers, will still, alas, be considered too advanced by many "who for the time ought to be teachers". Recognizing, therefore, the necessity to consider these "first principles of the oracles of God", and also the limits which our space and the ability we may possess impose upon us we commence, with this number, a fresh approach to the consideration of those things which are most surely believed among us. These things include that which may be called Doctrine, such as the teaching of Scripture concerning the Person and Work of the Son of God, the claims of Scripture to its inspiration and authority, the nature of man, of sin, of salvation, of punishment, and of those things which more naturally range themselves under the heading of Dispensational Truth and which constitute the peculiar witness of *The Berean Expositor*, and which includes the different callings, the constitution of the Church, the question—did the Church begin at Pentecost? the place of Israel in the scheme of redemption and the consequences that follow the rejection of that people at the end of the Acts, the two-fold ministry of the apostle Paul, the Dispensation of the Mystery and the distinctive place of the "Prison Epistles", &c., &c. The following taken from an announcement of meetings at the Chapel of the Opened Book, may not come amiss as an expansion and explanation of these aspects of truth.

THE THREEFOLD DIVISION OF ALL TRUTH

The revelation given in the Scriptures comes to us in three forms. (1) Doctrinal Truth, (2) Dispensational Truth, (3) Practical Truth.

What do we mean by Doctrinal Truth?—Doctrinal truth embraces all that has been revealed concerning the Being and Attributes of God, and all that God has done, commanded, promised or foretold in Creation, Law and Grace. “All have sinned” is true under whatever dispensation we may be called. “God is just” is as true under grace as it was under law. “To the Jew first” was true during the period covered by the Acts, but cannot be put into practice since the dismissal of the Jew in Acts xxviii. This latter statement therefore comes rather under the next heading.

What do we mean by Dispensational Truth?—Dispensational truth takes note of the purpose of the ages, the changes that have been introduced since Creation, such as may be denominated the dispensations of Innocence, Law, Kingdom, Grace, Church, Mystery, &c., and the office of Dispensational truth is to decide whether any particular doctrine—be it command, promise, calling or prophecy—does or does not pertain to any particular individual. Dispensational truth would lead the believer to distinguish between the blessing which says, “The meek shall inherit the earth”, and those blessings which are described as “all spiritual” and to be enjoyed “in heavenly places”.

What do we mean by Practical Truth?—Not until Doctrine has passed the mesh of Dispensational truth, can Practical truth put in its claim. It is obvious that the people of Israel, called to be a royal priesthood and a holy nation, with its sphere of influence in the earth, could not be called upon to put into practice the injunctions of Eph. iv.-vi. In like manner, the Church of the One Body has no guarantee that obedience to the special truth attaching to that calling will result in blessing in “basket and store”. Those who are under the law, must have a very different form of practice from those who are under grace.

Only by loyally preaching and teaching the truth of God as related to these three aspects can we hope to become workmen who need not to be ashamed, for only by so doing shall we “rightly divide” the Word of truth.

As all our teaching, whether Doctrinal, Dispensational or Practical is based squarely upon the actual wording of the Scriptures, a word concerning the Scriptures themselves may not come amiss in this opening article.

How were the Scriptures written? How did they come? Paul supplies an answer to the first question, and Peter to the second:

“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God” (II Tim. iii. 16).

“Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (II Pet. i. 21).

HOW WAS SCRIPTURE GIVEN?—“By inspiration of God.”

HOW DID SCRIPTURE COME?—“Holy men were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

Let us give earnest heed to these statements and examine them in the light of their contexts. Both are the utterances of men in view of death, and there is a suitable solemnity about the two epistles containing them that pervades their whole doctrine. In both instances the immediate contexts speak of death:

“The time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith” (II Tim. iv. 6, 7).

“Shortly I must put off this my tabernacle as the Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me” (II Pet. i. 14).

Thus, on the eve of martyrdom, both Paul and Peter give unambiguous testimony to the absolutely divine origin of the Scriptures. How, then, can we hope to finish our course, how keep the faith, how entertain the hope of a crown or a “well done” if we deny or trifle with the Scriptures held so dear by these two servants of the Lord?

“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).

Graphe, the Greek word translated “Scripture”, is practically an English word, having been in use in our language for a great while. It occurs in such words as *photography*, *geography*, *graphic*, &c., and always means something *written*. While *graphe* could, of course, refer to anything written at any time by anyone, it assumes a special meaning in the Word of God, and when used without qualification always means “The Scriptures”, the writings *par excellence*. So *gegrapti*, “It is, or hath been, written” is a phrase that indicates the Scriptures. We trust that no more need be said to stress the fact that we are dealing not with thoughts, ideas, or even spoken words, but something *written*. As will be seen in the sequel this is most important.

The Old Testament abounds in references to writing and to books. Moses wrote all the words of the Lord in a book (Exod. xxiv. 4, 7). So did Joshua (Josh. xxiv. 26). Over and over again appeal is made to the *written* law (Exod. xxxi. 18; Deut. xxviii. 58; Josh. viii. 31). The foundation of our faith is *written* testimony.

What does Scripture say as to the way in which the subject matter of these holy writings was given? Paul answers in one word, *Theopneustos*. *Theos* is the Greek word for “God” and is too well known to need comment here. *Pneustos* is the third person singular, perfect, passive, of *pneo*, to breathe. This also gives us *pneuma*, which is usually translated “spirit”. The close association of *pneuma* with breath is seen in our words *pneumatic* and *pneumonia*, while to inspire, to respire and to transpire are all processes of breathing either in or out by nostril, pore or cell. Let us now put together the two parts of Paul’s great utterance. All Scripture that is *written*, is given by inspiration of God, that is, *God-breathed*.

Now if what is *written* is what was *breathed* by God, there is no interval in which the prophet or the writer may, by meditation, incorporate a vision of his own heart. However intelligently the writer might co-operate with the divine Spirit, or however mystified he might be by the words given him to write, when it was a question of the making of Scripture, and the receiving of the oracles of God, the writers ceased to act merely in the capacity of thinkers, theologians or philosophers, they became willing instruments. Thus while personality is stamped upon every page of Scripture, Moses differing from Isaiah, Paul from Peter, Matthew from Luke, yet all its writers were instruments in the hand of God. The readers of *The Berean Expositor* will never see the actual words written by the Editor that later appear on these pages, neither will the printer nor the proof readers. The manuscript will be turned into type-script, to save the time and temper of the compositors, and the type-script into the printed page. Each stage will have had its peculiar characteristics, yet each will convey the same message. It would be but a quibble to say that the Editor did not actually write the article, simply because only the matter set up in type is read.

So with the writing of Scripture, “*God, at sundry times and in divers manner, spake in time past by the prophets*” (Heb. i. 1). However divers the manners, one thing remained constant, it was “*God*” Who “*spoke*”. Moses was peculiarly favoured by God. “*Hear now My words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make Myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches: and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold*” (Numb. xii. 6-8).

Into the question of how the revelation of truth was given we will not enter further here, but turn to the testimony of Peter, as given in the first chapter of II Peter. Speaking of the second coming of the Lord, Peter declares first of all: “*We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*” (II Pet. i. 16). His testimony now divides into two parts: (1) His own personal experience, and (2) The testimony of the word of prophecy.

Peter’s experience on the mount of transfiguration was blessedly real and true. So far as Peter was concerned nothing could remove the impression he there received. But he was commissioned to preach, not his experiences, but the Word. Experiences are of secondary importance when compared with one clear statement of Scripture. Yet many a child of God is misleading himself and others by so-called experiences. And strictly speaking, the value of these experiences often becomes very small when stripped of all associations and sentiments, and submitted to a cross-examination. Peter, therefore, turns even from the true experience of the mount of transfiguration to something “*more sure*”:

“*We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed in your hearts, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise*” (II Pet. i. 19).

The word of prophecy is “*sure*”, sure as the promise (Rom. iv. 16); steadfast as the word spoken by angels (Heb. ii. 2), fast as the anchor of hope (Heb. vi. 19).

“Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (II Pet. i. 20, 21).

The word “moved” used by Peter is found in the record of the storm in Acts xxvii. 15 and 17, “we let her *drive*”; “and so were *driven*”. The human element was set aside in that driving storm, even as Peter testifies, the human will was not permitted to interfere with the direct inspiration of the writers of Scripture. As a most blessed endorsement of these two testimonies, is the undeniable attitude of the Saviour to the integrity and authority of the Scriptures. At Bethlehem the Scriptures were fulfilled. At the cross, the resurrection and the ascension, the Scriptures were proved to be true down to the veriest detail. During the earthly ministry of the Son of God, He declared that it was impossible to believe His teaching while repudiating the writings of Moses (John v. 47), and reaffirmed this in resurrection by “beginning at Moses and all the prophets” (Luke xxiv. 47). Whatever difference there may be discernible between the aspect of truth presented by Matthew and by John, by Peter and by Paul, they stand solidly by the affirmation “All scripture is given by inspiration of God” and this must be recognized as the basis of all the teaching set forth in *The Berean Expositor* or any of its publications. As by faith we gaze at the cross of Christ, as we see indissolubly linked together the finished WORK of Calvary and finished WORD of God, there we take our stand, and with heart and life declare that our Saviour’s Bible so far as the Old Testament is concerned is our Bible, and that His deep reverence for the written Scriptures shall be our continuous example. “Beginning at Moses”, moreover, seems to suggest the only way in which the present series of elementary studies should proceed, and accordingly with this introduction we turn the reader’s attention to some of the outstanding teaching of the book of Genesis in our endeavour to set out some of the “First principles of the oracles of God”. The book of Genesis closes with a “coffin in Egypt”. This can be no ordinary book to justify so strange an ending. We catch something of the importance of this reference by nothing that of all that might have been brought forward this is recorded of Joseph in Heb. xi. 22. We believe our subsequent studies will reveal the reason for this strange sequel.

“And Joseph said unto his brethren, I die: and God will surely visit you, and bring you out of this land unto the land which He sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. And Joseph took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence. So Joseph died, being an hundred and ten years old: and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt” (Gen. l. 24-26).

The book of Genesis moves from Creation to New Creation, embodied in the unflinching hope of Joseph, even as the whole of the Bible moves from the Creation of the heaven and the earth in the beginning to the new heaven and the new earth, wherein sin, sorrow, death and the curse shall be “no more” (Rev. xxi. 1, 4; xxii. 3).

Here for the moment we stay, except to draw the reader’s attention to a series of articles which commenced in Volume XXXIV of *The Berean Expositor* which is entitled “Time and Place” and which in Volume XXXVI, page 176 brings the

chronology of Genesis to a close with the year 2369, the date of the death of Joseph. We quote in this connexion from the Rev. Martin Anstey, B.D., M.A.:

“Each step in the progress of the chronology is clearly explained in the above table, and the ‘proof’ is given in the ‘testimony’ of the Scripture cited. These proof texts are the historical data with which the science of chronology is built up. The result arrived at is characterized by the accuracy and certainty of an exact science. It cannot be one year more. It cannot be one year less.”

The first of the first principles of the oracles of God is, therefore, the inspiration, integrity and authority of the Holy Scriptures.

No.2. “Beginning at Moses.” **pp. 33 - 35**

“Beginning at Moses.” These words are taken from Luke xxiv. 47, and describe the line of teaching adopted by the Risen Christ, when instructing His disciples. We cannot hope to improve on such an example and in this series, addressed particularly to new readers, we too can find no other approach to the task before us than to begin at Moses also. Even when we are dealing with the unsaved, who are seeking light and guidance on the question of salvation, we are driven back to the opening chapter of Genesis. If there be no Creator, man is not a responsible being, for there is no one above him to whom he can be held accountable. If he is not responsible, there can be neither sin nor salvation, purpose or goal. Life becomes an insoluble enigma, we seem to be but pawns in a terrible game of chance. If, however, I have a Maker, and if He made me in His image, then I have a purpose to fulfil, and to fail or “come short” constitutes the basic meaning of sin. We shall have to elaborate this aspect of the truth later. We feel however that before we embark on such themes both the example of Christ Himself, the example of Paul (Acts xxviii. 23) and the construction of the Scriptures, make the commencement at Genesis imperative.

In the series we shall endeavour to avoid over-elaboration or too minute analysis. Where outlines are given, they will be as it were sketched in charcoal. Where meanings of words are dealt with, the original Hebrew and Greek will only be indicated. Where, however, it will be wise and necessary for the reader to consider more extensive proofs or analysis, an index of articles or books bearing on the particular theme will be given at the close.

The composition of the book of Genesis appears to consist of the collation of ancient family records, edited by Moses, and endorsed by the Spirit of God, to which an inspired revelation is given in the opening chapter. Further, these family records consist of genealogies, giving the chronology of Genesis in unhesitating steps from Adam to Joseph.

A glimpse at the book of Genesis as a whole will reveal a unique arrangement of subject matter. It *opens* with the creation of heaven and earth “in the beginning”, it *closes* with the record of Joseph’s death in Egypt.

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth” (Gen. i. 1).

“So Joseph died, being an hundred and ten years old; and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt” (Gen. l. 26).

Did any book ever begin and end like this? What possible connexion can there be between so vast a theme as the creation of the universe, and the embalming of one man, aged 110 years, in Egypt? The first item that emerges is that the record of creation given in Genesis is not put there as a matter of scientific interest, it evidently subserves another purpose. That purpose embraces man and his destiny, and the purpose that underlies the inclusion of “a coffin in Egypt” is REDEMPTIVE, so that the fate of Joseph is of more consequence than the appointment of sun, moon or star. When once this aspect of truth is accepted, we shall have made the first step to the understanding of the Scriptures, we shall understand why Moses devotes almost as many chapters in Exodus to the description of the tabernacle, its foundation and its priesthood, as he devotes verses to describe the creation of the world.

In a subsequent study we shall have to consider the relation of Genesis, the first book, with the Revelation, the last book, but all in good time. We now come a little closer to Genesis, and while still considering it as a whole, let us endeavour to trace its outline in the large. Chapters i.-xi. deal with the whole human race, *Adam to Noah*. Chapters xii.-l. deal with the one chosen nation Israel, *Abraham to Joseph*. We therefore use the word RACE for the first part, and NATION for the second. Next we observe that the first half ends with an ARK, while the second half ends with a COFFIN. In order to be able to appreciate this strange correspondence, the reader must permit a reference to the Hebrew and the Greek words involved, but there will be nothing put forward which need bother the simplest.

The word “ark” in Gen. vi.-ix. is the translation of the Hebrew word *tebah*, a word that is described by grammarians as “a loan word” from the Egyptian T-B-T “a chest”. If the reader possesses “Young’s Analytical Concordance”, he will observe that under this heading Ark *tebah*, there are listed all the references in the record of the flood, with two references from Exodus in addition. Now there can be no reference discovered in Exodus to the Flood, but Moses had been saved from death. His own mother *had made an Ark* of bulrushes, daubed it with slime and with pitch, and Moses remembering his mother’s devotion used the selfsame Egyptian word for the Ark, made by Noah of wood, which was also covered within and without in pitch.

The word translated “coffin” in Gen. l. 26 is the Hebrew word *aron*, which is translated “chest” six times and “ark” 195 times. There is therefore a closer connexion between Noah’s Ark and Joseph’s coffin than at first appears. This is by no means all, however. We discover that this word translated “coffin” is used in Exodus for the *Ark of the Covenant!* and not only so, a consultation of the N.T. reveals that the selfsame word *kibotos* speaks of the Ark prepared by Noah (Heb. xi. 7) and the Ark of the Covenant

(Heb. ix. 4). Consequently had Moses chosen, he could have avoided the Egyptian word which had such moving associations with himself, and have used the word *aron* for both the Ark in Gen. vi. and the coffin in Gen. i., the pitch, the slime and the embalming alike being used as preservatives. The two portions of Genesis therefore end on the same note:

From Adam to Noah - The Ark. Preserving seed.
From Abraham to Joseph - The coffin. Preserving seed.

The life of Joseph teems with interest, and it is morally certain that had any of us been entrusted with the task of selecting one event or feature of Joseph's life that should take its place in the list of faith, we would scarcely have selected the one that we find in Heb. xi.:

“By faith Joseph, when he died.”

When he DIED, yet all his life that life teemed with incidents.

“By faith Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departure of the children of Israel: and gave commandment concerning his BONES” (Heb. xi. 22).

One of the first principles therefore of the oracles of God is that the Bible is primarily concerned with REDEMPTION, other important themes, such as creation itself, are not introduced for their own sakes, but as subsidiary items to the main theme.

No.3. Creation and the Purpose of the Ages. **pp. 64 - 67**

Most students of Scripture are aware of the many items that occur in the book of Genesis, and which find their sequel and balance in the book of Revelation. The recognition of this fact is not merely the recognition of some sort of literary construction or pattern, but the acknowledgment of the presence, the pursuit and the attainment of a purpose. Anything that brings to the believer the assurance that there is a purpose underlying the welter and confusion of human history is of itself a Gospel, or good news, for there is nothing so disheartening as the feeling that all is in vain, that we are traveling nowhere in particular, that we have neither chart, compass, nor destiny. Therefore, in spite of the fact that these corresponding features have been set out before in these pages, we must do it again so that all without exception, shall be in possession of these liberating details.

In subsequent studies we shall bring forward the evidences necessary to show that the condition of things indicated by “without form and void” in Gen. i. 2 was a condition into which the primary creation fell, but for the moment we take this interpretation for granted in order to set out before the eye the general plan of the Bible, with particular

reference to the relationship of Genesis with Revelation. Before doing so we want to establish that there will be an equivalent period of dissolution at the time of the end, to that of Gen. i. 2, before the new heaven and the new earth appear. For this we will appeal to two portions of Scripture here, although the reader will doubtless be able to supplement these passages by others with which he is familiar. First a passage from the O.T. telling us of a future period of dissolution comparable to Gen. i. 2:

“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 it is the day of the Lord’s vengeance” (Isa. xxxiv. 4, 5, 8).

We anticipate future studies by drawing attention to the fact that the two words translated “without form and void” in Gen. i. 2 occur in verse 11 of this same chapter, there translated “confusion” and “emptiness”. This of itself confirms the thought that Gen. i. 2 is to be in some measure repeated in the future.

Secondly, a passage from the N.T.:

“Looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God, by reason of which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. But, according to His promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” (II Pet. iii. 12, 13, R.V.).

Again we anticipate future studies by assuming as true, that the work of the six days of Gen. i. was the preparation of the earth—so long submerged—for man. These things being accepted, the pattern of the ages (another term that must be considered in its place) can be set out somewhat as follows:

CREATION	«--- The present heaven and earth ---»	NEW CREATION
Gen. i. 1	The platform of the Age-Purpose and destined to pass away.	Rev. xxi. 1
Gen. i. 2 Chaos Vengeance		II Pet. iii. 12 Chaos Vengeance

Supplementing this survey we will now present a few of the most evident parallels between Genesis and the Revelation. The new heaven and the new earth of Rev. xxi. 1 answers Gen. i. 1. The “first” heaven and earth, should read “the former heaven and earth”, as the word is translated in verse four. This refers, not to the primary creation of the Universe (Gen. i. 1) but to the present creation, the limited heaven (called the firmament, yet to be considered) the present earth.

The added statement “no more sea” refers to the great deep of Gen. i. 2 which, like death, pain and the curse, are to be “no more” (Rev. xxi. 4; xxii. 3).

Paradise is lost in Gen. iii. together with the tree of life. Paradise is restored in Rev. xxii., together with the tree of life, the leaves of which will be for the healing of the nations, a contrast with the leaves used by Adam and Eve after the fall.

The cherubim were placed or “tabernacled” at the east of the garden and in Ezekiel these cherubim are described as having the face of a lion, a man, an ox and an eagle. In the Revelation the “four beasts” or better “the four living ones” with similar description are found closely associated with the glorious purpose of restoration. The intention of the cherubim will form a separate study and cannot be considered here.

Nimrod, first king of Babylon is mentioned in Gen. x. 8, 9 and his anti-type the Beast, the great Babylonian rebel at the time of the end, is seen in Rev. xiii. to xviii. The Serpent of Gen. iii. is identified as “The Devil” (N.T.) and “Satan” (O.T.) in Rev. xii. 9. The list can be expanded to great length, and the reader will find great help and blessing if he discards all helps in this matter and patiently and prayerfully endeavours to construct a set of parallels for himself.

Not only does Genesis anticipate Revelation, but the use of the word “beginning” in Gen. i. 1 anticipates “the end” of I Cor. xv. 24-28, when God will not only be “All” as He must ever have been as the Creator, but “all in all” as He will be when Redemption issues in Restoration and all enmity is for ever subdued. This subject, however, calls for a careful examination of the term “beginning” and deserves an article to itself. This we hope to give in the succeeding pages of this series. For the moment we pause and consider as an appendix to our meditations the essential place that Creation plays in the Scriptures of the Law, Prophets, Psalms, Gospels, Acts, Epistles and the Revelation. We are told, by some, that we have outgrown the primitive idea of placating an angry God (a distorted version of the Love that provided the great sacrifice for sin) and that modern science has made the idea of creation childish and impossible. If the reader would but go through the N.T. books and cut out all references to Redemption by blood, the Creation and the Miraculous, what he had left would be unreadable and worthless. For the moment our theme is Creation, and we draw attention to the way in which “All Scripture” is committed to this theme:

- (1) The Law of Moses. (Gen. i. 1; Deut. iv. 32; Exod. xx. 11).
- (2) The Prophets. (Isa. xl. 26; xlii. 5; Mal. ii. 10).
- (3) The Psalms. (Psa. xcvi. 5, 6; cxxxiv. 3; cxlvi. 6; Eccles. vii. 29; xii. 1).
- (4) The Gospels. (Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; John i. 1-3).
- (5) The Acts. (Acts xiv. 15; xvii. 24, 26).
- (6) The Epistles. (Rom. i. 20; I Pet. iv. 19; II Pet. iii. 4; Col. i. 15, 16).
- (7) The Revelation. (Rev. iii. 14; iv. 11; x. 6; xiv. 7).

The destiny of the people of Israel is intertwined with the fact of Creation.

“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 I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek Me IN VAIN” (Isa. xlv. 18, 19).

“For behold, I create NEW HEAVENS and a NEW EARTH I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy” (Isa. lxv. 17, 18).

“For thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; the Lord of hosts is His name. If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever” (Jer. xxxi. 35, 36).

The Gospel is never expressed in terms of self-improvement, of any “turning over a new leaf”, of any sort of “evolution”, but in terms of a New Covenant, which NEW Creation implies an OLD.

“Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature (or there is a New Creation). Old things are passed away, behold new things are come into being” (II Cor. v. 17).

“For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a NEW CREATURE (or creation)” (Gal. vi. 15).

“Put on the NEW MAN, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. iv. 24).

“And have put on the NEW MAN which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him Who created him” (Col. iii. 10).

The vexed question as to the creation of the six days, and all that this implies, and which modern science forces the believer to ponder, must be given the attention which such a question demands, and this will form the subject of an article in this series in the near future.

No.4. Gen. i. 2. A judgment, not a mode of creation. pp. 95 - 98

We can quite understand how difficult it must be for any one, with even a most elementary knowledge of the findings of modern science, to believe that the earth is only just about 6,000 years old. The sad thing is that so many in the name of science affirm that this is the teaching of the book of Genesis, and then proceed to set the Scriptures aside without first of all assuring themselves that what they say represents the facts and that it is they who stand in need of correction. Surely it is an elementary rule that a scientist should deal with *fact* and *evidence*, and if the first chapter of Genesis be the object of research, then WHAT IT SAYS should be most scrupulously noted and adhered to before any opinion is formed or expressed. A scientist worthy of the name who reads Gen. i. 9, 10 would immediately conclude that such a statement *cannot possibly refer to primal creation*.

“And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and LET THE DRY LAND APPEAR, and it was so. And God called the dry land EARTH.”

Here are two plain statements. The land that had been submerged beneath the waters, was made to “appear”, and this restored land is denominated “earth”. That is what this

text-book tells us, and being truly scientific, we too will use the term “earth” as the text-book directs. We shall not read “appear” (Heb. *raah* “become visible”) as though it were *bara*, the Hebrew word “create”. We should scrupulously keep to facts as stated. This means of course that the opening verses of Genesis have been misread and so we turn back to verse two to examine its testimony. The reader may have noticed, that the A.V. printers have taken the trouble to use two sorts of type for printing the word “was” in that verse.

“And the earth was (*ordinary type*) without form and void; and darkness was (*italic type*) upon the face of the deep” (Gen. i. 2).

As this series of articles is primarily for new readers, we purposely refrain from too many grammatical notes, but we believe that all will be able to follow the explanation here given. When the ordinary sense of the verb “to be” is intended (am, art, is, was, &c.), no Hebrew word is employed, its presence is assumed, and so in English the word “was” is printed *was*. When the sense is “become” rather than “be”, the word “was” is printed in ordinary type, signifying that the Hebrew verb is actually used. Now this verb occurs in Gen. ii. 7 where man “became” a living soul, for he certainly was not “living” until he breathed the breath of life. Again we read in Gen. iv. 2 that Abel “was” a keeper of sheep, and that Cain “was” a tiller of the ground. But common sense tells us that some years must have elapsed after their birth before this could have been possible, and all is in harmony if we remember that the word here is “become”.

“And Abel became a keeper of sheep.”

In Gen. xix. 26 the verb is translated correctly “she became a pillar of salt”, indicating a catastrophe subsequent to her normal well being. At some time after the initial creation of heaven and earth, a period as long as astronomy and geology may demand, the earth *became* without form and void. This places the teaching of Genesis on its true basis. It teaches that the universe was created “in the beginning”; that a chaotic condition at some time supervened and that this period of darkness and deluge can be of any length of time, and that the present heaven and earth, prepared for the habitation of man, came into being some 6,000 years ago. There is more to it than merely settling a scientific objection however. The question arises “why did this state of affairs take place?” Science here can provide no answer. Unless God Himself has told us, we do not know. The reader will probably remember that on page 65 we set out a tentative illustration of the pattern of the ages, in which we balanced the state of affairs described in Gen. i. 2, with that described in I Pet. iii., a chaotic condition supervening at the beginning and again at the end of the present world system. This is completely justified by the way in which inspired Scripture uses the words translated “without form and void” elsewhere. Let us turn to Jer. iv. Jeremiah laments the condition of Israel, and foresees the terrible consequences of its departure from the Lord.

“I beheld the earth, and lo, it was *without form and void*” (Jer. iv. 23).

Here the same Hebrew words are used as found in Gen. i. 2. Let us in the next place observe their setting here.

The fruitful place has become a wilderness.
The cities thereof are broken down.
The land is to be desolate, the earth to mourn, the heavens to be black.
(Jer. iv.25-28).

No one in his senses would teach from Jer. iv. that the land thus described was actually *created* a wilderness, the only legitimate interpretation is that it *became* so. No one either with this parallel usage can teach that creation originally came into being “without form and void” but that the pristine creation of Gen. i. 1 *became* the chaotic confusion of Gen. i. 2. The next question is “why?” Jeremiah supplies the answer. “All the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by His *fierce anger*.” Is that not judgment? Can it by any possible way refer to initial creation?

We have another witness in Isaiah, who also uses the words translated “without form and void”, but in the A.V. they are rendered “confusion” and “emptiness”.

“He shall stretch out upon it the line of *confusion* (same word “without form”) and the stones of *emptiness* (same word as “void”)” (Isa. xxxiv. 11).

Here again the context is one of judgment.

“Indignation fury utterly destroyed slain sword curse.
It is the day of the Lord’s *vengeance*” (Isa. xxxiv. 2-8).

In verse four we have a passage parallel with II Pet. iii. 10-12, the dissolution which ushers in the new heavens and the new earth:

“And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all the host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree” (Isa. xxxiv. 4).

We are enjoined to compare spiritual things with spiritual, which comparison will take note of the words “which the Holy Ghost teacheth”, and in these two prophets we have the fullest warrant that we can hope to find, for interpreting Gen. i. 2 as a *judgment* that fell, rather than as the primitive condition of creation itself. “The earth *became* without form and void.” Not only does this interpretation rob the scientific objection of any basis for its objection, it does more, it throws light upon the period of time spoken of in Eph. i. 4 where we read:

“According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world.”

To “prove” this connexion would demand an examination of the Greek word translated “foundation” and that we are avoiding in this more elementary approach. We will however direct the reader to recent articles where the subject is given meticulous care, and sincerely hope that all who desire the fullest understanding of the distinctiveness of the calling made known in Ephesians, will spare the time to acquaint themselves with the evidence there assembled. These articles will be found in Volume XXXVI, pages 61, 81, 101, 121 and 141, all that we will do here is to sum up the findings which are there set out.

Two sets of time are found in the N.T. that should be kept distinct, “from the foundation of the world” and “before the foundation of the world”. The latter is used once only of the redeemed, namely of those called during the dispensation of the Mystery. The verbal form of the word translated “foundation” is rendered “cast-down” in II Cor. iv. 9 and Rev. xii. 10, and in the articles mentioned above, twenty-nine occurrences of this same word used in the Septuagint (the Greek version of the O.T.) are set out where the translation is consistently “throw down”, “break down”, “overthrow”, never create, build or plant. If each reference be read in its context, the references will be found to be those of battle, of siege, of destruction, of judgment. We believe it is impossible for any reader not to be impressed with the solidarity of its witness.

The first verse of Gen. i., tells us of the initial act of creation, which took place in the dateless past.

The second verse of Gen. i. tells us of an overthrow, a judgment that fell upon the earth, the darkness only being dissipated at long last by the movement of the spirit of God and the words of God “Let there be light”.

These words compel us to turn to one utterance made by the apostle Paul, which will show that he at least believed that Gen. i. 1, 2 speaks of a state comparable to the fall and conversion of man.

“For God Who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (II Cor. iv. 6).

The context of this quotation speaks of Satan and his ways, and we shall have to consider the teaching of Scripture with reference to the fall of the angels before we can answer the question “why did judgment fall upon the earth?” as indicated in Gen. i. 2.

No.5. The Present Creation likened to a Tabernacle. pp. 110 - 113

At either end of the Sacred Volume a revelation is given for which no human witness was or could be available, namely, in Genesis, Moses looks back before Adam to the preparation of the present heaven and earth for man, and John, in the Revelation looks forward to the future Day of the Lord and the ushering in of the New Heavens and New Earth, for which, once again, no human witness was possible. The prophetic vision alone could reveal either the past to Moses or the future to John. The past was made known to Moses in a series of revelations occupying seven days, all of which except the seventh, being divided into two parts, the evening and the morning were the first, second, third day, etc. The future was made known to John by a series of revelations in the form of seven visions, each being a pair, (1) something taking place in heaven, followed by (2) something taking place on earth. These lead up to the New Creation of Rev. xxi. 1.

It is nowhere hinted that these seven visions of Revelation comprise all that God will do during the Day of the Lord, they are seven vignettes, giving enough information to guide the overcomer whose difficult pathway is under review from Rev. ii. 7 until he is seen inheriting “all things” in Rev. xxi. 7. In like manner, it is nowhere suggested in Gen. i., that God did nothing else on day one, but call light into being and divide the light from the darkness. The complicated inter-relationships of created beings is so vast, that not only pages, but books would have to be written to give in barest outline what God must have wrought between the calling of light into being and the making of Man.

Some godly men of science have spent laborious hours in the endeavour to show that the geological order of creation as set forth by the rocks and fossils of the earth, keeps pace with the order of created beings that is set forth in the six days of Gen. i. This, though well meaning, is labour in vain, partly because of the ever-changing patterns of the universe as it is unfolded to the men of science and partly because no such idea can be found in the record of Gen. i. The simplest explanation of the record of the six days work is that it was a series of six visions granted to Moses, in much the same way as the seven visions of the Revelation were granted to John, and whether it actually took the Lord six days or six ages cannot be proved and does not concern us, so long as we realize the underlying reason for the selection of this number of days that Moses so faithfully records.

The second day is devoted to the making of the “firmament”, a word which appears at first sight so unscientific as not to be taken seriously. The translators of the A.V. were influenced by the Latin Vulgate which employed the word *firmamentum* to translate the Greek word found in the Septuagint, namely *stereoma*, which in its turn was used to translate the Hebrew word *raqia* which means “an expanse” as given in the A.V. margin. The verb *raqa* is translated “spread abroad”, “spread out”, “stretch out” and in Exod. xxxix. 3 it is translated “beat” in reference to beating out thin plates of gold. Isaiah not only speaks of the heavens that have been “stretched out” (Isa. xlii. 5), but in chapter forty records the purpose for this peculiar work of the second day.

“That stretcheth out the heavens **AS A CURTAIN** and spreadeth them out as a **TENT TO DWELL IN**” (Isa. xl. 22).

The very same word for “tent” is used over and over again by Moses to speak of the tabernacle which he erected in the wilderness. Not only is the heaven which was stretched out over the earth likened to a tent as though God would teach us that the sole purpose of the present heaven and earth was redemptive, we find that according to Job the “foundations” on which the earth rests are “sockets” and identical with the silver sockets upon which the tabernacle rested, and which were made of the redemptive shekels of silver taken from the people (Exod. xxx. 13-16; xxxviii. 25-27). When the redemptive purpose of the ages has been accomplished, the present limited “firmament” will roll together as a scroll (Isa. xxxiv. 4) just before the chaotic condition of Gen. i. 2 is repeated (Isa. xxxiv. 11) as we have already seen in No.3 of this series. The present heavens and earth are to be folded up as a vesture and put aside when their redemptive purpose has been served.

Gen. i. introduces the Jubilee element on the opening page of Scripture, and this feature is enforced by parallel heptads as the following list will show:

DAYS	Seven days of creation, ending in a sabbath of rest (Gen. i. 2, 3).
WEEKS	Seven sabbaths to the morrow. Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 15, 16).
MONTHS	Seven months complete the festal year (Lev. xxiii. 24-44).
YEARS	Seventh year kept as a sabbath.
JUBILEE	Seven seven years, liberty proclaimed (Lev. xxv. 8-10).
CAPTIVITY	Seventy years, which lead on to the seventy sevens (Dan. ix. 1-23).
PROPHETIC	Seventy sevens, Gentile dominion, Israel's restoration (Dan. ix. 24-27).

It is abundantly evident that the vision given Moses of the six days work and the seventh day's rest of the creation and restoration of the earth as a dwelling-place for man was intended to be typical, setting forth in this first of a series, the redemptive purpose of the ages. The heaven of Gen. i. 1 lies entirely beyond the limits of the firmament of Gen. i. 6 and will never pass away. Through these limited and stretched out heavens the Saviour passed at His ascension (Heb. iv. 14 *dierchomai* "to pass through"), was made "higher than the heavens" (Heb. vii. 26), and "ascended up far above all heavens" (Eph. iv. 10). These words are emptied of meaning unless we perceive that "far above" the stretched out curtain or firmament, there remains unaltered by the advent of sin and death, the "heaven of heavens" (I Kings viii. 27).

What is the significance of this teaching concerning the present heavens? Because Abraham, Isaac, Jacob looked for a city which hath foundations, they were content to dwell in tabernacles as tent-dwellers, and by so doing declared plainly that they sought a heavenly country (Heb. xi. 9-16). They "sojourned" in the land of promise, the word in both the English and the Greek suggests a temporary residence. "We are strangers before Thee, and sojourners, as were all our fathers: our days on the earth are as a shadow, there is none abiding" (I Chron. xxix. 15). David in Psa. xxxix. 12 says:

"For a sojourner I am with Thee
A settler like all my father" (Young's Lit. Trans.).

It is that expression "with Thee" that is so startling. We can understand Abraham and David being sojourners, but in what way was the Lord Himself associated with such a mode of living? *Shaken*, the word translated "dwell" in Exod. xxv. 8 and Gen. ix. 27 and in Job xviii. 15 means to dwell as in a tent or a tabernacle and consequently, many of the passages which speak of God "dwelling" imply that He too, during the outworking of the purpose of the ages, He too, shares with His redeemed this attitude of heart; He too dwells, as it were in a tent, until the Day of glory dawns, and sorrow and sighing flee away.

Every one of us who have been redeemed, and have consequently set our affection on things above, who look for our equivalent of a heavenly city and heavenly country, every one of us can have the overwhelming joy of knowing that God Himself is with us in our

pilgrimage, we are sojourners with Him. This present world is a vast tabernacle, its great purpose is the outworking of God's great redemptive purpose, and when this purpose is achieved, the tabernacle or tent with its sojourning, pilgrimage and limitations, its types, shadows and ceremonial, will give place to fullness and stability when God shall be all in all.

No.6. Adam, Image, Likeness and Dominion. pp. 144 - 149

The supreme moment in the six days of Gen. i. is when God ceased to say "Let there be", "Let the earth bring forth", "Let the waters bring forth" and when the record suggests a pause and a deliberation.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" (Gen. i. 26).

With these words uttered at his creation, Adam and his descendants appear to be unique in the universe, for there is not the remotest hint that any creature, anywhere, at any time, angel, principality or power, was ever thus distinguished. The word "image" translates the Hebrew word *tselem*, and this word is translated in every occurrence but one "image", the exception being Psa. xxxix. 6 "in a vain show", which Rotherham more correctly translates "Surely as a shadow doth every man wander" and if the reader remembers the reference made to the "sojourner" in the preceding article of this series, he will remember that that reference is taken from Psa. xxxix. also. The whole Psalm is written around the transient character of man's earthly life. *Tselem* "image" is used of the image seen by Nebuchadnezzar in his dream, an image which set forth in symbol the beginning, end and character of Gentile dominion. It may be that there is nothing significant in the fact that the Hebrew word is translated sixteen times "image" and once "vain show", and that the Chaldee word is also translated sixteen times "image" and once "form", the exceptional translation being in Dan. iii. 19 "the *form* of his visage was changed". The root of the word is *tsel*, meaning "shadow" and is so translated forty-five times in the O.T. The second term used in Gen. i. 26 "likeness" is the translation of the Hebrew *demuth*. This word is found in Ezek. i. 8 and 10 where it is used in the description of the cherubim.

For the moment we turn from this subject to consider another, but one that is vitally related, and will prove to be illuminating. That subject is the meaning of the name Adam. The reader of the A.V. may have been led to believe that this word does not occur until we meet in it Gen. ii. 19, but such is not the case. The Hebrew word *adam* occurs in Gen. i. 26, 27; ii. 5, 7, 8, 15, 16 and 18, where it is translated "man". What is the meaning of the first name given in the Bible? There can be no question but that the names in Scripture often have a significance and particularly so in the early chapters. "Cain" means "gain" and enters into the verb "I have gotten" (Gen. iv. 1). The five other occurrences in Genesis are translated either "purchase" or "bought".

“Seth” means “set” and is translated “appointed” in Gen. iv. 25. The reader who uses Young’s “Analytical Concordance”, should note that while the index reads “appoint” three times, only two references are given under the Hebrew word *sheth*, Gen. iv. 25 for some reason being omitted. This is a mistake. *Sheth* is used in Gen. iv. 25. The translation “set” is found in Gen. xli. 33 and in twenty-two other places. After the fall, Adam called his wife’s name Eve, for said he, she was the mother of all living, “in that she was made mother of every one living” (Gen. iii. 20 Rotherham) which suggests that Adam believed the promise made to the woman in Gen. iii. 15, 16. Eve is the English spelling of *chavah*. It will be remembered that Ezekiel uses the word “image” a number of times when speaking of the cherubim; these he calls “the living creatures” *chaivah* thirteen times in Ezek. i.-x.

We are glad to learn that Cain, Seth and Eve were names of deep significance, and we also observe that in the very verse where these names first occur, the inspired penman is guided to give the explanation. If Cain, Seth and Eve are of such importance, surely the name given to the first man Adam must be of the greatest significance, yet so far as we can discover on the surface, no explanation is found in the first occurrence of the word, Gen. i. 26. The usual interpretation is that seeing that man was made of the dust of the ground, “ground” being the Hebrew *adamah* as in Gen. ii. 7, “red earth” is its significance. Truly we are taught that man is of the earth, earthy, we nowhere read that the earth from which we was taken was “red”, and so we still return to the first occurrence of the name, and wonder why it should have received no explanation there.

If similarity of sound be sufficient justification for this connexion of Adam with the *adamah*, and if we find not only similarity of sound but close association with the word “image” and its presence in the very verse in which the word Adam first occurs, then the word translated “likeness” has even greater claim than the remoter *adamah* had. “Likeness” is derived from the Hebrew word *damah*, and in the light of the other verses where names are explained upon their first appearance, we believe that Adam was so named, not because he was taken out of “red-earth” but because he was a “shadow”, a type, a likeness of Him Who is the true IMAGE OF THE INVISIBLE GOD, Him Who created all things which are in heaven and earth” (Col. i. 15, 16). We learn from Rom. v. 14 that Adam was a “figure of Him that was to come”.

By creation man is “the image and glory of God” (I Cor. xi. 7) but this image is, after all, “earthy”.

“The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly” (I Cor. xv. 47-49).

Even now, before the day of glory dawns, “we have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him” (Col. iii. 10). Col. i. 16 makes it clear that the Son was the Creator of Gen. i. 26 and that Adam foreshadowed “Him that was to come”, “the last Adam”.

Returning to Gen. i. 26, we must now consider a little more closely the added clause “after our likeness” (*demuth*). The LXX Version translates this by *kath homoiosin*, which we may compare with the Apostle’s use of the word when speaking to the Athenians in Acts xvii.:

“Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is *like* (*homoios*) unto gold, silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device” (Acts xvii. 29).

Isaiah also challenges us with the question:

“To whom then will ye *liken* (*damah*, see *demuth* above) God?” (Isa. xl. 18).

And Ethan says:

“Who in the heaven can be compared unto the Lord? Who among the sons of the mighty can be likened (*damah*) unto the Lord?” (Psa. lxxxviii. 6).

Nevertheless it is true that man was made after the likeness of God, and in James iii. we read, concerning the tongue:

“Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the *similitude* (*homoioses*) of God” (James iii. 9).

The prophet Hosea uses the word *damah* when speaking of the way in which God had condescended to use figures of speech:

“I have multiplied visions, and used *similitudes* by the ministry of the prophets” (Hosea xii. 10).

During His public ministry, the Lord Himself used many similitudes. For example:

“The kingdom of heaven is *like* (*homoios*) unto treasure” (Matt. xiii. 44).
“Unto what is the kingdom of God *like*?” (Luke xiii. 18).
“Whereunto shall I *liken* this generation?” (Matt. xi. 16).

Man is to God what a figure of speech is to thought, a symbol, an analogy, a type.

When Nebuchadnezzar saw in a dream the successive kingdoms of Gentile rule in the form of an image, neither he nor Daniel ever imagined that such kingdoms were actually like the image itself, but simply that this image and its peculiar construction “shadowed forth” in symbol the moral characteristics of the kingdom concerned. So, in Gen. i. 26, there is no question of external resemblance. Whether seen in the frail type of Adam, or in the glorious person of the Son of God, the “image and likeness” are never to be understood as physical. The Saviour Himself taught that God is spirit, that no man has ever seen His shape. It is true that He declared that “He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father”, but no one with any understanding of the word would think that He intended physical likeness here. The Father was set forth in the life and character of the “Word made flesh”, but the Father was not “like” the physical form which the Lord took when

He was “found in fashion as a man”. So, in connexion with Adam, the “image” and “likeness” have reference to what is moral and mental.

How far, and in what direction, was Adam intended to shadow forth God Himself? How far was he, as a creature, able to represent Deity? What limits can be set? The reader will no doubt be acquainted with the two extreme answers to these questions. There are some who will not allow the image and likeness to be anything more than physical, while there are others who would deduce from this passage the inherent immortality of the soul. The truth lies mid-way between the two extremes, and is associated with the words that follow referring to image and likeness.

“And God said, LET US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness; and LET THEM have dominion” (Gen. i. 26).

We have seen that the name “Adam” is similar to the Hebrew word for “likeness”. This “likeness” was expressed in the “dominion” which was originally conferred upon man. When sin entered into the world, however, resulting in a curse upon the earth, his dominion over the lower creatures was impaired. When Noah, whom we can regard as a sort of second Adam, steps out of the ark into a new world, and the word “dominion” is no longer used, and “the fear of you and the dread of you” takes its place (Gen. ix. 2). Man, however, is still looked upon as being “in the image of God” (Gen. ix. 6), and “in the likeness of God” (James iii. 9).

The dominion that was given to Adam was:

“over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth” (Gen. i. 26).

This dominion was a “shadow” of the greater dominion that was to be exercised by Christ, the true Image of God, and is even included in the dominion given to Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. ii. 38). David, in the eighth Psalm, sees something of this, and the apostle Paul in the N.T. completes the story:

“When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; What is man, that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that Thou visitest him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet: All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas” (Psa. viii. 3-8).

If we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we shall see that Adam foreshadowed Christ. The Creator of Gen. i. 26 is addressed in Psa. viii., and the Psalmist says that “the heavens are the work of Thy fingers”. Unless we are willing to quibble over the difference between “fingers” and “hands”, it is clear that Christ is the Creator in Whose image and likeness Adam was created, for in Heb. i. we read:

“And Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth: and the heavens are the works of Thine hands” (Heb. i. 10).

From Heb. i. we proceed to Heb. ii., where we have Psa. viii. quoted, with the comment:

“For in that He put all in subjection under Him, He left nothing that is not put under Him” (Heb. ii. 8).

This shows that we have passed from the type, whose dominion was over sheep and oxen, to the Antitype, Whose dominion is over all. The apostle continues:

“But now we see not yet all things put under Him. But we see Jesus, Who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. ii. 8, 9).

This dominion, of which Adam’s “likeness” was but a faint shadow, is further expanded in Eph. i., where we reach the zenith of the revelation of “the mystery of Christ”. In this epistle we are concerned with that section of the “all things” that is associated with the exalted sphere where Christ sitteth “far above all heavens” (Eph. iv. 10). And so we read, in chapter one:

“He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be Head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 20-23).

With this rapid glance at the relationship between this “dominion” and “mystery”, let us turn now to I Cor. xv., to see one further application of the passage:

“Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For He hath put all things under His feet. But when He saith all things are put under Him, it is manifested that He is excepted, which did put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all” (I Cor. xv. 24-28).

This goal of the ages is the fulfillment of the pledge shadowed forth in the creation of Adam.

We must now turn to Gen. i. 26, in order to investigate what is actually implied by the word “dominion”. There are various possible alternatives that are *not* used in this passage. The word used here is not *baal*, “to have dominion as lord and proprietor” (Isa. xxvi. 13), or *mashal*, “to reign as a governor, or a superior” (Judges xiv. 4), or *shalat* “to rule” (Psa. cxix. 133), but *radah*, “to tread down, to subdue”. The following are three passages in which this particular word occurs:

“They that hate you *shall reign* over you” (Lev. xxvi. 17).

“With force and cruelty *have ye ruled*” (Ezek. xxxiv. 4).

“*Rule thou* in the midst of thine enemies” (Psa. cx. 2).

These references indicate something of the nature of this particular type of dominion, and particularly the passage from Psa. cx., which is Messianic and speaks of the Day of the Lord. The Psalm goes on to speak of the Lord “striking through kings”, “filling places with dead bodies” and “wounding the heads over many countries” (Psa. cx. 5, 6). This conception of dominion is carried over into verse twenty-eight of Gen. i. where we read:

“Replenish the earth and *subdue* it.”

The word “subdue” is a translation of the Hebrew *kabash*, and its significance may be gathered from the fact that its substantival form means a “footstool” (II Chron. ix. 18). In Neh. v. 5 it is rendered “to bring into bondage”; and it is the word used by the King when he exclaims of Haman, “will he force the Queen?” (Est. vii. 8). The word is also used of the conquest of Canaan under Joshua (Josh. xviii. 1), a subjugation whose rigour there is no need to quote chapter and verse to prove. The LXX translates the word “subdue” by *katakurieuo*, meaning “to rule imperiously”, “to lord it over”, “to get the mastery”. Its occurrences in the N.T. will give further light on its meaning:

“Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles *exercise dominion* over them” (Matt. xx. 25; Mark x. 42).

“The man in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, and *overcame* them, and prevailed against them” (Acts xix. 16).

“Neither as *being lords over* God’s heritage” (I Pet. v. 3).

The creation of Adam, his very name, and the dominion given to him, all foreshadowed the subduing of all enemies beneath the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ. An enemy is most certainly in view in Gen. i. 26-28, and in chapter three he is revealed. He is “that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan” (Rev. xii. 9).

No.7. The essential difference between a mechanical and a moral creation. Gen. i. and ii. pp. 228 - 231

The name of God in Gen. i. is the Hebrew word *Elohim*, a plural word, yet followed by a singular verb, a feature which demands a separate study. The name of God in chapter two is “The Lord God”, in Hebrew, *Jehovah Elohim*. In Gen. i., under the title “God” we have creation. In Gen. ii., under the title “The Lord God”, we have purpose, and we pass from creation in general to the story of a responsible creature, man. All creation is “held”, but man is “held accountable”, in other words man is not a mechanical creation, obeying the laws of God as do the sun, moon stars and tides, but is a moral creature, who can be addressed, promised, warned, rewarded or punished. Should there be any aberration of the sun or the moon, such could by no means be termed “sin”, but any departure from obedience on the part of man *is* sin. The nature of creation is seen in the words used at its inception:

“For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast” (Psa. xxxiii. 9).

This is seen to be true in Gen. i. “And God said, Let there be light, *and there was light*” (Gen. i. 3).

At the close of the record of the second day we read “and it was so”. Again and again we get the phrase “and it was good”. Light is good, but light here is not moral but physical. The gathering of the waters, the growth of grass, herb and tree, the rule of sun, moon and stars, the creation of sea monsters and creeping things are called “good”, but not in the moral sense. It is inconceivable that the dry land could or would refuse to “appear”, it is outrageous to think of either rewarding the sun when it shines, or of punishing the moon when the sun is eclipsed. Here in Gen. i. we have a mechanical and physical creation, but with the advent of man, the moral element enters, and with the moral comes the contingent “IF”. It would have been impossible without altering the nature of man for such words as “it was so” to have followed the command concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; man’s obedience was not inevitable. As a creature man was pronounced “good” (Gen. i. 31), but whether he would “do good” could not be ascertained apart from trial and proof. Moral good cannot be ready made, it must be acquired.

There were three ways in which evil could have been prevented:

- (1) God could have created a being who was incapable of sinning. Had He done so, the creature thus formed could never have risen above the level of a brute beast. His actions would have been governed by the promptings of instinct, and would have had no moral value.
- (2) God could have created a being capable of sinning, and yet have kept him from all possible internal and external temptation. Had man been thus formed and hedged about, he would have remained innocent, but would never have been upright. He would have been as innocent as an animal is innocent, but could never have been upright as a man can be upright.
- (3) God could have created man, and allowed temptation, and yet have prevented him yielding to it. If this had been done, the very act would have destroyed the moral nature that had been formed. Enforced goodness, coerced love, compulsory worship are contradictions. Goodness, love and worship are emptied of their essential meaning the moment the principle of compulsion enters. God can create innocent beings, but in the very nature of things, the creation of a virtuous character or a ready-made righteousness is impossible. A virtuous character cannot be bestowed by Divine fiat.

This leads us to the vexed subject, the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. In the first place it must be remembered that it is not “good and evil” that were open to Adam and Eve, but “the *knowledge* of good and evil”. Now it is affirmed in Gen. iii. that God said man has become “as one of us, *to know* good and evil” (Gen. iii. 22) and in Heb. v. 14 we find such knowledge commended and indeed desirable in those who were “perfect” or adult, as contrasted with those who were but “babes”. Adam was a babe so far as *experience* was concerned, and to acquire an adult’s knowledge with a babe’s experience was fatal. Man was made “for a little, lower than the angels”, though destined

to be “above” them. To attempt to penetrate into the realm of the spirit before the right time, resolves itself into witchcraft and spiritism, and to attempt to grasp universal knowledge while still a babe is equally disastrous. It may include the ability to split the atom, but may also lead to self destruction. Man will one day “know, even as he is known”, but he must be willing to wait God’s time.

The same thing is true with regard to the kingdoms of the world. It is the revealed purpose of God that, when the seventh angel sounds, the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ (Rev. xi. 15). On the other hand, for the Lord to have yielded to the temptation of the Evil One, to grasp this sovereignty before the appointed time, would have been the same in principle as the act which brought about the downfall of Adam. Where however man failed, in a garden of plenty, the Lord triumphed in a wilderness of want (Matt. iv. 8, 9).

A knowledge of good and evil really comprises the whole realm of knowledge. He who knows all good and all evil, knows all things. This was evidently understood in O.T. times, as the language of the woman of Tekoah indicates:

“As an angel of God, so is my lord the king to discern good and bad” (II Sam. xiv. 17).
“My lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth” (II Sam. xiv. 20).

Comparing the two passages, we see that “good and bad” and “all things on the earth” are synonymous. Isa. xlv. 7 is often misquoted, as though it taught that God was the Author of moral evil. The passage reads “I make peace, and create evil”, and not “I make GOOD and Create EVIL”. The opposition of “peace” and “evil” here fixes the meaning we must attach to the word “evil”.

There is a tendency with most of us to read the words of Gen. ii. as though they emphasized evil, the passage reading: “the knowledge of good and *evil*”, or even “the knowledge of *evil*”. We must remember, however, that the tree represented both *good* as well as *evil*. “Good” out of place, and before its time, can be definitely harmful. Marriage, for example, is “honourable in all” but that which is most blessed within the limitation of the marriage bond, is itself a sin if entered into apart from those Divinely appointed limits. Again we observe that “good” and “evil” are not things in themselves, but terms which refer to the actions of particular people.

We will conclude by giving, in the form of a table, a list of some of the characteristics that distinguish the sphere of mechanical determinism from that of moral accountability.

CREATION (<i>Mechanical</i>)	CREATION (<i>Moral</i>)
<p>Title: God. Pronouncement: "It was so." Created things "good". Created things "held". No option. Things or animals. Sin not possible. Faith and love impossible. No fellowship. "Let there be light."</p>	<p>Title: Lord God. Pronouncement: "Thou shalt not." Moral creatures "tested". Moral creatures "held responsible". Freedom of choice. Persons. Sin possible. Faith and love possible. Fellowship. "Let us make man."</p>

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth. (Second Series).

No.55. GALATIANS.

The argument for faith without works (ii. 15 - 20). pp. 17 - 20

Having seen the structure of Gal. ii. 15 - iv. 12 as a whole, we return to the personal testimony of Paul, which he made at Antioch and recorded in Gal. ii. 15-20.

It will be necessary to examine with some care both the terms and the arguments which the Apostle used, for in this most personal testimony is enshrined the "Truth of the Gospel", together with the question of the Apostle's own personal integrity which was so much at stake in those early days of witness. First of all let us consider the general outline of the subject.

- A | 15. Not *sinner*s of the Gentiles.
 - B | 16-17. | a | "Knowing." Justification by faith asserted.
 - b | "Believed." Justification by faith. Gospel.
 - a | "For." Justification by faith confirmed by O.T.
 - b | "While." Justification by faith sought.
- A | 17. We ourselves are found *sinner*s.
 - B | 17-20. | Peter's action. |
 - a | Is Christ minister of sin?
 - b | God forbid.
 - b | If build again.
 - a | I make myself transgressor.
 - Paul's testimony. |
 - c | I, through law, to law died.
 - d | Dead to law.
 - e | Live unto God.
 - c | I, crucified with Christ.
 - d | Christ liveth in me.
 - e | I live by faith of Son of God.

The Apostle approaches his argument by way of privilege. He contrasts "Jews by nature" with "sinners of the Gentiles".

Israel were called "the natural branches" of the Olive, and the inclusion of the Gentile was compared to a grafting a tree wild "by nature" and "contrary to nature" (Rom. xi. 21, 24). The Gentile is referred to as having "not the law by nature" (Rom. ii. 14), and as "the uncircumcision by nature" (ii. 27).

As compared with the Jew and his religious privileges the Gentiles were called “sinners”. In the gospel according to Matthew, we read “The Son of man is betrayed into the hands of *sinners*” (xxvi. 45) which in Luke xviii. 32 reads “He shall be delivered unto the *Gentiles*”. Luke vi. 33 reads “for sinners also do even the same”. So, too, the expression “publicans and sinners”, indicating the thought that any one who had sunk so low as to collect taxes for an heathen government had sunk to the level of the Gentiles and had forfeited the high privileges which he had as a “Jew by nature”. In Phil. iii. Paul gives some idea of what ground of boasting a Jew had “in the flesh”, which he himself had cast away as worth nothing, to be “found in Christ, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law.

It is evident therefore that in this argument with Peter, Paul is not using the title “sinners” in the universal and doctrinal sense, but is adopting the current Jewish reference to the Gentiles. This we must not forget when we meet the word again in Gal. ii. 17, otherwise the point of Paul’s argument will be lost.

At first reading, there is a deal of repetition in verse sixteen that makes the public reading of this verse something of a test, and its analysis calls for care.

We have suggested in the structure that the references to being “justified” divide into four links in the chain of argument.

- (1) We, that is both Peter and Paul, know that a man is not justified except (*ean me*) through faith. Justification by works of law has already been set aside as hopeless and impossible.
- (2) This is evident from the fact that “even we” believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by faith, and not by works of law.
- (3) The next clause would be an unmeaning repetition unless the Apostle is seen to be reinforcing his own argument by a free citation of scripture. The introductory “for” *dioti* suggests a quotation, as does the Hebraism *ou pasa* “not all”. The same citation is found in Rom. iii. 20; and Psa. cxliii. 2 seems to have become the basis of a maxim, a quasi-proverb, that could be cited to clinch an argument.

With these three steps in the argument solidly placed and impossible of denial, Paul proceeds to his conclusion:

- (4) “But.” The *de* here is both adversative and logical. A contrast is now to be instituted. If what has been said is true, if we Jews have believed in Christ in order to be justified, if after all, if seeking thus to be justified by Christ, we ourselves are “found sinners” then the conclusion is inevitable, “Christ is the minister of sin”. Such a thought however is intolerable—away with such an idea, the thought is profane. Our guilt lies not in abounding the law as a means of life and righteousness, our guilt lies in seeking it afresh and using it to supplement the gracious work of Christ.

If we keep in mind the opening words of Gal. ii. 15 and remember that a “Jew by nature” was one who, through circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic ritual, believed that he had acquired merit in the sight of God, while the rest of the world had no interest in the promises, covenants or fathers, and were indeed “sinners of the Gentiles”, we shall be better able to appreciate the conclusion found in Gal. ii. 17.

If we ourselves, then (as Peter’s attitude seemed to suggest), through the desire of ceremonial observance become no better than “sinners” (and this we must be if circumcision by indispensable to salvation), what must be the inference? It must be that Christ, in Whose name we have thus acted and believed, by ridding us of this incubus of ceremonial law has but brought us to the level of the uncircumcised, unsaved, sinner of the Gentiles!

Paul as we know from similar argument in Rom. vi. and vii. cannot long dwell upon the fallacy which he would expose. Passing from the use of “we”, the Apostle gives his own personal testimony and the uses the pronoun “I” which Peter is invited to apply to his own case.

“For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor”
(Gal. ii. 18).

It may be useful at this point to draw attention to the fact that while in the Apostle’s statement of the truth, the great doctrine of justification by faith is uppermost, it must be remembered that the conflict between the apostles was not so much the question of justification by faith, but the defence of the Apostle’s own character, commission and independent message that is prominent.

“The things which I pulled down” *Ha katelusa*.

The charge against Stephen, which the converted persecutor Saul, so soon had to meet was:

“We have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy (*kataluo*) this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us” (Acts vi. 14).

Where there is “no law” there can be “no transgression of the law” (Rom. iv. 15); and if the law be revived, then there must come about a revival of transgression, and so, said Paul, I shall constitute or commit myself of being a transgressor.

The sacrificial death of Christ is the one unanswerable rejoinder of the Apostle to each and every attack upon the believer’s perfect emancipation by faith. This can be seen in other epistles beside Galatians. Does the objector bring forward the specious plea “shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?” The Apostle does not enter into a lengthy disquisition, he cuts the false argument short with his “God forbid. How shall we, that are DEAD to sin, LIVE any longer therein?” (Rom. vi. 2).

Does his Jewish objector look upon the giving up of the law of Moses for the faith of the gospel as a kind of spiritual adultery? The Apostle meets the objection by saying “for

the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband *so long as he liveth*, but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become DEAD to the law by the body of Christ: that ye should be married to another, even to Him Who is raised from the dead” (Rom. vii. 2-4).

The conversion of Saul of Tarsus was no mere change of creed or change of opinion, it was a matter of death, followed by a new life.

This being the basic doctrine of the Apostle’s preaching, it is not surprising that he discontinues the line of argument started in the fifteenth verse, and stakes his all on the death of Christ, and his own death as reckoned in Him:

“For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God” (Gal. ii. 19).

The word “law” is the Greek *nomos*, which occurs many times in Paul’s epistles, sometimes with the article “the” and sometimes *anarthrous*, or without the article “the”. Here in Gal. ii. 19 both occurrences are *anarthrous* and should read “For I through *law*, to *law* died”. *Nomos* with the article represents a specific code of laws, like for example “the law of Moses” and “the laws of Khammarabi”. *Nomos* without the article represents the idea of obligation arising out of law.

In what way could Paul say that “through (the instrumentality of) law, he had died to law”? The best answer is found in the verse that immediately follows, read in the light of Gal. iii. 13:

“I am crucified with Christ Who loved me, and gave Himself for me” (Gal. ii. 20).

“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. iii. 13).

In some wonderful way Paul realized that the law had been honoured, its curse endured and removed, and that though he personally had been mute and helpless, while the Son of God undertook his complete redemption, yet in the marvelous provision of grace, when Christ died the just for the unjust, he, Paul, had been reckoned to have died too. This matter is so vital, so near the heart of the gospel, so closely related to the whole scheme of redeeming love, that we cannot feel that the closing paragraphs of an article are the proper place for its discussion. We will carry this introductory part of Paul’s argument with us when we resume our studies in the next number of this series.

The preceding article “Emmanuel God with us” (*Emmanuel38, pages 24, 25*) was written some years after this present series, and without conscious pre-arrangement takes up this important subject “reckoning”, which we commend to the quickened understanding of the reader.

No.56. GALATIANS.
The Cross, Life and Law (ii. 19, 20).
pp. 29 - 32

We have considered the first part of Paul's argument with Peter upon the defection of the latter at Antioch, and reach the point where Paul gives his own personal testimony to clinch the matter and place it beyond dispute.

"I through law, to law, died, that I might live unto God" (Gal. ii. 19).

How Paul died both "through" law and "to" law is not stated in so many words, but the subject is most evidently continued and expanded in the subsequent verse, which we now proceed to examine.

"I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, Who loved me, and gave Himself for me" (Gal. ii. 20).

In the first place, let us attempt a more literal translation of this passage in order that we may build on a good foundation. The apostle is most evidently moved by the solemnity of his subject when he penned these words, for he throws them into a form, named *Epanadiplosis* or Encircling, thereby giving completeness to the statement, and suggesting by the opening and closing members of the circle the most important feature. This is how the passage appears to the Greek reader:

"CHRIST, I have been crucified-together-with, yet I live: and yet it is no longer I that live, but, in me, CHRIST."

In the next place we must draw attention to the verb "to be crucified with". In the A.V. it is cast in the present tense "I am crucified with Christ", whereas the original uses the perfect tense "I have been crucified with Christ".

There are three primary modes of indicating time—present, past, and future—and any action can only be regarded as having happened in one or the other of these three modes. Moreover every action may be (1) finished or perfect, (2) going on, or unfinished and imperfect, and (3) indefinite.

The verb *sunestauromai* is in the perfect or finished tense, and should be translated "I have been crucified with". The thing has been done, gloriously, blessedly, finished, and the perfect or finished tense together with the *Epanadiplosis* of the title "Christ" is no small part of the apostle's conclusive argument.

Alford punctuates the passage thus:

"I have been crucified with Christ but it is no longer I that live but (it is) Christ that liveth in me" and comments that the punctuation as in the A.V. "is altogether wrong".

Gwynne's comment here, however, is salutary:

"In sense varying immaterially from the received construction, it presents a pleasing parallelism to the ear, but dearly purchased at the expense of the old familiar paradox 'I am crucified with Christ nevertheless I live' which bears so unmistakeably the impress of Pauline antithesis, see II Cor. viii.-x." And of Alford's pronouncement he adds: "It requires something more than mere assertion to sustain the allegation."

The R.V. adopts the following punctuation in the text: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me", and in the margin gives the alternative "Or, and is no longer I that live, but Christ, &c."

The reader will see that whatever punctuation is adopted, the sense remains practically the same, and we therefore, while taking note of these variations, shall continue to use the A.V.

Stauroo "to crucify" is used in Galatians three times (iii. 1; v. 24; vi. 14), once of Christ, Who, said the apostle, had been evidently set forth crucified among them, and twice of the believer, of whom he says that they have crucified the flesh, and to whom the world was crucified. Three times, the cross itself, *stauros*, is mentioned (v. 11; vi. 12, 14); speaking of "the offence" and "persecution" which attached to it, and the only ground of "boasting" which Paul left to him.

Sustauroo "to crucify with" occurs in Gal. ii. 20 and in Rom. vi. 6, elsewhere only in the Gospels, Matt. xxvii. 44, Mark xv. 32 and John xix. 32. We shall gain light on Paul's reference in Gal. ii. 20 by considering the teaching both of Rom. vi. and of the Gospels.

Rom. vi. and vii. contain many expression and follow much the same argument as is compressed into Gal. ii. 15-20. In Rom. vi. it is the "old man" that was crucified with Christ, so that the body of sin should be rendered inoperative, and that henceforth the believer should not serve sin. These words illuminate the language of Gal. ii. 20, "I have been crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live".

Moreover, Paul had said "I through the law, to law died", and in Rom. vi. 7 he writes: "For he that is dead is freed from sin", and it is the recognition of an important piece of doctrine to note that the word "freed" is *dedikaiotai* "hath been justified". Death has vindicated the law and settled its claims. The references to *sustauroo* in the Gospels relate to the thieves who were crucified with Christ on Calvary.

"The thieves also, which were crucified with Him, cast the same in His teeth" (Matt. xxvii. 44).

"And they that were crucified with Him reviled Him" (Mark xv. 32).

"Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with Him" (John xix. 32).

Luke does not use the word, although he records the fact that there were malefactors "one on the right hand, and the other on the left" (Luke xxiii. 33). Luke's contribution

however is of far deeper import than merely to record the literal physical fact of crucifixion, he enables us to hear the confession of one of those thus “crucified with” Christ:

“Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly: for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss” (Luke xxiii. 40, 41).

These words let light in upon the doctrinal intention in the words “crucify with” as used by Paul. Paul as much as said, I too, like that malefactor recognize two facts: (1) that I was condemned by the law, and merited death; this curse of a broken law is set forth under the Hebrew judgment of “hanging on a tree” (Gal. iii. 13); (2) I also recognize that Christ had done “nothing amiss”, that He was indeed without sin and perfectly righteous. Consequently I saw with rapturous faith that “the Son of God had loved me, and given Himself for me”. I realized that He had not only died “for” me as my Substitute, but that by the gracious reckoning of God, I can now be looked upon as having died in my Substitute, that I can indeed take to myself in a sense unknown before the words “crucify with”, and have passed for ever out of the dominion both of sin and law, to find my life in Christ Who died for me. “So far as I now live in the flesh, it is a life of faith” (Lightfoot). The “now” is not used here to indicate a contrast with present life on earth, and future life in glory, but rather a contrast between the old life, the old man, the *ego* of Rom. vii. 14, and the newness of life, the new man, the *ego* of Rom. vii. 25 (see also Rom. vi. 4).

All now depends upon the Son of God. The faith of the Son of God refers to His faithfulness, not merely the believer’s faith in Him. Faith “in Christ, must be distinguished from the faith “of” Christ, the one refers to the believer’s exercise of faith in the person and work of the Saviour, the other refers to the faithfulness unto death and beyond that is the sure anchor of all our hopes. This matter is of sufficient importance to demand our most earnest attention.

“The faith of Christ.” The usual interpretation makes the faith of Jesus Christ nothing more than the believer’s faith in Him. That something is wrong with such an interpretation is manifest the moment we attempt to introduce it into the Scriptures. For example who would tolerate such a rendering of Rom. iii. 21, 22 that read:

“The righteousness of God has been manifested through the believer’s faith in Jesus Christ”?

Both in Rom. iii. 22 and 26 this aspect of faith is found. The second reference hides it under the translation “him which believeth in Jesus”. The near context provides a proof of the translation suggested, for in Rom. iv. 12 “the faith of our father Abraham” can by no stretch of imagination mean the believer’s faith in Abraham.

The word translated “faith” in these passages is *pistis*. In the LXX of Hab. ii. 4 “the just shall live by faith” the Greek word *pistis* is used to translate the Hebrew *emunah*. This Hebrew word and its cognate *amanah* often mean “faithfulness” as for example:

“His righteousness and His *faithfulness*” (I Sam. xxvi. 23).
“The men did the work *faithfully*” (II Chron. xxxiv. 12).
“All His works are done in *truth*” (Psa. xxxiii. 4).

The “*faith* of God” (Rom. iii. 3) is practically synonymous with “the *truth* of God” (iii. 7) and shows that Paul retained the Hebrew meaning of the word. In Gal. iii. 22 we have the two expressions used together:

“In order that the promise out of the faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”

The context speaks of another possible source, *ek nomon* “out of law” (Gal. iii. 21). But righteousness cannot arise “out of law”, it can only arise “out of the faith of Jesus Christ”. His faith and faithfulness, not my belief in Him, is the one great foundation of the gift of righteousness.

So in Gal. ii. 20, the apostle’s new life as well as the free justification he had received, originated and was sustained by the faith and faithfulness of his Substitute and Surety, or as he so feelingly puts it “The Son of God, Who loved me and gave Himself for me”.

“Nevertheless I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me.”

Paul who could say “I have been crucified with Christ” could nevertheless affirm that he lived. The words “Yet not I” refer not to Paul absolutely in himself, or to Paul relatively as distinct from others, but to Paul naturally, the old man, the descendant of Adam, the breaker of law. He still had to live “in the flesh” though he no longer was under any obligation to walk after the flesh.

Sarx “flesh” has a variety of meanings, each of which must be decided by the context. “Flesh and blood” (Gal. i. 16) is repudiated, “no flesh shall be justified” (ii. 16) gathers up into itself all human nature, “Are ye now made perfect by the flesh” (iii. 3), refers to the activities of a carnal chimerical religion; “infirmity of the flesh” (iv. 13) makes reference to the mortal nature of the apostle. Here, in Gal. ii. 20 “the life which I now live in the flesh” does not stress mortality, carnal religion or mere human nature, it is a way of indicating the present, transitory life, lived here under similar conditions and limitations as before, but now activated by a new power “Christ liveth in me”. “I live by the faith of the Son of God.”

No.57. GALATIANS.
Structure and Argument of the Section (ii. 21 - iii. 7).
pp. 67 - 69

The structure of the epistle to the Galatians reveals a large member covering ii. 15 - iv. 12, of which the present smaller section ii. 21 - iii. 7 now falls to be examined.

In the structure of ii. 15 - iv. 12 this section is found to be in correspondence with another, and this we will lift out and display here:

B	ii. 21 - iii. 7.		d	<i>Atheteo.</i> Frustrate.
			e	<i>Ei gar.</i> For if righteousness come by law.
			*	*
			*	*
			*	*
			*	*
B	iii. 15-21.		d	<i>Atheteo.</i> Disannul.
			e	<i>Ei gar.</i> For if law could give life.

While the second member iii. 15-21 must be considered together with its context in the orderly exposition of the epistle, it is important to observe this recurring note. The apostle is keenly aware of the objections that would be made against the free salvation which he preached and taught, objections that found an expression in the accusation against Stephen (Acts vi. 13, 14), and later were to be laid to the apostle's account also (Acts xxi. 21). Neither the grace of God, nor the promise of God can be frustrated or disannulled, neither can the law provide righteousness nor life. Let us therefore with these points or correspondence in mind return to the section ii. 21 - iii. 7 to acquaint ourselves more intimately with its teaching. Before we attempt any detailed examination of this section, let us note the structural outline.

A	ii. 21. Righteousness not by law.		a	Frustrate.
			b	Grace.
			b	Righteousness.
			a	In Vain.
B	iii. 1-5.		c1	y Foolish.
				z Received ye the spirit.
			d1	By works of law.
				e1 Or by hearing of faith.
			c	Foolish.
			d	Begun in spirit.
				e Perfected in flesh.
			c2	y In vain.
				z Ministry of the spirit.
			d2	By works of law.
				e2 Or by hearing of faith.
A	iii. 6, 7. Righteousness comes by faith.		a	Abraham.
			b	Righteousness.
			b	Children.
			a	Abraham.

“I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain” (Gal. ii. 21).

The word translated “frustrated” *atheteo*, is composed of *a* the negative, and *thetos* “placed” from *tithemi* “to place”. In a mild form this word is used in the sense of “despising” or “rejecting” *persons* (Matt. vi. 24; Luke x. 16; John xii. 48; I Thess. iv. 8; Jude 8), the fuller sense of nullify, abolish or abrogate is seen in the noun form *athetesis* (Heb. vii. 18; ix. 26), where it is used of the abrogation of the law and of the sin offering. In both instances, something else that takes its place is in view. In Heb. vii. it is the oath that appointed Christ a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not the carnal commandment that appointed the priests after the order of Aaron, and in the ninth chapter it is the abrogation of the sin offering by reason of the once offered sacrifice of Christ. In Gal. ii. 21 the sense is to nullify, bring to nothing (I Cor. i. 19) the grace of God.

What is here intended by the expression “the grace of God”? Reading the entire verse we observe that the *death of Christ* is substituted for the grace of God. The evil which the apostle here condemned “frustrated” *the grace of God*, and proved that *the death of Christ* was “in vain”.

There is what is known as “a suppressed premise” in this verse, which can be supplied as follows:

“I do not nullify the grace of God, *which I should do, did I attempt to justify myself by legal works*, for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ died in vain.”

“In vain” is not a good rendering of *dorean*, for to say that Christ died “in vain” really intimates that his death was “ineffectual”, whereas the intention of the apostle is to give the impression that Christ would have died “unnecessarily”.

“I say *ouk atheto*, for it is an immediate inference, that if the law had been the medium of *dikaiousune*, Christ’s death would have been purposeless” (Ellicott).

Dorean “in vain” is from *dorea* a gift as in Rom. v. 15. In the adverbial form, the form in which it is used in Gal. ii. 21, it means (1) in a good sense, “freely”, “gratis”, as in Rom. iii. 24 and (2) in a bad sense “undeservedly”, “without cause”, “gratuitously”, as in John xv. 25.

Calvin’s comment on this passage is worth recording:

“If we could produce a righteousness of our own, then Christ hath suffered in vain; for the intention of His sufferings was to procure it for us; and what need was there that a work which we could accomplish for ourselves should be obtained from another? If the death of Christ be our redemption, then were we captives—if it be satisfaction, we were debtors—if it be atonement, we were guilty—if it be cleansing, we were unclean. On the other hand, he who ascribes to works his sanctification, pardon, atonement, righteousness or deliverance, makes void the death of Christ.”

To which quotation we might add that of Theodoret who said:

“The death of Christ was *superfluous*, if the law is *sufficient* for justification.”

The argument which has been put forward in the first person now ceases, and the apostle addresses the Galatians direct. Notice this use of the pronoun “I” in verses 19-21.

“Thus St. Paul courteously uses the first person *I* instead of the second *thou*, and with that delicate refinement and consummate skill of which he is master, leaves St. Peter to adopt his words and apply them to himself” (Wordsworth).

With the opening of the third chapter the apostle addresses himself to the main purpose of his epistle. Up till now, he has not *directly* established the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, but has devoted his attention to the vindication of his apostleship and the authority and nature of his gospel. The way is now cleared for the definite enunciation of the gospel way of righteousness which this epistle was written to show, and with the preparation provided by these studies as a background we hope to take up the main argument of this epistle in our next article.

No.58. (16) GALATIANS.

Galatians ii. 21 - iii. 7.

“Jesus Christ . . . crucified” (iii. 1).

pp. 92 - 95

With the closing verse of Gal. ii., the apostle leaves behind the personal approach to his great theme, and addresses himself to proof. He had vindicated his apostleship, he had shown that those who seemed to be pillars at Jerusalem were compelled to admit his claims and endorse the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, he shows that Peter was in the wrong when he acted as he did at Antioch under pressure of the Circumcision, and had concluded by giving his own personal testimony.

With the opening of Gal. iii. “he enters upon a course of reasoning as close, as logical, and as conclusive as is to be met with in the works of the most metaphysical of modern writers” (Gwynne). “O foolish Galatians.” To address the inhabitants of Phrygia and Iconium as “Galatians” is to take the Roman point of view. “The very fact that only Romans or person speaking decidedly and pointedly from the Roman point of view employed the name in that sense the ‘men of the Province of Galatia’ are, therefore, those who desire education, who have shaken off the numbing and degrading influence of magic and superstition who lay claim to insight and *noesis*. There is a telling innuendo in the juxtaposition *anoetoi Galatia*, ‘you who are showing yourselves devoid of *noesis*’ ‘Galatae who fail the first characteristic of Galatae’.” (Ramsay).

This suggestion is put into plain language in Gal. iv. 9-11, which the structure places in correspondence with the argument of Gal. ii. 15-20. Did the apostle open his argument with these believers who were so dear to him, with the somewhat rude and

brutal word “stupid”? “Even could it be proved that the Galatians were a stupid people, insult we cannot imagine to have been intended by the apostle” (Bloomfield). There are at least four ways of calling a person a “fool” in N.T. Greek, and each one has its own significance. Had Paul wished to be rude he could have called these beloved saints of God “morons” (Matt. v. 22), a word that has passed into our own vocabulary. He could have called them “senseless” and used the word *aphron* as he did in I Cor. xv. 36. He could have implied that they were lacking in wisdom and used *asophos* as in Eph. v. 15, but he uses none of these terms. He chose the same epithet that was employed by the Saviour in Luke xxiv. 25 when it was evident that “their understanding” needed to be opened (Luke xxiv. 45).

Anoetos the word used in Gal. iii. 1 means “thoughtless”, being made up of *a* the negative and *noeo* “to understand” (Eph. iii. 4); “to perceive” (Mark viii. 17) and “consider” (II Tim. ii. 7); which in turn is derived from *nous* “the mind” (I Cor. ii. 16); and “understanding” (Luke xxiv. 45).

Dr. Bullinger in his Lexicon explains *anoetos* as “unreflecting, never applying the *nous* (mind) to moral or religious truth” which is similar to Ellicott’s remark “it seems to mark, not so much dullness in, as a deficiency in, or rather insufficient application of, the *nous*”.

The argument of Gal. iii. 2-7 is an intense “application of the *nous*”. It is a deadly and a deadening thing to allow a false deduction from the necessarily evil character of mere human “reasoning” to lead to the assumption that faith is irrational or blind, or that there can possibly exist any divergence between true “reason” and living “faith”. Anything that is demonstrably not “right” can form no part of the creed of a moral creature, this turns the noble word “faith” into the base word “credulity” and belongs not to the free but to the enslaved.

Had the Galatians, who had been justified, and who had been set free by grace, but applied their emancipated minds to the Judaistic proposals that had caused such havoc, all might have been well. As it turned out, their lapse has been overruled to provide this great polemic and apology “The Epistle to the Galatians”. The apostle, in measure, explains the idea he had when he used the word “thoughtless”—for he continues “who hath bewitched you?” and by so saying shifts the blame somewhat from the Galatians themselves to those emissaries of Satan, who, appearing as they may as angels of light and ministers of righteousness, stultify the truth by preaching “another Jesus”, “another gospel” and “another spirit” (II Cor. xi.).

“To bewitch” *baskaino* becomes in its Latin form the word “fascinate” and had special reference to the bewitching power of the “evil eye”, a spell which was supposed, among other evils, to check the growth of children—a feature that the Galatians would be quick to perceive.

The LXX translators use the word always in the sense of the “evil eye” as may be seen by consulting Deut. xxviii. 54, 56; Prov. xxiii. 6 and xxviii. 22. There is resident also

in the word the idea that “envy” is the moving cause of this bewitchment. These Galatians had been “fascinated”—and a philosopher can be quoted as saying that fascination is “evil by the eye” a thought that is suggestive as we read the next statement of Gal. iii. “Before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you” (Gal. iii. 1). The Revised text omits the words “that ye should not obey the truth” which appear to have been interpolated from chapter v. 7.

Paul’s preaching of “Jesus Christ and Him crucified” must have been vivid, as we can well believe. He uses a figure borrowed from the hustings, for the words “evidently set forth”, *prographo*, refer to the exhibition of placards which modern though it may sound, was a practice in common use at the time of the apostle.

Prographo when used in its primary sense “to write beforehand” occurs in Rom. xv. 4 and Eph. iii. 3. In Jude 4, it indicates rather a notice of trial or condemnation, but when writing to the Galatians, Paul uses the word, as he does the word *diatheke* “covenant” in Gal. iii. 15, “after the manner of men”, and the Galatians would know the practice that was common in their day, of using placards for making public notices and proclamations. There may also be a glance at the practice of both heathen and Jew to resort to amulets and phylacteries as charms to avoid the evil eye, and concerning this Wordsworth has the following comment:

“O foolish Galatians—foolish as *children*—who was it that *bewitched you* with his evil eye of jealousy? who envied you the liberty of Christ, and desired to spoil you of it? Who beguiled you, my children (Gal. iv. 19), whom I was rearing up as a father, unto men in Christ? Who beguiled you back into Judaism, with its rites and ceremonies and external observances? Your false teachers who so deal with you, would have written and bound before your eyes the scrolls of the Law; they would have laid upon you its outward fringes and phylacteries, and thus have entangled you to bondage. Who *envied* you the liberty of the Gospel, which I your apostle, preached to you? Who bewitched you, *before* whose eyes was written and bound by me, as *your true scriptural scroll*, your frontlet of Faith, your *Scriptural Phylactery*, CHRIST CRUCIFIED; and whom I had thus guarded, as I thought, against all the envious fascination of your spiritual enemies?”

The words “among you” are omitted by the Revised texts, though some commentators still reckon that they should be retained. If they are, it is important to remember that they must be construed as a “regular local predicate appended to *proegraphie*” (Ellicott) and must not be understood as referring to the word “crucified”. The order of the words in the original adds greatly to the pathos and emphasis, “written before, in you, crucified”. The words “in you” moreover must be understood as a reflection of the truth expressed in Gal. ii. 20 “Christ liveth *in me*”, and as here, that the last word of the sentence—for emphasis sake—is the word “crucified”.

The extreme importance that the apostle attached to the Cross of Christ, is most evident from these two references (Gal. ii. 20 and iii. 1), and it would be profitable and illuminating to pause, while we considered all that has been said of this most wondrous theme—yet, it seems better to let the apostle pursue his own argument in his own way. We shall find him introducing the Cross early in the argument (iii. 13) and with great point. Consequently with the atmosphere created by the consideration of Gal. iii. 1, all

is ready for the argument which develops with the opening words of Gal. iii. 2 “This only would I learn of you”, which must be the subject of our next article.

No.59. (17) GALATIANS.
Galatians ii. 21 - iii. 7.
“Spirit” v. “Flesh”.
pp. 113 - 116

The apostle having quickened the interest of the Galatians by the various ways in which he has already approached the main issue before them, now begins to show to them the folly of their actions and the evil they had permitted, by a series of closely reasoned arguments. As we said earlier, there are some who would ban all “reasoning” as evil, but such would have to ban the apostle himself, and incidentally ban their own “arguments” that “reasoning” is evil. It is discoverable upon the surface of the Scriptures that Paul often “reasoned” with his hearers, for the reader of the A.V. can find four such statements in the Acts of the Apostles, there are, however, nine such passages, some hidden from the English reader under the translation “preach”, as though the translators themselves wished that Paul had not used logic so freely. Let us see this series of references, for if Paul be our pattern, then to hide, or disguise any one of his accredited methods cannot be tolerated.

Dialegomai

“And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days *reasoned* with them out of the Scriptures” (Acts xvii. 2).

“Therefore disputed (*reasoned*) he in the synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him” (Acts xvii. 17).

“And he *reasoned* in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks” (Acts xviii. 4).

“He himself entered into the synagogue, and *reasoned* with the Jews” (Acts xviii. 19).

“And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing (*reasoning*) and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God” (Acts xix. 8).

“He separated the disciples, disputing (*reasoning*) daily in the school of one Tyrannus” (Acts xix. 9).

“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached (*reasoned*) and continued his speech until midnight and as Paul was long preaching (*reasoning*),” (Acts xx. 7, 9).

“And as he *reasoned* of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled” (Acts xxiv. 25).

It will be remembered from these passages that Paul’s method persisted even though circumstances changed. The first set of references are confined to the synagogue, and we might at first sight have felt that “reasoning” was perhaps a limitation under which the apostle laboured. But upon separating the believers from the synagogue, the apostle “disputed daily” in the school of one Tyrannus—consequently, the change of ground did

not call for a change of method. At Troas where the disciples assembled together to break bread, and where the company presumably was mostly made up of believers, Paul occupied a “long time reasoning”, and finally, when dealing with an individual sinner needing salvation, Paul, the one who said of himself “woe is me if I preach not the gospel”, “reasoned” with Felix concerning righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.

Instead, therefore, of banning the exercise of reason in the ministry of the Word, we have every “reason” to see that its exercise and use is commended and blessed. The apostle therefore, when he commenced to “reason” the matter of justification by works of law, as over against justification by faith, adopted the best procedure that he knew, and we who follow at a distance would do well to keep his method before us.

“This only would I learn of you” (Gal. iii. 2). He teaches them for the moment nothing. He adopts what has been called the Socratic method of argument, namely, the enforcement of the truth by the asking of questions. Paul is the one who would “learn”—the Galatians are the ones who are to teach him!

Every argument, however it be pursued, consists of two parts (1) that which is proved and (2) the means by which it is proved. The “means” varies from the strictly syllogistic and formal, to the inductive and the appeal to common sense, experience and authority. We shall not expect to find in the epistle to the Galatians, the argument proceeding step by step from one proved syllogism to another, the apostle uses a variety of means to the one end. Let us follow therefore the inspired penman as he endeavours by the grace of God, to overthrow the false teaching that had descended like a blight and a bewitchment upon the churches of Galatia, and let us observe the varying means he adopt to bring them back to the only ground of their acceptance before God.

“Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of the faith?”
(Gal. iii. 2).

This is the first reference to “The Spirit” in Galatians, but it is evidently of such importance that the apostle was willing to base his whole argument upon its reception and continuance. “This ONLY would I learn of you.” Omitting the two passages where “the spirit of meekness” (Gal. vi. 1) and “your spirit” (Gal. vi. 18) refer to the spirit in a different sense than that intended in Gal. iii. 2, we observe that in this epistle there are fourteen occurrences of *pneuma*, in chapters iii.-v. of which seven passages use the word with the article *to pneuma*, “The Spirit”, and seven use the word without the article, even though in every case the A.V. inserts the article for the sake of the English reader. Let us set out these two sets of references, observing particularly any allusions in the context to the controversy that prompted the writing of the epistle.

To *Pneuma*. “THE SPIRIT.” (The Seven Occurrences).

- (1) “Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?” (Gal. iii. 2).
- (2) “He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?” (Gal. iii. 5).

There is but one answer to this repeated question “NOT by works of the law BUT by the hearing of faith”.

- (3) “. . . . Redeemed from the curse of the law that the blessing of Abraham might come on to the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith” (Gal. iii. 13, 14).

Again the only answer must be “faith”; not “works of law” see verses 10-13.

- (4) “. . . . Redeemed them that were under the law because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts; crying, Abba, Father” (Gal. iv. 5, 6).

The context shows that by redemption that status of “servant” has been removed, and the glorious position of “son” given, with the cry “How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” (Gal. iv. 7-11).

- (5, 6) “The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other” (Gal. v. 17).

These, said the apostle, are “contrary” *antikeitai* the one to the other, and we must remember in all our studies that the apostle has placed “flesh” and “spirit” in two contrary categories, so that it is impossible to be in both and one at the self same time.

- (7) “The fruit of the Spirit is love against such there is no law” (Gal. v. 22, 23).

This “fruit” is in direct contrast with the “works of the flesh” (v. 19-21) with the sequel such “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” and therefore a parallel with the sequel here “against such there is no law”.

***Pneuma.* “SPIRIT.”** (The Seven Occurrences).

- (1) “Are ye so foolish? having begun in Spirit, are ye now made perfect in flesh?” (Gal. iii. 3).

We have learned from the preceding set of references that “spirit” and “flesh” are contrary one to the other, so that there can be but one answer to this question.

- (2) “But as then he that was born according to flesh, persecuted him that was born according to Spirit, even so is it now” (Gal. iv. 29).

This as we know is a part of the allegory that the apostle built upon the record of the two sons of Abraham, the son of the bond maid and the son of the free; Mount Sinai with its bondage, and Jerusalem that is above, with its freedom. We have given a more literal rendering of these occurrences than is found in the A.V.

- (3) “Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we *in* Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith” (Gal. v. 4, 5).
(4) “Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of flesh” (Gal. v. 16).
(5) “If in Spirit, ye are led, ye are not under law” (Gal. v. 18).
(6, 7) “If we live in Spirit, in Spirit also we should walk” (Gal. v. 25).

We have grouped these passages together as they all insist upon a logical and manifest outworking of the truth, maintained by the apostle, in the daily life and walk.

Although these words found in later chapters of the epistle were not *written* when the apostle asked the question in Gal. iii. 2, this doctrine was already known and was in his mind and teaching. It is clear, before we examine the subject in full detail, that there

could be no compromise. “That which *hath been* born of the flesh *is* flesh, and that which *hath been* born of the spirit *is* spirit”, was the utterance of the Lord as recorded by John, was endorsed by the apostle, and is true to-day in the dispensation of the Mystery.

With this preparation we must for the moment stop, but we shall be the better able to appreciate the argument of Gal. iii., since we have seen what “works of law”, “hearing of faith”, “flesh” and “spirit”, mean in the doctrinal language of the apostle.

No.60. (18) GALATIANS.

Galatians ii. 21 - iii. 7.

The Argument from the ministry of the Spirit (iii. 2 - 5). pp. 134 - 136

We have considered the way in which the apostle refers to the “Spirit” in Galatians, and have discovered that it is placed in direct contrast with the works both of the flesh and of the law.

So the Apostle continues in Gal. iii.:

“Are ye so thoughtless? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” (Gal. iii. 3).

The same two verbs occur together in another epistle:

“Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun (*enarchomai*) a good work in you will perform (*epiteleo*) it until the day of Jesus Christ” (Phil. i. 6).

Paul was “confident” that if anything had been “begun” by God, by God it would be “perfected”, and the Galatians were “thoughtless” not to have the same conviction.

Incidentally, should the reader have been troubled by an interpretation put forward to teach that Paul in Phil. i. 6 meant by “perfecting” a bringing to an end so that, for the time being the particular work should discontinue while something else was put into its place, he now has the corrective in the identical combination in Gal. iii. 3, and should set the interpretation referred to aside.

A passage almost parallel with Gal. iii. 3 is that of II Cor. viii. 6, where the word “begun” is *proenarchomai* “to begin before”, while the word “finish” is *epiteleo* the same as in Gal. iii. 3 and Phil. i. 6.

It is not only unreasonable to think that Paul desired Titus to *discontinue* or bring to an end the offering of the Corinthian Church, it is contrary to the truth, for in verse eleven he uses *epiteleo* again saying “now therefore *perform* the doing of it so that there may be a *performance*”. The Galatians had “begun in Spirit” and it was illogical to think of

being brought to the full end in any other sphere or by any other agency. To allow “works of the law and the flesh” to intrude at the goal, when they were repudiated as valueless at the commencement was neither of faith or reason. To bring the Galatians to a fuller sense of their irrational behaviour, the apostle appeals to their past experiences, even as he appeals later in the epistle to his own.

“Have ye suffered so many things in vain? If it be yet in vain” (Gal. iii. 4).

At the time of the conversion of the Galatians, suffering normally followed the reception of the gospel, and so the apostle turned aside for a moment to ask, “was all that endured in vain?” Yet it was hard for him to think so “if it be really in vain”, for *ei ge* leaves a loophole for doubt, and *kai* widens this, implying an unwillingness to believe this on the part of the speaker. Reverting to the Galatian defection when writing chapter four, the apostle speaks, not of their suffering “in vain”, but of his labours on their behalf.

“I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain” (Gal. iv. 11).

These persecutions had been endured mainly at the hand of Jews or Judaizers. What an extraordinary thing, said the apostle in effect, you suffered at the hands of the legalists when you were first saved by grace, and now you contemplate attaining the goal of faith by reverting to their questionable and obsolete practices!

In order that the force of his opening question should not be dulled by the subsequent development of his argument, the apostle reverts to it with the phrase *ho oun* “well then, as I said, etc.”

“He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?” (Gal. iii. 5).

The apostle had before him seven different words that are translated “to minister” in the N.T.; the one he chose here is *epichoregeo*. *Choregeo* meant originally “to lead a chorus”, in course of time it came to mean, especially in Athens, “the defraying of the cost of solemn public choruses”, and so, ultimately to “furnishing” and “supplying” generally. This defraying of the expenses of the Greek Chorus was usually undertaken by a wealthy citizen who found the members, furnished instructions, musicians, and the dresses. The intensive form used by the apostle, *epichoregeo*, adds the thought of completeness to the provision, and so of itself emphasized the folly of the Galatians in their attempt to mingle their own puny works of law with the grace that supplied so liberally and so completely.

The Galatians would discover that Peter himself rebukes their folly for, concerning the conversion of Cornelius, he said:

“God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe (c.f. “the preaching of faith” Gal. iii. 5).

“And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts

by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck (a “yoke of bondage” indeed, Gal. v. 1) of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they” (Acts xv. 7-11).

In addition to the opening reference to the “Spirit” (Gal. iii. 3), the apostle adds “and worketh miracles among you”. Now it is the testimony of Scripture that “John (the Baptist) did no miracle”, the signs and wonders, that accomplished the preaching of the gospel both during the Lord’s earthly ministry and that of the apostles at Pentecost and after, were definitely a confirmation of this last revelation of Divine grace (Heb. ii. 1-4; I Cor. i. 5, 6; Rom. xv. 19; II Cor. xii. 12), but are never associated in the N.T. record with the law of Moses, its works and its ceremonial. One of the most formidable obstacles to the full reception of the gospel of the grace of God, was the age-long tradition that made Moses and the law he gave, eternal. The Jews who were guilty of breaking the commandment every day, were nevertheless opposing the gospel by enthroning the very law that condemned them.

Paul now moves to his great argument, the age-lasting nature of the promises made to Abraham, as over against the limited character of the covenant of works. The promises are “by faith” and therefore sure, the Old Covenant rested on “works” and was rendered “weak because of the flesh” (Rom. viii. 3). Together with this contrast between Abraham and Moses, the apostle introduces another feature. Abraham’s “seed” is not limited to physical descent, it includes those who walk by faith. To enforce this new line of argument the apostle appeals to the Scriptural record of the justifying of Abraham, shows the impossibility of attaining righteousness by works of the law, turns to the Galatian law that governed the making of a will and the appointing of the heir to enforce the claims of the promise made to Abraham, and concludes with the glorious doctrine of “adoption”. This left them no longer “servants” but “sons” and consequent “heirs” of God through Christ with complete exemption from law, its “tutors and governors”.

No.61. (19) GALATIANS.

Galatians ii. 21 - iii. 7.

The realm of faith (iii. 6, 7).

pp. 150 - 152

The apostle Paul had no scruples about using figures borrowed from the race course, the theatre, the pugilistic ring, or the throwing of dice (I Cor. ix. 24-26; iv. 9; ix. 27; Eph. iv. 14) and we are sure that he would appreciate the figure that comes to our mind when we speak of the introduction of "Abraham" into the argument both in Galatians and in Romans, as the apostle's "trump card". In each of these epistles the name of Abraham occurs nine times, and every reference is a definite part of a consecutive argument. Let us note these references in Galatians before proceeding.

- (1) *Justification is by faith.* "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness" (Gal. iii. 6).
- (2) *Children be faith.* "That they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 7).
- (3) *The Gospel and faith.* "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed" (Gal. iii. 8).
- (4) *Blessing by faith.* "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" (Gal. iii. 9).

The apostle now reveals the fact that any attempt to be justified by works of the law is virtually putting oneself under a curse. Yet in accomplishing redemption, Christ became a curse for us, with this object.

- (5) *Promise through faith.* "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. iii. 14).
- (6) *Promises made to the Seed, which is Christ.* "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ" (Gal. iii. 16).
- (7) *Inheritance by promise.* "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise" (Gal. iii. 18).
- (8) *Christ's are Abraham's seed.* "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii. 29).

After an interval in which the figure of adoption is introduced, and the retrograde movement of the Galatians placed on all fours with a turning back to paganism, the last reference to Abraham is made in which the two children, one of the free woman and one of the bondmaid are used as an allegory.

- (9) "It is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman mount Sinai bondage, Jerusalem, which is above is free" (Gal. iv. 22-26).

These references fall into three groups, each group having one dominating word. The first four references are under the heading of “faith”, the next three deal with “promise”, the last two with “Seed” or “Son”. It would occupy too much space, to go through the nine references to Abraham found in Romans, but we are sure that the reader would gain further and fuller light if this were undertaken. We must now return to Gal. iii., where the apostle introduced Abraham and associates with him the glorious doctrine of justification.

The point of the apostle’s argument concerning justification by faith may be more keenly felt if we remember that the Jews’ tenet concerning the Law as contained in the Talmud and Rabbinical writings descends from:

“The six hundred and thirteen precepts of the law as collected by Moses Maimonedes reduced by David to eleven in Psa. xv.; further brought within the compass of six by Isaiah (Isa. xxxiii. 15); further reduced to three by Micah (Mic. vi. 8), and again to two by Isaiah (Isa. lxi. 1), to one by Amos (Amos v. 4), and crystallized by Habbakuk in the words “the Just by his faith shall live.”

“Thus”, says Dr. Lightfoot—“the Jews witness against themselves, while they conclude that faith is the sum of the law, and yet they stand altogether upon works:—a testimony from Jews exceedingly remarkable.”

This confusion of faith and works accounts for the saying of the Jews concerning Abraham, “Abraham performed all the law, every whit”.

“Even as.” The answer to the question already propounded is assumed, Lightfoot puts it “surely of faith; and so it was with Abraham”. As we have seen, there are four links with Abraham in verses 6-9, and each the word “faith”. First of all, and fundamental to all, is the question of justification. This is the issue before the apostle, before the Galatians, before the church to-day and will be before all men at the last.

In the Garden of Eden, two coverings symbolize the two methods that were then adopted and will always be adopted until the end of time, the one a covering of *leaves*, the other a covering of *skins*, the former a fit symbol of the fading covering of human provision, the latter resulting from sacrifice and provided by God. Outside the garden of Eden, these two ways are again set before us in the two offerings, the one of Cain, like the apron of leaves being rejected, the other by Abel, like the coats of skin being accepted and for this same reason. The apostle here brings this twofold aspect of righteousness up to date. The Judaizers with their “works of law” were treading the way of Cain, the only alternative being the way of Abel. While the cases of Adam and Abel are Scriptural, the apostle knew how proudly these Judaizers clung to the thought that they were the “children of Abraham”. In Rom. iv. 9-11 he demolished this claim by showing that at the time that Abraham was justified he was *uncircumcised*; here, he attacks the same exclusivism by showing that Abraham’s justification, as also the privilege of being Abraham’s children, is “by faith”.

The precise doctrine of justification by faith and the doctrinal meaning of the term “faith imputed for righteousness” is not so much the apostle’s immediate concern as to

prove his point that these Galatian believers had “begun” in the realm of faith, whether he uses the ministering to them of the “Spirit” or whether he dwells upon the place that faith occupies in evangelical justification is all one. He is eliciting from them the answer to his question “the hearing of faith”; he is forcing them to perceive that any claim upon Abraham and the clinging to works of law were mutually destructive, for if they were really children of Abraham, they must be children of faith.

“Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same (‘these’ emphatic ‘these and these only’, see Rom. viii. 14) are the children of Abraham” (Gal. iii. 7).

Among the services rendered to the truth by the R.V. is the observance of the two words translated “children” and “son”. In many passages the A.V. has rendered the word *huios* by the word “child”, and has rendered the word *teknon* by the word “son”. In practically every case the R.V. consistently reads “son” for *huios*, except in the phrase “the children of Israel”, which it was found impossible to change owing to the power of its long associations.

“There is the position of ‘sonship’ (characteristic of the teaching of St. Paul), which suggests the thoughts of privilege, of inheritance, of dignity; and there is also the position of ‘childship’ (characteristic of the teaching of St. John), which suggests the thought of community of nature, of dependence, of tender relationship. Sons may be adopted; children can only be born” (Some lessons of the R.V. of the N.T. by Bishop Westcott).

The sequel Gal. iii. 15 - iv. 12 with its insistence upon the “adoption” demands the recognition here in Gal. iii. 7 that the apostle intentionally used *huios* and not *teknon* “sons” (not “children”) thereby intensifying the correlated thoughts of dignity, inheritance, and liberty, each of which were endangered by the retrograde steps that the Galatians had taken.

“By faith” they had been justified. “By faith” they had become sons. No wonder the apostle should exclaim:

“O thoughtless Galatians who hath bewitched you?”

No.62. (20) GALATIANS.

Galatians iii. 8 - 12.

The appeal to the Scriptures (iii. 8).

pp. 186 - 189

Before proceeding to the exposition of Gal. iii. 8, which lies immediately before us, we must pause to note that we now pass into another section of the structure.

C | iii. 8-12. | f | The SCRIPTURE preached beforehand.
g | Justification by faith *ek pisteos*.
h | *Hupo* under a curse.

* * * * *

C | iii. 22, 23. | f | The SCRIPTURE concluded.
g | Promise by faith *ek pisteos*.
h | *Hupo* under sin, under law.

The introduction of Abraham in Gal. iii. 6 is also the first reference to the Scriptures in the epistle. Right through chapters one and two the apostle has followed the method so characteristic of him when dealing with a mixed company of Jews and Gentiles, namely an appeal to experience and present facts, knowing full well that there is no conflict between the ways of God as recorded in Holy Writ and the ways of God in the process of their unfolding, always allowing of course, for dispensational changes. When however the moment comes for the apostle to speak of the Scriptures, there is never any uncertainty in his reference to them or his belief that they are inspired, authentic and authoritative.

To the apostle the Scriptures were “holy” (Rom. i. 2) and “sacred: (II Tim. iii. 15); they are to be received as “the word of God” (I Thess. ii. 13). Then defining the simple foundation of the gospel he preached, the apostle relates the death and resurrection of the Saviour to “the Scriptures” (I Cor. xv. 3, 4), and over and over again the formula “it is written” provides a Scriptural basis for his teaching and arguments. There are at least thirty-seven occurrences of the phrase in the four epistles Romans, I and II Corinthians and Galatians to which must be added such allusions and quotations that are introduced by such words as “And again he saith again and again Esaias saith” (Rom. xv. 10-12). Then we find the apostle not only quoting, but seeing in the O.T. prophet a kindred spirit with himself, as for example in Rom. x.:

“First Moses saith but Esaias is very bold, and saith” (Rom. x. 19, 20).

When the apostle introduces the Scriptures into the argument he does so by using the somewhat remarkable words “the Scripture foreseeing”, this personifying of the Scriptures being very common among the Rabbinical writers who often use the formula “what saw the Scripture?” When the Scriptures as a whole are referred to, the word *graphe* is generally put in the plural *graphai*, but where some particular passage is

intended, we find the singular *graphe* used as in “another scripture” (John xix. 37); “this scripture” (Luke iv. 21). This rule does not apply when “the whole Scripture” is referred to as in II Tim. iii. 16.

In this passage, Gal. iii. 8, the Scripture is said to have done two things. “The Scripture foreseeing preached.” The one other occasion where *proeidon* “foresee” is used is Acts ii. 30, 31:

“Therefore being a prophet, and knowing *he seeing this before* spake of the resurrection of Christ.”

In this passage Peter reveals that the language used in Psa. xvi. was uttered by David as a prophet who saw beforehand what should come to pass. So, the utterances recorded in Gen. xii. 3 and xviii. 18, go further than the blessings associated with the setting up of Israel in the land of promise, they include the blessings of salvation during the gospel period that precedes that era.

While the controversy among the Galatian Christians necessitated some insistence upon the Gentile, as we have already seen in Gal. i. 16, ii. 2, 8, 12, 14, the word must not be unduly stressed in the quotation made from Gen. xii. 3 for the simple reason that when Abraham was called, *there were no Jews in existence*, the word *ethne* then referring to all the nations that were then occupying the surface of the earth.

We do not lose, we gain rather by remembering this all inclusiveness of the gospel—“all nations”, Gentiles as well as Jews, Jews as well as Gentiles, all were to be justified in one way only—“by faith”, no other way ever being conceived, and no other way ever open to man whether he be Jew or Gentile, since the dawn of history. Israel had many privileges and many advantages, but in this respect there has never been any difference, the whole human race including all its tribes and nations standing on an equality both in their need and in the provision of the gospel.

When the gospel was “preached before unto Abraham”, the Mystery was unknown. It is evident that any argument that does not differentiate between the gospel and the Mystery must be fallacious; any argument that does not distinguish between “doctrinal truth” and “dispensational truth” fails at the outset. Objectors to the revelation of the Mystery have instanced Abraham, not realizing that Abraham could have known all the terms of the gospel, without ever having heard of the third sphere of blessing and the dispensation of the Mystery.

So again, the apostle has no hesitation in Gal. iii. of blending into one the grace of salvation by faith and the gift of miraculous powers, the gospel being “doctrinal truth” and persistent, while the gift of miracle was “dispensational truth” and passing.

In order to compel the reader to recognize that justification can only be by faith, the apostle turns to the testimony of Scripture concerning the position of all men who are “of the works of the law” saying of all such that they must be “under the curse”. This statement would naturally be challenged and so the apostle proceeds to prove the point.

“For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.”

These exacting terms if taken point by point, leave man hopelessly undone, but not only is this so, there is a second argument gathered from the same source:

“But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.”

This second argument is strengthened by the observation:

“The law is not of faith: but, the man that doeth them shall live in them,”

and the whole reduced to impotence in the presence of the cross of Christ:

“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree!”

And so by way of redeeming love the apostle returns to Abraham’s faith and blessing saying:

“That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might received the promise of the Spirit through faith” (Gal. iii. 10-14).

The chain of reasoning adopted by the apostle commences and concludes with the reception or promise of the Spirit, the intervening links being:

- (1) The unreasonableness of concluding that having begun in the Spirit one could be perfected by the flesh.
- (2) The sufferings endured at conversion being all in vain if this were to be so.
- (3) The example of Abraham.
- (4) The character of all his sons.
- (5) The preaching of the gospel by the O.T. Scriptures.
- (6) The foredoomed nature of all attempts at seeking a righteousness by the works of the law.

Some of the arguments we have considered, some await our attention; all must influence our judgment and understanding and should deepen our regard for the grace that has been brought to us by our Saviour Jesus Christ.

No.63. (21) GALATIANS.

Galatians iii. 8 - 12.

**“For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse” (iii. 10).
pp. 226 - 228**

The proofs just considered (Gal. iii. 6-8) are positive in nature, we now advance to a negative argument, the impossibility of attaining to justification by law. Speaking of the Apostle’s method of reasoning, while sometimes it is closely akin to the Rabbinical method that sees proof where a Western mind would see none, he does at times approach nearer to the syllogistic form of argument, as may be seen from what has already been adduced.

“They of faith are the children of Abraham.”

“The children of Abraham are blessed.”

“So then they of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.”

We now consider the negative argument, and we can anticipate an objection. Is it not jumping to a conclusion, of admitting prejudice, of damning a man before trial to make so sweeping a statement that “As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse”? The relative pronoun *hosos* allows no exceptions. Sometimes it is translated “whatsoever” (Rom. xv. 4); when referring to time it is translated “as long as” (Gal. iv. 1); or in the account of the woman of Samaria “He told me all *that ever* I did” (John iv. 39). “As many as” are of the works of the law, “so many” are under the curse. Such is the statement. Now for the proof.

The Apostle compels the objector to attempt to pass through the sifting meshes of a passage borrowed from the O.T., each mesh in the sieve becoming smaller, and he challenges any one successfully to pass the test, or to produce from history any one who has.

Here are the tests:

- (1) Cursed is EVERY ONE. No respects of persons must be expected, for none will be shown. Every one without exception, without favour, must stand here.
- (2) First demand of the law is “continuance”. No mere perfunctory performance can satisfy the claim of the law. Here is no sabbath day observance, but a day by day, hour by hour performance from cradle to grave.

The word here translated “continue” is *emmeno*, a compound of *en* “in” and *meno* “to abide, remain or continue”. The Apostle uses two other variants of the word in Galatians thus, *epimeno* “to remain upon, or at”, “to abide” (Gal. i. 18), indicating that, for the whole course of the fifteen days, Paul did not change his place of abode, but “remained upon” it.

Diameno “to continue right through” as the gospel did, in spite of all the antagonism of Judaistic opponents, by the grace of God and the faithful witness of the apostle Paul, when he stood alone against all “the somebodies and somewhats” at Jerusalem.

Emmeno “to continue in”. It is used of the faith in Acts xiv. 22 “exhorting them to continue in the faith” and is used of the failure of Israel “they continued not in My covenant” (Heb. viii. 9).

There are many indications that the epistle to the Galatians was a “covering letter” sent together with the epistle to the Hebrews. The omission of any reference to circumcision in Hebrews is inexplicable taken by itself, but with the matter so thoroughly disposed of, as it is in Galatians, it is understandable. Here are all the references to *emmeno* in the N.T. (omitting a reading in the Alexandrian MSS of Rev. xx. 3), and the fact that the epistles to the Galatians and Hebrews use this word in connexion with one subject, the inability of man to continue in the observance of the law, is one of many incidental links between the two epistles. Most, if not all, fail to pass this intense test. But suppose for argument’s sake some could, let us note what is said further.

- (3) ALL things. Just as every one without exception is intended in the opening of the argument, and all the time without reprieve is demanded in the next step, so every commandment without exception must be thus “continued in” or the curse must fall.

Most men, except the utterly depraved, discover that they have their strong points as well as their weak ones. Where one man would be proof against the sin of adultery, he may be an easy victim to covetousness. Where one would scorn to bear false witness, he may be slack in the honouring of his parents, and if we bring the subject forward and understand the law to be the love of God with all the heart, soul, mind and strength, and the neighbour as oneself, then it is evident that not one can hope to continue in *all things* which are written in the law. Further, both O.T. and N.T. point out that ignorance is no excuse. “Though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity” (Lev. v. 17), “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” (James ii. 10, 11).

Finally, the last test is simple but complete: “To DO them.” Volumes have been written in praise of the Mosaic code. Praise has been bestowed upon the sanity and the salutary nature of its precepts. Comparison with such as the Code of Khammurabi reveals the exalted nature of the law of Sinai, yet God never asked man to pass his opinion upon the law, to extend his patronage to the law, to render lip service to the law, he was simply under the obligation to DO the works of the law, or to come under the curse. Alford sadly misses the argument and misrepresents God, when he says, from Gal. iii. 11 “not even could a man keep the law, would he be justified, the *condition* of justification, as revealed in Scripture, being by faith”. It is untrue to teach that God would repudiate perfect obedience; He would not, the argument is directed to another thought namely, justification, which, if ever it is to be received, will have to be by faith as a free gift, because no one would ever be able to produce the obedience required by the law to merit it.

God shuts no man out. Man shuts himself out by his own failure. To every man God says as he said to Cain:

“If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, the sin offering coucheth at the door” (Gen. iv. 7).

Man can, theoretically, be justified by a perfect obedience, but practically he can be justified only through the offering of Christ. There is no middle course, and no other way.

In Gal. iii. 11 “law” as such is now set aside. Not merely “the law”, there is no article here, and “by” should be rendered simply “in”. “The more inclusive *en* is thus, perhaps, chosen designedly, as the Apostle’s object is apparently to show that the idea of justification falls wholly *out of the domain of the law*, and is incompatible with its very nature and character” (Ellicott). The argument now adopted by the Apostle may be stated thus:

“It is written that justification is only of faith” (verse 11);
“But the law admits not of justification by faith” (verse 12);
“Consequently, no man under law is justified” (verse 10). (Gwynne).

Throughout this sustained argument the initial question “received ye the Spirit by the works of law, or by the hearing of faith?” is never dropped. It is in view in each step of the argument.

First. Blessing is the inheritance of those who are justified by faith (verse 9).

Secondly. As many as are of the works of the law (primarily Jews but including all others who place themselves under law) are subjects, not of blessing, but of the curse (verses 10-12).

Thirdly. This curse has been lifted from all those who were under the law, by redemption, this being accomplished by Christ coming under a curse in their room and stead; the fact that He died by being “hung upon a tree” revealing the character of His sacrificial death.

This third and last member of the present argument is too important to occupy the few remaining lines at our disposal, so will accordingly be given fuller consideration in our next study.

“Go ye and learn what that meaneth”

(Matt. ix. 13)

(A series of studies on the importance of, and the comprehension of, “meaning”)

No.1. Meaning

pp. 78 - 80

The Holy Scriptures, even though they had been written in letters of burnished gold would not have been a *revelation* of God to man, if the *meaning* of those burnished letters was hidden from man. It matters not how fair the script may be, or whose hand wrote the lines—they may even be engraved by the finger of God Himself as were the Ten Commandments, yet they would still fail of their purpose if no meaning were attached to the holy symbols. Significance, meaning, intention, these are the spirit; the actual words used are but the body, and as the body without the spirit is dead being alone, so is a word divested of its meaning.

In order to be sure of the meaning of the Scriptures, we must give attention to grammar, to usage, to structure, to manner and custom, to time, place, circumstance and to the changing dispensations.

Before us as we write is a book which contains a “Form of service for the observation of the Passover”. Prayers preceding and following the search for leaven in the house are given, the disposition of the table, the cakes, shank bone, &c., is set out, the sanctification for the Passover is pronounced and prepared for, and then at the filling of the cup of wine the second time, the youngest child in the company asks: “Wherefore is this night distinguished from all other nights? On all other nights we may eat either leavened or unleavened bread, but on this night only unleavened bread; on all the other nights we may eat any species of herbs, but on this night only bitter herbs; on all the other nights we do not dip even once, but on this night we dip twice; on all other nights we eat and drink either sitting or leaning, but on this night we lean?” There is also provision “for him who hath not capacity to inquire” and the head of the family must begin to discourse, as it is said, “and thou shalt show thy son on that day”.

The Passover feast was never intended to be a mere empty ritual. Provision was made by Moses in the very day of its institution, that children should ask “What mean ye by this service?” (Exod. xii. 26). The same provision is found in connexion with the feast of unleavened bread (xiii. 8) and the setting apart of the firstborn. Another symbolic memorial which had attached to it the duty of explaining its meaning, was the erection of the twelve stones in the bed of the Jordan, for it is written, “When your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, What mean ye by these stones? Then ye shall answer them” (Josh. iv. 6, 7).

When we ask the “meaning” of any word or thing, we use a word that is derived from the Anglo Saxon *maenan* “to intend”, and a word has no message or power, that has no

meaning or intention. A dog, who has no ability to consult either a dictionary or a lexicon knows what his master intends, when he makes certain sounds, and if his master had always said “in front” when he meant “to heel” the faithful animal would have obeyed the intention regardless of the common usage of the words. Significance is everything.

In the eighth chapter of Daniel a vision is recorded, and after the record come the words “And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and *sought for the meaning*”, that a voice commanded “Gabriel make this man to understand the vision” (viii. 15, 16), showing the Lord’s pleasure in this desire of his servant.

Zechariah the prophet manifests a vivid inquisitiveness, that is answered by the heavenly visitant, and his questions “What are these, my lord?” “What is it?” and “whither?” run through chapters iv., v. and vi.

We find when turning to the N.T. that the same concern that the “meaning” of the message should be perceived actuates both the Lord and His apostles. “Declare unto us” said the disciples, “the parable of the tares of the field” (Matt. xiii. 36), and a patient comparative explanation follows. Peter received a strange vision, and hears a yet stranger command to “Rise, kill and eat”, and while he pondered what the meaning of such a vision could be the answer is provided by the embassy from Cornelius (Acts x. 17).

The Apostle makes much of intention, significance and meaning, when he sought to guide and restrain the Corinthians in the use of the gift of tongues. Let us read Moffatt’s translation:

“Suppose now I were to come to you speaking with ‘tongues’ my brothers, what good could I do you, unless I had some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching to lay before you? Inanimate instruments, such as the flute or the harp, may give a sound, but if no intervals occur in their music, how then can one make out the air that is being played either on flute or on harp? If the trumpet sounds indistinct, who will get ready for the fray? Well, it is the same with yourselves. Unless your tongue utters language that is readily understood, how can people make out what you say? You will be pouring words into the empty air! There are ever so many kinds of language in the world, every one of them meaning something. Well, unless I understand the meaning of what is said to me, I shall appear to the speaker to be talking gibberish, and to my mind he will be talking gibberish himself. So with yourselves; since your heart is set on possessing ‘spirits’ make the edification of the church your aim in this desire to excel” (I Cor. xiv. 6-12).

As the body without the spirit is dead being alone, so the Scriptures deprived of their meaning are empty sounds and unedifying symbols.

In the O.T. “meaning” is the translation of either the word *binah* “to understand” (Dan. viii. 15), *damah* “to think, or devise”, from the root meaning “to be like” (Isa. x. 7); or *chashab* “to devise, to count”. In the N.T. “meaning” is expressed, either by parts of the verb “to be”, as *esti* “it is” (Matt. ix. 13); *eie* “it would be” (Acts x. 17); a combination of “to be” and “to wish” *thelo einai* (Acts ii. 12); or *dunamis* “power” (I Cor. xiv. 11). Should the student seek the Hebrew word that is translated “mean” in

Exod. xii. 26, in “Young’s Analytical Concordance”, he will not find it, simply because there is no word in the original that stands for it, the literal version of Exod. xii. 26 reading “What is this service to you?” but of course the intention is evident just the same.

In this series our purpose is to consider from a variety of angles, this great question of “meaning” and “intention” in order that in the study of the Inspired *Words*, we may attain unto a fuller understanding of the Inspired *Word*.

No.2. How we learn. The pursuit of Meaning. Six processes. pp. 89 - 92

perception, conception, intelligence, conclusion, thinking, considering, understanding, the heart, the mind, learning, remembering, accounting, knowledge and acknowledgment, acquaintance, wisdom, prudence, reason, comparison, reception, judgment, enlightenment, fitness, growth, inclination, experience, ideas, persuasion, reflection, search, study, exercise, fellowship, and practice. Added to this list could be concomitant delight, love of the truth, and holding of the form of sound words. These are some of the ways along which the mind travels as it seeks “meaning”.

As an illustration both of the wonder of words, and the pitfalls to avoid when seeking their meaning we will consider in this article some mistakes and misconceptions that have crept into our language. Here are a few odd items of interest collected together without any attempt at classification.

Adamant. This word in Greek means “the invincible” and in order to illustrate this quality the word was used to indicate the hardest metal, probably steel, and then from the German *demant* via the French *diamant* we reach the English *diamond*. Some late Latin writers however misunderstood the word and read it *adamantem* (lapidem) “the loving” (stone) and then applied it to the load-stone. This accounts for such strange expressions as “the armourous steel” Norris (1678) and Thomas Fuller (1648) asks of the loadstone “how first it fell in love with the north?” Here is an example to show what a crop of strange ideas a false etymology can produce.

When the writer was a boy, a favourite joint at the week-end dinner table was “The aitch-bone” of beef, and he remembers in answer to the question “why?” that there was some supposed resemblance to the letter H. Others at different times have speculated on this name and propounded ash-bone, each-bone, edge-bone (C. Lamb) and ice-bone. The mistake arises out of the failure to realize that just as “an apron” originally was *a napron*, a form still preserved in napkin and napery, and “an adder” was originally *a nadder*, so

“an aitch-bone” is a misunderstanding of the older form *a nache bone* a word derived through old French from the Latin *natis* buttock.

As the word “belfry” is now written, it is perhaps excusable to see some reference to the “bells” that hang therein. This however is the result of a corruption. The original spelling of the word was *berfrey* and *berefreid* meaning a “watch-tower” and tower of defence, adopted from the old German *bergan* “protect” and *fridu* “peace”. The Italians manufactured a different form of the same word, associating the belfry with the “striking” either of a bell or clock, hence the Italian *battifredo*. It is our own unestablished speculation that the term “bats in the belfry” may have arisen from this peculiar turn in the spelling of the word.

“A pretty kettle of fish” means to most of us a perplexing state of affairs, but the “kettle” has no reference here to the pot in which the fish may be cooked, it refers to the *keddle*, a net fixed with osier stakes, old French *quidel*, and so an enclosure alive with floundering fish. We are not likely to perpetuate the definition given in a learned German publication “A fort, is a place to keep men in, *fortress* to keep women in”.

Not far from the Chapel of the Opened Book is the Church of St. Giles, Cripple-gate. Most guides assure us that the gate was so called because of the cripples who begged there. Stowed says that “the postern of Cripplegate was so called long before the Conquest”. The postern itself was the original *crypel* otherwise *creep*, a low arch opening through which there was a passage. A *crypel-geat* in Wiltshire is mentioned in the Domesday Book, and the word is used in Yorkshire for a low opening in a fence or walk.

“Who”, says Dr. Smythe Palmer, “would not feel confident that the verb ‘to adjust’, to arrange and settle, was a derivative of the Latin *ad* and *justus*, and meant to make just or even, to set right?” The word however is derived from the old French *joste* and the Latin *juxta*, which means to bring things “near” and so to harmonize or match them. So arises the ambiguity of our phrase “It is *just* twelve” which may either mean “It is *nearly* twelve, but not quite” so following the original idea of *juxta* or “it is exactly twelve” so following the mistaken original, the Latin *juste*. When being shown over an old house, visions of cream and golden butter come before the mind when the guide says “This is the buttery”. The word is derived from “butt” which meant a cask.

It is universally assumed that the Trade Winds are so called because they are serviceable to shipping and so encourage trade. This however is but an accidental connexion. The original word “trade” meant a “course” with which we should compare the Saxon *trod*, a track, or the Sussex *trade*, a road. As Shakespeare makes King Richard II say:

“I’ll be buried in the King’s highway,
Some way of common *trade*, where subjects’ feet
May hourly trample on their sovereign’s head;
For on my heart they *tread* now whilst I live” (Rich. II. iii. 3. 158.).

It would be similarly a surprise to many to be told that when a visitor *leaves* a house, or takes his *leave*, even though the intention is similar, namely that of taking his departure, the two words nevertheless are totally unrelated. In the former instance *leave* is simply old English *leven* “to quit” and so depart. But “to take leave” is the old English *leve*, permission, and akin to *life*, *be-lieve* and *love*.

When we say that some antiquated or superstitious belief is “exploded” we naturally think of a spent bomb, or of an explosion that has “blown the argument to bits”. This is quite beside the original meaning of the figure. The word really retains the meaning of the Latin *ex-plodere* i.e. *ex-plaudere*, to drive or hoot off the stage an unpopular actor, the direct opposite of “applaud”. Milton says that Enoch was “exploded” by his unbelieving contemporaries, but Milton never intended the thought that because Enoch was “not found” that he had been “blown to bits”.

The number of examples of false analogies and misinterpretations could be multiplied to many pages, but sufficient has been indicated to show that great care must be exercised in coming to a conclusion concerning the etymology of any word or phrase, lest by coming to a false conclusion we should be found building our doctrinal teaching upon sand. The examples of false analogy and misinterpretation have been selected from the many that are given in the book *The Folk and their Word-Lore* by A. Smythe Palmer, D.D.

The reader is advised to check the etymology offered by any dictionary that may be employed, or any book that is read, by such a work as *The Concise etymological Dictionary of the English language* by W. W. Skeat.

No.3. The senses and the parts of speech. pp. 116 - 119

We have suggested that in the pursuit of “meaning” the activities of the mind can be reduced to six stages or processes. The first three being Sensation, Memory, Reason, and then limiting our investigation to the “meaning” of Holy Scripture, we have another three steps or links, Revelation, Translation and Interpretation. Let us give attention to these essential steps, and begin, where all must and do begin with “sensation”.

Human language occasionally manifests by a sudden gleam, by a momentary relation of words, the underlying basis of all thinking. This is seen in the fact that in English the word “sense” has two meanings. The first meaning that which limits the meaning of the word “sense” to the five senses, sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch, the second meaning that which indicates the ultimate goal of “sense” that is “meaning”, as when we say “the sense of this remark is”, “Take the sense or the meaning” or as in Neh. viii. 8 “They read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense”. So also we speak of a person who fainted, that he is “senseless” referring only to the

physical senses, or we may say that a remark is “senseless”, intending this time the idea “meaningless”. Again, we may say that a person is very “sensible” and by so remarking, make no observation upon the physical senses, of sight, hearing, etc., or we can, with Macbeth say:

“Art thou not, fatal vision sensible to feeling, as to sight.”

A “sensualist” may indicate a person who is devoted to the gratification of his baser appetites, but the term may indicate a supporter of the sensual theory of philosophy. Enough has been said to show that the first door by which perception enters is the door of the five senses, and then, traversing the chamber of the mind, that which came in as a “sensation” emerges as “sense”.

The underlying substratum of all experience is twofold, namely that of space and time. Every event that has ever happened of which the human mind is capable of thought must have taken place someWHERE and at some TIME. Timeless immensity, while capable of being written or spoken, cannot be comprehended. An infant entering into this world, is immediately influenced by light, heat, sound, smell and taste. In course of time he begins to associate these impressions with objects outside of himself, he reacts to these sense impressions and experiences comfort or distress, and so feels an inclination towards or an aversion from the origins of these sensations. Qualities such as hardness, softness, light, heavy, rough and smooth, begin to enter into the mind, and a world “other” than himself is recognized and accepted. Time is not associated in the infant mind with clocks or the sun, but with sequence, repetition, succession, and that mainly as associated with feeding, bathing and daily routine. Arising out of these experiences comes the need to give them a name, and the first use of language is that of naming an object, of attaching a signal to it that will recall it to the memory, and at the same time separate the named object from others that are different in degree or kind.

It must be remembered however, that unless there were some intuitive sense, which forms a part of the original creation of man, none of these external objects as perceived by the senses would give rise to thought, reason or understanding. Certain axioms lie at the basis of all the processes of thought, and are often of a mathematical nature, such as:

“Things equal to the same thing are equal to one another.”

“The whole is greater than the part.”

The “signal” thus appropriated to each object is called by grammarians “a noun” or a name, which part of speech is defined by Aristotle to be “a sound which by convention is significant, but does not determine the time”. Aristotle here really distinguishes between the difference between a noun and a verb. The noun represented a permanent *thing*, the verb a temporary and transitory *state*. We are therefore dealing with “things” and with “states”. Nouns and names represent things, and consequently states must have some other part of speech devoted to their expression. This power of expressing the various “states” of a “thing” is the office of the adjective and the verb, and in reality every verb can be reduced to an adjective—*notion*, combined with one particular word expressing time, past, present and future. Thus “he writes” can be expressed “he is—writing”. “He

sings” can be expressed “He is—singing” so that all verbs are fundamentally one, the verb *to be* with its three tenses *is*, *was*, *shall be* combined with the adjective-notion “writing”, “singing”, etc.

Mathematics and grammatical analysis may, at first appear to be far removed from the sense impression received by an infant in its cradle, but they are after all but extensions of the two notions of space and time that comprise an infant’s early impressions. The infant moreover enters into a complex world. Sense impressions do not come singly but in battalions, and he soon discovers the necessity to express the relationship in which one object stands to another. These relationships are expressed in terms of movement or of rest—in, out, from, with, above, below, near, far, etc.—and are called prepositions. Speech therefore is primarily divided into four parts. Nouns, names or substantives to express substances; adjectives to indicate attributes, like good, smooth, hot, cold; prepositions to denote relations in, out, from; and the verb to indicate the relation of the substance to time, or to assign various attributes.

Any one who has opened a book devoted to “Figures of Speech” will acknowledge the complexity and diversity of the subject, yet, all figures of speech begin in the cradle. Before I can appreciate the figure involved in the expressions “hardness of heart”, “a rough speech”, “an upright nature”, “a sweet disposition”; before the expressions “inflamed by anger”, “warmed by affection”, “swollen with pride”, or “melted with grief” can be appreciated, hard and rough materials must have been handled, sweet and sour things tasted. So, the prepositions originally expressed the circumstance of place “the man was *in* the room” “The cat sat *on* the mat.” This elementary significance of place, is transferred by figure to apply to certain conditions and situations of an abstract nature, and so “in” is employed to express more abstract circumstances, such as “in health”, “in doubt”. Even the word we have just employed, “circumstance” is primarily a word of place. *Circum* is the Latin for “around”, *stance* for “stand”. Circumstances are things, or a state of things, that “stand around”. Crabb says: “many circumstances constitute a situation”, and in this definition Crabb employs two other words that are figures of place, which if expressed literally would read:

“Many things which stand around cause to stand together a location or site.”

It will be seen therefore that we move from the concrete to the abstract, from things seen to things not seen, and here again the two words “concrete” and “abstract” are figures derived from the senses. Concrete meaning “to grow together”. Abstract means “to draw apart”. The concrete “like” has the abstract “likeness”; the concrete “father and son” have the abstract “paternity” and “filiation” (*see* Mill). In “Pilgrim’s Progress” the character called “Honest” said of himself “Not Honesty *in the abstract*, but Honest is my name”. Even the word “figure” in the term “figure of speech” is itself a “figure”, for it is derived from a word that means “shape”. So also is the word “speech”

his is foreign to modern thought, but if the reader can put himself in spirit back into O.T. times, the aptness of the figure will be appreciated.

The Greek equivalent to *zakar* is *mnaomai*. This Greek verb has two meanings: (1) to woo, to court, to sue for, and to solicit (Matt. i. 18) and (2) to think, and to remember. In all probability they were originally one in meaning, for there is not a great distance between thinking much of a thing, and trying to get it. In the Epic and the Ionic dialects *mnaomai* was used in both significations, but later *mimneskomai* was confined to “thinking” or “remembering” while *mnaomai* was used exclusively of “wooing” or “soliciting”. This note may be necessary, as students who consult Dr. Bullinger’s Lexicon will not find *mnaomai* in the body of the book, a note in the Greek and English Index reading *mnaomai*, see *mimnesko*. *Mnaomai* suggests the sequence re-mind, re-collect and re-member, and is found in the Greek N.T. in about nineteen or twenty forms and combinations. Mnemonics is an English word derived from this Greek root, and means “the act of memory; the principles and rules of some method to assist the memory”. In this category we must place the Acrostic Psalms, of which Psa. cxix. is an outstanding example. While it is evident that amnesia (a word used to indicate loss of memory), is derived from this same Greek root, it may not be so generally known that an “amnesty” is also from the same, and means “an act of oblivion”.

“The past shall be covered with a general amnesty” (Macaulay).

It will not serve our purpose to quote every occurrence of the twenty forms of *mnaomai*, but there are a number that have to do with the understanding, or the attaining to meaning, that must be recorded. The place that memory plays in arriving at meaning and truth is plainly indicated in the promise of the Comforter:

“He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John xiv. 26).

“These things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them” (John xvi. 4).

Earlier in John’s Gospel the part that memory plays is suggested in the language of chapter ii. 17 and 22.

“And His disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of Thine house hath eaten Me up.”

In arriving at an understanding of the Saviour’s meaning, when He “spake of the temple of His body” memory played a part for the passage continues:

“When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said” (John ii. 22).

Again in connexion with the ride into Jerusalem we read:

“These things understood not His disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him” (John xii. 16).

Peter stresses the value of remembrance saying:

“Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance” (II Pet. i. 12, 13).

“This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance, that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour” (II Pet. iii. 1, 2).

In Peter’s estimate memory is associated with a stirring up of the mind. *Diegeiro* occurs just seven times in the N.T. and in the five references other than those used by Peter, the word is used of one awaking from a sleep (Matt. i. 24; Mark iv. 38, 39; Luke viii. 24); and the effect upon the sea of a great wind (John vi. 18). Moses too was inspired to stress the value of remembrance and the danger and evil of forgetfulness.

“And thou shalt remember all the way which the LORD thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness Beware that thou forget not thine heart be lifted up, and thou forget but thou shalt remember the LORD thy God if thou do at all forget ye shall surely perish” (Deut. viii. 2, 11, 14, 18, 19, 20).

To recapitulate. The sense impressions received from the external world provide us with the basic material of thought, but these basic materials only minister to thought when they can be examined and compared and when deductions can be drawn from the results of this comparison. Without memory, we should be for ever making bricks, but never building. Each day we should receive the impressions made through the eye, the ear, the taste, touch and smell, but we should never be able to translate these into terms of thought unless we could re-call them at will, or at least by effort.

At long last memory will be seen to become almost synonymous with identity. A man who has lost his memory, has lost his identity. A man is an individual who possesses one peculiar set of memories, memories that, while they include others, are memories that belong to him and to him alone. At the resurrection, a new body will be provided, but given to this new body will be the one and only individual memory that makes *you*, *YOU*. Unless we remember the past, we shall not be able to realize the wonder of redemption, forgiveness or the many blessings of grace. Without memory, we might as well have never existed and never have been redeemed.

Having the material, the sense impressions, and having the power to recall them, reason is made possible. Reason is much more than redeemed impressions, but remembered impressions are essential to reason. Shakespeare in his wonderful way speaks of memory as “the warder of the brain” and as “the receipt of reason”. We must consider this next step on the road to “meaning” namely “reason”, in our next article.

No.5. Reason.
pp. 157 - 159

We have seen that sense impressions apart from memory could form no basis for the exercise of thought, but that memory enables the mind to re-collect these impressions, and so make the comparison of one impression with another possible. Thus, the way is open for that process of the mind, which we call “reason”. The word “reason” is derived from the Latin *ratio*. *Ratio* means essentially a calculation or a reckoning, and ratiocination is the act or process of deducing consequences from premises.

Because some have placed reason in the place that faith should occupy, and because the true and beautiful word “rational” has been degraded by the term “rationalism”, that is no justification for denying the supreme place that the exercise of reason holds in the process of thought. Whoever uses a grammatical sentence intelligently employs reason, for there is a logical connexion between noun and verb, between adjective and noun, etc., that makes language what it is. We have heard of some who “want a religion without argument” but such are confusing terms. Without argument, a book would be but a collection of words without association, relation or intention. Reason has been explained as “the power of thinking consecutively; the power of passing in mental review all the facts and principles bearing on a subject, and after carefully considering their bearings, drawing conclusions” (“Lloyd Encyclopædic Dictionary”). The “Oxford Dictionary” defines reason as “a statement of some fact (real or alleged) employed as an argument to justify or condemn some act, prove or disprove some assertion, idea, or belief”.

“Reason issues in judgment, and judgment leads to a conclusion. Judgment is the act or process of the mind in ascertaining the truth by comparison of ideas, facts or propositions. It is the examination of the relationship between one proposition and another. It is the faculty of judging wisely, truly, or skillfully: discernment, discrimination, good sense” (Unknown author).

At last in this attempt at definition, the word “sense” emerges, as we found that it did earlier. We employ our senses, to enable us to attain to the sense of any statement, but

this use of the “senses” to arrive at the “sense” is by the employment of what is called “commonsense” which is but reason dressed in lowly garb. Reasoning can be an indication of unbelief, and the verb *dialogizomai* is employed many times in this sense (see Matt. xvi. 7; Mark ii. 6), yet who will accuse Mary of unbelief when we read that she “cast in her *mind*” what manner of salutation it was that the Angel had given her? (Luke i. 29), or shall we accuse Caiaphas of indiscretion when he use this same word saying “nor *consider* that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people”? (John xi. 50).

Paul however is the great “reasoner” of Scripture, yet who is his equal as a man of faith? Not only does he “reason” out of the Scriptures, but his epistles abound in logical particles. First, let us acquaint ourselves with passages that tell us that in the exercise of his ministry Paul “reasoned”. We shall find the word in the Acts of the Apostles, and it is translated “reason”, “dispute” and “preach”, while the one occurrence in the epistles is found in Heb. xii. 5 where the reference is to God Himself, and the word is translated “speaketh”.

“And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh (reasoneth) unto you as unto children” (Heb. xii. 5).

Let us tabulate the references in the Acts:

“And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures” (Acts xvii. 2).

Let us note the following facts. This took place in the synagogue, a place devoted to the worship of the Lord, to prayer, to the reading of the Scriptures, and to exhortation and teaching. Even if this had been the only record of Paul’s teaching, the words “as his manner was” would compel us to recognize that “reasoning out of the Scriptures” was a characteristic of his ministry. Moreover this took place upon the Sabbath, was repeated on successive Sabbaths, so that “reasoning” was a calculated method adopted by the apostle, not something done in the heat of the moment and regretted afterwards. Finally, note that Paul did not simply “reason” he reasoned “out of the Scriptures”. The Scriptures were his premises, his teaching was but the drawing of conclusions, the method was that of comparison and observation of things that differ. Would to God that there were more such “reasoners” and “reasonings”. The choice really lies between such acceptable preaching and the blind acceptance of “authority” which no true Berean can tolerate. In the same chapter of Acts that tells us that Paul reasoned out of the Scriptures on the sabbath day, we find him “disputing” not only with the Jews in their synagogue, but in the market place at Athens.

Dealing with pagan idolators and philosophers, Paul could not reason with them out of the Scriptures, for they did not accept his premises, he simply “disputed” (same Greek word) and based his argument upon the conscious failure of their religion, “the unknown god” (Acts xvii. 23) and of their accepted teaching concerning the nature of man (28). Here therefore, is a warrant for sanctified “reasoning” where the Scriptures are unknown.

We follow the footsteps of the apostle from Athens to Corinth, from Corinth to Ephesus, on to Troas and finally private witness at Jerusalem, and on seven more occasions the Scriptures record his faithful “reasoning” and “disputing”.

“He *reasoned* in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks” (Acts xviii. 4).

“And he came to Ephesus entered into the synagogue, and *reasoned* with the Jews” (Acts xviii. 19).

“And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing (*reasoning*) and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God he separated the disciples, *disputing (reasoning)* daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks” (Acts xix. 8, 9, 10).

“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached (*reasoned*) unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight and as Paul was long *preaching*” (Acts xx. 7, 9).

“And as he *reasoned* of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled” (Acts xxiv. 25).

There are one or two features of special importance that must not be overlooked in this record. The apostle’s “reasoning” at Ephesus was so helpful that the Jews desired him to tarry longer, but although he had to leave them he promised to return. This he did, and for the space of another three months he “disputed” or “reasoned” with them. The goal of this disputing was their “persuasion”, the subject of their persuasion was “the kingdom of God”, while the persuasion itself was an act of faith, *peitho* being allied with *pistis* “faith”. When separation became necessary, the disciples were removed from the synagogue and the little company met in a school, and this witness continued for two years, and as a result of this two years “disputing” all that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus. Here we have the seal of God upon this sanctified exercise of reason, confirmed by signs and wonders wrought by the hands of Paul. In Acts xx. 7 and 9 *dialegomai* is actually translated “preach” in the A.V. which the R.V. changes to “discourse”. A very little while after this, the apostle summed up his ministry saying that he had kept back nothing that was profitable, but that he had showed, and taught, in public and private, testifying repentance and faith, and that as a consequence he was “pure from the blood of all men”.

Finally, when Paul had the opportunity of preaching the gospel to a Roman Governor, we are told that he “reasoned” of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come. These nine passages that reveal Paul’s accustomed manner of preaching are given us as a “pattern”, and we should be very suspicious of that form of teaching that says, because man has fallen and his faculties have become warped by sin, that we should exclude “reason” and simply accept upon the authority of anyone who cares to lord it over our faith any doctrine that may be brought forward.

The Bereans were well pleasing to the Lord for the very opposite quality. They did not “accept” without previous examination, they search the Scriptures daily, to discover whether the things taught by Paul were “so”. In the next article of this series we will devote all our available space to the examination of Paul’s epistles in order to discover his use of what we call “the logical particles” of discourse. While we must never be

numbered among the “reasoners” who explain away the Truth of God, let us rejoice in the fact that at salvation the mind has been “renewed” and whether in testifying to others, or reading for ourselves, the things believed (like the offering of our bodies), must be reasonable (*logikos*) service. Less than this dishonours both God and man who was made in the image of his Maker.

No.6. Some logical particles.
pp. 238 - 241

We have seen that in the quest for “sense”, the mind advances from sense impressions to reason by the aid of memory. We have seen that to “reason out of Scriptures” was an outstanding characteristic of Paul’s ministry, and we should strenuously resist any attempt by a teacher of the *authoritarian* school (the school so contrary to the Berean spirit) to intimidate us by a disproportionate emphasis upon the failure of human reason to arrive at the truth.

As a supplement to the study of Paul’s manner which occupied our space in article No.5, we devote the present article to an examination of some of the logical particles which of themselves imply a reasoning faculty, and which are of such frequent and pointed occurrence in his writings.

conjunction, an adjective or an adverb. “That” is used to introduce a clause which is logically the subject, the object, or a necessary complement of an essential part of the principle sentence. It introduces the reason, purpose, object or end. Let us take as an illustration of the following:

Hina in classical Greek is an adverb of *place*, and this sense of direction is inherent when it is used as a conjunction. It indicates an end or a goal, and so should be translated “in order that”, “to the end that”, “with the object that”. Dr. Bullinger comments “thus hope is followed by *hoti* which represents the object of the hope, while prayer is followed by *hina* showing the purpose and design of the prayer”.

In many instances *hina* is followed by the subjunctive mood, to signify the objective, possibility or intention, “in order that it might be”. In other cases it is followed by the indicative pointing to the *fact* rather than to the mere possibility. Keeping to Rom. i. we note as examples of *hina* “for I long to see you IN ORDER THAT I may impart unto you some spiritual gift IN ORDER THAT I might have some fruit” (Rom. i. 11, 13). And, passing over to Rom. iv., we have the important statement of doctrine, “therefore it is of faith, IN ORDER THAT it might be by grace” (Rom. iv. 16).

Hoti. This word expresses the *substance* or *content*, and then the *reason* why anything is said to be or to be done, “because”, “since”, “for that”.

“First I thank my God THAT (because) your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world” (Rom. i. 8).

“Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, THAT often times I purposed to come unto you” (Rom. i. 13).

Hos. This word is used in comparisons.

“For God is my witness THAT (how that) without ceasing I make mention of you” (Rom. i. 9).

It is evident therefore by these few examples taken mainly from Rom. i., how “logical” is the method of Paul’s presentation of the truth.

Let us turn our attention to another term which will repay examination. *Men de*. Lexicographers have differed over the origin of the particle *men*. Some see in it a derivation from the Hebrew that supplies us with the word “Amen”, but it is more

generally considered to be formed from the Greek word that means “one” even as *de* which so often follows it, is but a shortened form of *duo* “two”. “On the other hand” is a somewhat clumsy way of expressing these two words in English. *De* is frequently employed, when something new is subjoined, distinct or different from what proceeds, though not strictly its very opposite.

An example of the use of *men de* is found in Rom. vi. 11.

“Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead *indeed (men)* unto sin, *but (de)* alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

An example of the way in which *men de* is not fully translated in the A.V. is provided in Rom. v. 16.

“For the judgment (*on the one hand*) was by one to condemnation, but (*on the other hand*) the free gift is of many offences unto justification” (Rom. v. 16).

We will not multiply examples, but give a few further references, where the A.V. gives no sign that the words *men de* are in the original. I Cor. i. 12, 18, 23; Gal. iv. 8, 23, 24; Phil. i. 16, 28; iii. 13, are passages that should be examined and noted. In Hebrews there are eighteen passages where these discriminating particles *men de* occur, but in six passages only is there an English equivalent in the A.V.

It will not be possible, neither is it necessary, that we should give examples or tabulate the many logical particles that are found in the N.T.; we will be content with one more, and that the word “IF”. Shakespeare, that master of words, says “there is much virtue in your if”, and the old saying has it, that:

“If ‘ifs’ and ‘ans’ were pots and pans,
All the world would tinkers be.”

“If” *ei* puts the condition simply, “for if, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God” (Rom. v. 10). “For if through the offence of one many be dead” (Rom. v. 15). Here “if” assumes the hypothesis as an actual fact, no doubt being thrown upon the supposition “for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised” (I Cor. xv. 16). If of course the word is followed by the subjunctive or the optative mood, then conjecture and uncertainty necessarily enter.

Ean, is strictly a combination of *ei* “if” and *an* “haply”. *Ean* implies an objective possibility, and refers therefore to something future. It is usually followed by the subjunctive mood, which expresses a condition of uncertainty. “For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law” (Rom. ii. 25). “But if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband” (Rom. vii. 2).

Other variants are *eige* and *eite*. *Eige* “If at least”, “if indeed”, “If ye have heard of the dispensation” (Eph. iii. 2). *Eite* “whether”, “if a man speak in an unknown tongue” (I Cor. xiv. 27). We leave the student the happy labour of patiently examining the epistles of Paul and of extracting from them the many and varied particles of speech that

the Apostle uses in his logical enforcement of the doctrine that is according to godliness. We cannot arrive at the sense of a passage if we ignore the sequences, the links, the steps that lead on from one conclusion to another. Even the title of Christ “The Word” means much more than an articulate sound, *logos* implies a reason as well as word, Christ is the logical account of God. He is the Divine Reason and Purpose made manifest. Ultimately we can only arrive at the “sense” of God and His Redeeming Love through Christ, but in a lesser degree we arrive at this “sense” through the mediation of the language that is employed to express ideas.

We must now turn our attention more particularly to the Scriptures under three headings, Revelation, Translation and Interpretation. This we hope to do in subsequent articles.

HEBREWS

Perfection or Perdition

No.1. The evidence for the Pauline authorship.

pp. 84 - 88

In the year 1918 we commenced a series of studies in the epistle to the Hebrews that continued until 1930, but there can be very few readers to-day who possess volumes VIII-XX, and even if these volumes are still in use, they are not accessible to readers who have become interested in Dispensational Truth during the last thirty years. We therefore propose a new set of studies, in which the epistle will be opened up afresh, and pray that its meditation may be blessed. It is quite the fashion to believe that almost any name except that of Paul should stand at the head of this epistle, and while we do not intend wading through this controversy, readers will find a fair amount of material for the pros and cons in the commentaries of Alford and Wordsworth. One work on the subject of Pauline authorship cannot be passed over so lightly, and that is Forster on the Epistle to the Hebrews published in 1853 and now only to be obtained at second hand. Its 670 pages are literally crammed with examples in which the peculiar diction, grammar and mannerisms of Paul, taken from his acknowledged epistles, are echoed in Hebrews. We can give one or two as specimens only, the complete presentation of evidence demands more than we can attempt in articles of this character.

1.) In Heb. x. 30 the author quotes from Deut. xxxii. 35 but does not give a literal translation of the Hebrew, nor a literal quotation of the LXX. In Rom. xii. 19 Paul quotes from the same passage, and *uses the same* personal and peculiar translation that is employed in Hebrews. That is evidence of identical authorship.

2.) Words peculiar to Paul. *Agon* "race", "fight", "conflict", a word borrowed from the Grecian games. This word occurs in Phil. i. 30; Col. ii. 1; I Thess. ii. 2; I Tim. vi. 12; II Tim. iv. 7 and in Heb. xii. 1. Upon examination we find that the context of Heb. xii. 1 uses such words as "run", "patience", "witness", "faith", "perfect" that are characteristic of the context of the Apostle's usage elsewhere.

3.) Sometimes a passage in an undoubted epistle must be read with one in Hebrews, before the full meaning of the word used can be assessed. For example the word "mediator" occurs in Gal. iii. 20 and in Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15. In Galatians the mediation of Moses is treated of, while the Mediation of Christ is left to be inferred. The references in Hebrews however supplement this and give prominence to Christ, the mediation of Moses being rather inferred from the word "better" than from any explicit statement.

4.) "All things under His feet."

These words taken from Psa. viii. are found *nowhere else* in the N.T. than in I Cor. xv. 27; Eph. i. 22 and Heb. ii. 8. The peculiar argument of Corinthians "It is

manifest that He is excepted which did put all things under Him” is echoed by a similar argument in Hebrews “He left nothing that is not put under Him” and indicates identity of authorship.

5.) “The just shall live by faith.”

These words are taken from Habakkuk, and are found in Romans, Galatians and Hebrews, and nowhere else in the N.T. The apostle does not quote the actual words found in Habakkuk, but gives his own rendering. The words found in Rom. i. 17 and in Heb. x. 38 are identical. This is just another evidence of identical authorship.

6.) In Galatians Paul allegorizes, and uses the record of Genesis concerning Ishmael and Isaac to enforce the difference between Jerusalem that is below and in bondage and Jerusalem that is above and free (Gal. iv. 21-31). A similar use of Sinai with its blackness and darkness and Mount Zion with its angels and firstborn manifests the same hand (Heb. xii. 18-26).

In *The Christian* for 27th April and 4th May, 1916, there appeared two articles by J. W. Thirtle, LL.D., wherein the writer sought to show that the epistle to the Hebrews “in very early times followed that to the Galatians”. Quoting from this interesting article:

“What, in reality, do we find? Just this—two epistles or writings, in close succession, in a professedly Pauline section of the New Testament, are merely separated or divided off, the one from the other, by the words *pros Hebraious*—‘to Hebrews’.”

The writer proceeds to give evidence to prove that the epistle to the Galatians is the “covering letter” and the epistle to the Hebrews is an “enclosure” written especially for the Hebrew believer in the churches of Galatia. The reader is referred to these articles for the details and evidence brought forward. Parallels between the two epistles are suggested; the quotation of Hab. ii. 4 in Gal. iii. 2 and Heb. x. 38; the covenant teaching of Gal. iii. 15-17; iv. 24; Heb. viii. 6-11; ix. 15-20; x. 16. Both epistles deal with mediatorship (Gal. iii. 19, 20; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24). Gal. iv. 26 speaks of the Jerusalem that is above, Heb. xii. 22 of the heavenly Jerusalem.

Leaving much that is of interest and help unquoted, we ask the reader’s attention to another parallel which immediately comes to our mind. In Gal. iii. 3 the apostle asks:

“Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the spirit, are ye now PERFECTED in the flesh? Have ye suffered so many things in vain? If it be indeed in vain.”

This is practically the question dealt with in Hebrews. The Galatians were in danger of being led back to bondage; to avoid persecution the Judaizers constrained them to be circumcised, and to such the apostle’s words are very severe; however, there were some whose attitude towards the flesh enabled them to be designated as the “Israel of God”, the name given to Jacob when the hollow of his thigh was withered, and who, after that mighty change, limped in evidence that his spiritual gain meant “no confidence in the flesh”.

One subject is dealt with exhaustively in Galatians, namely the place that circumcision holds in the economy of grace. If Hebrews was sent together with Galatians, we have a sufficient explanation. When writing of the better things to the Hebrews, the apostle did not deal with circumcision. The omission even of the word is inexplicable if Hebrews stand alone. If however the covering letter be Galatians then the matter is dealt with once and for all, and the way is open for the Apostle to address the Hebrews with his “word of exhortation” (Heb. xiii. 22).

Returning to the question of authorship, let us consider the evidences that Scripture itself produces that bear upon the reason why the title “Apostle” and the name “Paul” should be withheld from the epistle to the Hebrews.

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 to the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13; Gal. ii. 8; I Tim. ii. 7; II Tim. i. 1).
- (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. xii. 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 to 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 other 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 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 epistle.
 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, 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 time 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"; "my brethren"; "my mouth" (Eph. i. 16; iii. 4, 13, 14; vi. 10 and 19).
 Paul never uses *more* 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.

One further piece of evidence must suffice. We learn from the second epistle to the Thessalonians, that even at that early date, a false epistle, purporting to have been written by Paul, was in circulation and to assure the reader on this matter the apostle concluded the epistle with these words:

"The salutation of Paul *with mine own hand*, which is the token in every epistle. *So I write*" (II Thess. iii. 17).

Like many another of his day, Paul dictated his letters, and these were written by slaves who were trained pen men. We know the name of the one who wrote out the epistle to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 22) who is seen to be a brother also in the Lord. When dictating the letter to the Galatians, the apostle seems to have been so desirous of gaining their attention, that he finished the epistle with his own hand (Gal. vi. 11). If however we look at the close of any of Paul's epistles, we will not discover the name Paul, consequently there must have been something written by Paul's own hand that would

be to all intents his signature. What he wrote with his own hand at the close of II Thessalonians was:

“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen” (II Thess. iii. 18).

It will therefore be a simple matter to look at the close of Paul’s epistles and see whether this holds good.

Galatians. “Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen.”
I Thessalonians. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.”
II Thessalonians. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.”
I Corinthians. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus. Amen.”
II Corinthians. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.”
Romans. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.” (Rom. xvi. 24).
Ephesians. “Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.”
Philippians. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.”
Colossians. “The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you. Amen.”
I Timothy. “Grace be with thee. Amen.”
Titus. “Grace be with you all. Amen.”
II Timothy. “The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. Grace be with you. Amen.”
Philemon. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen.”

Here are the salutations of Paul, appended to thirteen of his epistles. They vary in their wording, but use the words “Grace be with you” as the basis of every benediction. We turn to the close of Hebrews, and there we see with our own eyes “the salutation of Paul with his own hand”

“GRACE BE WITH YOU ALL. AMEN.”

As a matter of curiosity and obtaining a negative witness, we look at the epistles of James, Jude, John and Peter, seven in all, in none of them do we find the words “Grace be with you” in the salutation. In the presence of this testimony, it matters little what the early fathers thought, or what the opinions of scholars may be, so far as we are concerned, the internal evidence of the epistle itself is all sufficient. We shall therefore speak of the writer of the Hebrews, as Paul, without further proof or apology, and accept as true that fourteen (7*2) epistles from his pen form part of Holy Scripture.

**No.2. The scope of the Epistle decided by the structure.
pp. 108 - 110**

We have satisfied ourselves as to the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, and believe there is every reason to think that when Paul was dealing with the Galatian problem of the place of the *law* in the economy of *grace*, he took the opportunity of using the epistle to the Galatians as a covering letter, dealing with the same problems not from the point of view of the believing Gentile, but from the point of view of the believing Hebrew.

Our next consideration must be to discover the scope of the epistle, “what it is all about”, and this is indicated best by the structure. Now while we must not “invent” a structure, for that would stultify our very object, we must admit that the features that constitute the structure of a book or epistle do not always appear on the surface. We look at chapter i., and note its contents, and let our eye glance on to the opening verses of chapter ii. As we do so, something seems to “click”, we are conscious of the pressure of a theme that may be the beginning of our quest.

Heb. i. 1, 2. God hath spoken.

Heb. ii. 2, 3. If the word spoken first began to be spoken by the Lord.

The intervening subject matter stresses the superiority of the “Son” to Prophets, of the “Lord” to angels. We read of others who “spoke” in the chapters that follow, but we are arrested at the reference in Heb. xii. 25 because it is a most evident allusion to chapter ii.

“See that ye refuse not Him that speaketh. For if they **ESCAPED NOT** who refused Him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from Him that speaketh from heaven.”

Here the apostle is most evidently resuming the theme of chapter ii.

“How shall we **ESCAPE**, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord” (Heb. ii. 3).

So far so good, but we remind ourselves that “one swallow does not make a summer” and prosecute our investigation. In chapter xiii. the apostle seems to sum up Christian ministry under the heading,

“Who have spoken unto you the word of God” (Heb. xiii. 7).

We can tentatively record our first findings thus:

A | Heb. i., ii. The word spoken, the Prophets, the Son.

* * * * *

A | Heb. xii., xiii. Him, and they, that speak the word.

If these are indeed the opening and closing members of the underlying structure, there will be confirmation in the context. These soon emerges:

“Thou remainest. Thou art the same” (Heb. i. and ii.).

“Things that remain. Jesus Christ the same” (Heb. xii. and xiii.).

“How escape if neglect.” “Not escape if refuse” (Heb. ii. and xii.).

“Bring in again the first begotten.” “Brought again from the dead” (Heb. i. and xiii.).

The matter now passes from the possible to the certain. We have the opening and closing members of the structure confirmed to us. We seek further and are struck with the alternations that are brought forward in chapters vi. and x.:

“Let us **GO ON** unto *perfection*” (Heb. vi. 1).

“We are not of them who **DRAW BACK** unto *perdition*” (Heb. x. 39).

These two headings commend themselves at once, and we soon discover that they are supported “up to the hilt” by their contexts. “Let us come boldly” is answered by “let us draw near” (Heb. iv. 16; x. 22). The examples of unbelief of chapter iii. are gloriously answered by the examples of faith in Heb. xi. In chapter v. we have “babes” set over against “full grown”, but in chapter xii. we have “sons” over against “firstborn”. That dreadful passage which has caused so much anxiety to sensitive souls, “no renewal unto repentance” finds its explanation in the corresponding section of the epistle in Esau who “found no place for repentance”, and which shows us that the fear in chapter vi. was not the loss of salvation but of birthright and the firstborn’s position.

Let us now assemble our material.

HEBREWS as a Whole.

- A | i., ii. THE WORD SPOKEN.
Thou *remainest*.
Thou art the *same*.
How escape?
Bring the First begotten.
- B | 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.
- C | vii. - x. 18. PERFECTION, WHERE FOUND.
But this Man.
No perfection in priesthood.
No perfection in law.
No perfection in ordinances.
No perfection in sacrifices.
But this Man.
- B | x. 19 - xii. 25. BACK TO PERDITION.
Let us draw near.
Example of faith.
Sons v. Firstborn.
No place for repentance.
Discipline exercised.
Trodden under foot the Son of God.
- A | xii. 25 - xiii. HIM THAT SPEAKETH.
Things that *remain*.
Jesus Christ the *same*.
Not escape if refuse.
Brought from the death.

In chapter v., adults are manifested by the presence, not only of “senses” but “senses exercised”, which is balanced in chapter xii. with “discipline exercised”. In chapter vi. some are said to crucify afresh the Son of God and in chapter x. we read of those who have trodden under foot the Son of God. There is therefore no possible doubt but that here we have the material for the two flanking members of the central section. Chapters vii. to x. 18 therefore are left in the centre of the structure. This central section develops the flanking slogans “on to perfection” and “back to perdition” by devoting itself to the place where perfection can be found. It opens and closes with a reference to “This Man”, the Man Christ Jesus.

The earnest student will “search and see” and make this structure his own. We are now mercifully granted an infallible guide in our researches in this epistle, though we ourselves may be very slow to avail ourselves of its help.

Throughout the series of studies now commencing we shall seek to honour this God-given structure by continually aligning our comments and discoveries with its general bearing. Let no one accuse us of bombast; we no more “invented” this structure than Christopher Columbus “invented” America. We simply discovered what is there already, and give God thanks.

**No.3. An examination of the alternatives of
Hebrews vi. 1 and x. 39.
pp. 129 - 134**

The two foci “Perfection” and “Perdition” must now be given attention, for if we are wrong in our apprehension of their respective meanings, we shall necessarily miss the argument of the whole epistle. The English word “perfect” is made up of *per* “through” and *facio* “to do”, and from this same *facio* comes our word “fact”. So, the English word suggests the salutary idea of “making a doctrinal truth an experimental fact”. The Greek word “perfection” is *teleiotes*, one of a number of words derived from *telos* “the end”. The fundamental conception in all the variants of this word, *teleios*, *teleioo*, *teleiotes*, *teleiosis*, to say nothing of compounds made with *apo*, *ana*, *en*, *epi*, *dia* and *sun*, is that of taking whatever is in hand or in view to a finish or conclusion. This feature can be demonstrated in several ways:

(1) “Perfecting holiness” (II Cor. vii. 1).

Of all subjects, the one that cannot conceivably be “improved” must be holiness, and without the context such an expression as “to perfect holiness” seems to be more senseless and impossible than it would be “to gild the lily or to paint the rose”. If however we observe the context of this exhortation, we shall see that *practical* sanctification is in view. Not to be unequally yoked with unbelievers is to “perfect holiness”; to remember that, if we are looked upon as the temple of the living God, there can be no possible agreement with idols and with the promise attached to the separation from any unclean thing, the apostle says “Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us CLEANSE OURSELVES from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, PERFECTING HOLINESS in the fear of God” (II Cor. vii. 1). Perfecting, making what is yours by gift, grace and reckoning “a fact”, per-fect. In other words taking sanctification to its logical conclusion.

(2) Perfection is sometimes placed over against “the beginning”. Heb. vi. 1 urges the believer to leave the *arche* “the word of the BEGINNING of Christ, and to go on unto the goal, the end, the conclusion, ‘perfection’;” So, in Heb. xii. 2 the “Author”, the Greek *archegos*, is placed over against the “Finisher” or “Perfecter”, *teleiotes*. This emphasizes the presence in all words dealing with perfection of the root *telos* “the end”.

- (3) “The perfect” is sometimes used to indicate an adult, as over against the immature or the babe:

“Ye have need that one teach again which be the first principles of the oracles of God are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age (*teleios*)”. (Heb. v. 12-14). The connection between this passage and the opening exhortation of Heb. vi. is plain. In Eph. iv. 13,14 we have the perfect man placed over against children, and I Cor. ii. & iii. with its use of “perfect” and its “babes”, its “milk” and its “meat”, is another evidence that the writer of Corinthians wrote the epistle to the Hebrews.

- (4) The figure of a race or contest uses these words. Heb. xii. 2 just quoted associates the “finisher” with “running the race”, and Paul, who in Philippians was running with the prize of the high calling in view, confessed that he was not at that time “perfect”, is permitted in his last epistle to realize that he had touched the tape, saying:

“I have fought a good fight (*agona* "race" Heb. xii. 1),
I have finished (*teleo*) my course,
I have kept the faith; henceforth a crown” . (II Tim. iv. 7, 8).

It is utterly impossible to believe that the Saviour could be “improved” morally or spiritually, and where it says “He learned obedience by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect” (Heb. v. 8, 9) it indicates that He went through “to the end”, and as a consequence He became “the author” of eternal salvation; in Heb. ii. 10 “The Captain of our salvation” was made “perfect” through sufferings, and in Heb. xii. 1, 2 He became “the author” and “the finisher”, and for the joy set before Him endured the cross.

We shall meet with these words, these derivatives of *telos* “the finish” or “the end” in about thirty passages in Hebrews, and when we meet with them in the ordinary course of exposition, we can deal with their immediate bearing on the passage in hand, our comprehension being already enriched and illumined by the present survey.

Turning from Perfection, we face the dread alternative, Perdition. In view of the many statements of Scripture that the redeemed shall “never perish”, “shall not come into condemnation” and the like assurances, the idea of any child of God drawing back unto perdition sounds untrue. If we mean by “perdition” the orthodox theological view given by the Oxford Dictionary, for example “the condition of final damnation; the fate of those in hell, eternal death”, then our objections are valid, but if we are resting our arguments upon the usage of the English term, we are unwise. We must be guided by the usage of the original word. *Apoleia* and *apollumi* are both compounds of *luo* “to loose” and in the majority of cases the meaning of the word *apollumi* is expressed by the words “perish” or “be destroyed”. In some places, this “perishing” is modified as in the expression “the *lost* sheep of the house of Israel”, and a further suggestive aspect of the term is seen in the translation “lose his ward” or “lose his life for My sake”. In Luke xv. *apollumi* is used of the “lost” piece of money, the “lost sheep” and the “lost” son, who himself said “I perish with hunger”. Coming to Hebrews, we find the word in chapter i. 11 “they shall perish” used of creation. *Apoleia* “perdition” occurs twenty times in the New Testament and is used of the broad way that leadeth to “destruction”, of

“damnable” heresies, of “pernicious ways” and eight times of “perdition”. John xvii. 12 uses this term of Judas, who is called the son of perdition, and II Thess. ii. 3 uses the same title for “the man of sin”.

We must not omit to consider the bearing of context when attempting to interpret any word in Scripture, and we find that the word “perdition” in Hebrews is set in a context of persecution, long endurance, with the prospect of a “great recompense of reward”, but that owing to the wearing down of patience and the frailty of the strongest under trial, there was a need to urge these tempted souls to cast not away their confidence, to remember that a little while and He that shall come will come and will not tarry and that during this hour of testing “the just shall live by faith”; the alternative being the drawing back unto perdition. In Phil. iii. we find the Apostle using the same words “perfect” and “perdition” in close connection with the attaining to the *prize* of the high calling:

“Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but *I* follow after I press for the prize” (Phil. iii. 12-14).

Then follows the warning concerning those whose example is evil, who by their attitude make themselves enemies of the cross,

“whose end is perdition (destruction)” (Phil. iii. 17-19).

It is not conceivable that believers who had reached so high a standard as these Philippians should need to be exhorted not to follow the ungodly *pagans* among whom their lot was cast. The warning is uttered about the example of *Christians*, whose God is their belly, who glory in their shame, who mind earthly things, who by their self-indulgence antagonize all that the “cross” stands for, in contrast with those whose conversation is in heaven. We observe that in Heb. x., the loss of a “reward” is in view; in Phil. iii., the loss of the “prize” is in view. Further light upon the intention of the apostle in Heb. x., may be gathered from the use of *apoleia* in Matt. xxvi. 8, where it is used in a non-doctrinal sense:

“But when His disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this WASTE?”

In I Corinthians we have those who are “perfect” (I Cor. ii. 6) placed over against those who were “babes”, who were fed with “milk” and not with “meat”, just as we have in Heb. v. In Heb. vi., the apostle introduces the figure of husbandry, even as he does in I Cor. iii. 9 and says:

“That which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is NIGH UNTO cursing; *whose end is to be burned*” (Heb. vi. 8),

and these thus figured lacked those things that “accompany salvation” not salvation itself. So in I Cor. iii.:

“If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer LOSS: but he himself shall be saved; *yet so as by fire*” (I Cor. iii. 15).

Again observe, the alternative to suffering loss, is receiving a REWARD (I Cor. iii. 14). The alternatives in Hebrews are “going on unto perfection” or “drawing back unto perdition” and we must not so interpret “perdition” as to leave in the mind that the alternatives are “going on unto *salvation*” or “drawing back to *eternal punishment*”. The former word “perfection”, with its associated meanings, influences the application of the latter word “perdition” with its associated warnings.

We have seen the scope of this epistle set out in the structure and have some idea of the meaning of the alternatives set before the reader. We must now return to the opening chapter to learn what encouragements are offered and what warnings given to accomplish the twofold purpose of these exhortations. We close the present study with a comparison. What the Sermon on the Mount is to the calling of the kingdom on earth, and what Hebrews is to the high calling of the Mystery. In each we have the alternations of Perfection or Perdition (Matt. v. 48; vii. 13; Heb. vi. 1; x. 39 and Phil. iii. 12, 19) together with Reward or Prize. It will therefore be a fitting close to the present study if we exhibit the extraordinary literary correspondence that exists between Hebrews and Philippians.

Hebrews.		Philippians.		
Things accompanying salvation Heavenly city	vi. 9. xi. 10, xii. 22.	Work out salvation Citizenship in heaven	ii. 12. iii. 20,	
Reproach	xi. 26, xiii. 13.	Fellowship of sufferings	iii. 10.	
Reward	x. 35, xi. 26.	Prize	iii. 14.	
The race set before us Leaving . . . let us go on	xii. 1. vi. 1, 2.	I press toward the mark Forgetting things behind	iii. 14. iii. 13.	
Obtain a better resurrection (Condition attached)	xi. 35.	Attain unto an out-resurrection (Condition attached)	iii. 11.	
Power of His resurrection	xiii. 20.	Power of His resurrection	iii. 10.	
Work in . . . His will	xiii. 21.	Work in . . . His will	ii. 13.	
Christ the Image	i. 3.	Christ the Form	ii. 6.	
Angels worship Him	i. 6.	Every knee bow	ii. 10.	
Thou Lord, in beginning	i. 10.	Jesus Christ is Lord	ii. 11.	
A little lower than angels	ii. 9.	No reputation . . . He humbled Himself	ii. 7, 8.	
Cross endured for the joy and used as example	xii. 1, 2.	Cross suffered . . . wherefore . . . exalted . . . Let this mind be in you	ii. 5, 9.	
Crucify to themselves afresh	vi. 6.	Enemies of the cross of Christ	iii. 18.	
PERFECTION (vi. 1, x. 39).		or	PERDITION (iii. 12, 19).	
Fight of afflictions (<i>athlesis</i>)	x. 32.	Strive together (<i>sunathleo</i>)	i. 27, iv. 3.	
Discernment	v. 14.	Discernment . . . differ	i. 9, 10.	
Look diligently lest . . . Esau	xii. 15.	Mark them that walk	iii. 17.	
For one morsel of meat sold his birthright	xii. 16.	Whose God is their belly	iii. 19.	
That generation—tempted God in the wilderness	iii. 7-10.	Perverse generation . . . do without murmurings	ii. 14, 15.	
Be content with such as ye have	xiii. 5.	Whatsoever state . . . content	iv. 11.	
Communicate	xiii. 16.	Communicate	iv. 14, 15.	
With such sacrifices well-pleased	xiii. 16.	Sacrifice . . . sweet smell, well-pleasing	iv. 18.	
Fruit of righteousness	xii. 11.	Fruit of righteousness	i. 11.	
Compassion in bonds	x. 34.	Partakers in bonds	i. 7.	
Whose faith follow (<i>mimeomai</i>)	xiii. 7.	Be followers together of me (<i>summimetes</i>)	iii. 17.	
Ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods	x. 34.	Let your moderation be known unto all men	iv. 5.	
You have in heaven an enduring substance (<i>huparchonta</i>)	x. 34.	Our citizenship is in heaven (<i>huparcho</i>)	iii. 20.	
Salutation from Italy	xiii. 24.	Salutation from Caesar's household	iv. 22.	
Paul's sign manual	xiii. 25.	Paul's sign manual	iv. 23.	

Need we repeat that Hebrews does not *directly* minister to the church which is the Body of Christ? What we have learned is that there is a parallel in the ways of God with His redeemed people, whether they are members of the Bride or the Body, the earthly Kingdom or the Church. And as the principle of Hebrews has been so fully developed, it

is necessary that we should acquaint ourselves with it, so that we shall perceive the true place with Philippians has in regard to the Church.

The hope of the Church cannot be taught from Philippians. There is no room for the words, “If by any means I might attain” in connexion with our blessed hope. Philippians deals with those things which *accompany* salvation, and is therefore rightly associated with a prize, with pursuing, with examples unto perfection or perdition.

No.4. “In Son.” **pp. 189 - 194**

“God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son” (Heb. i. 1, 2).

Many pages have been written in the attempt to express accurately the meaning of “sundry times” and “divers manners”, but so far as we are concerned, all we need to remember is that the Old Testament Scriptures wherein God spake to the fathers were given over a long period of time through the ministry of many prophets, and that a variety of means was adopted, law, prophecy and type bulking large. Let it suffice, with Moffatt, that “many were the forms and fashions” that God employed, or with Weymouth “in many distinct messages and by various methods” or even with Theodoret (386A.D.) “in various dispensations, *pantodapas oikonomias*”, God has spoken. What is important is that in Heb. i. 2 we are compelled to face a wondrous change and focus our attention on one glorious Person:

“Hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.”

The transition being easily visualized as follows:

- A | In sundry times (i.e. in earlier dispensations).
- B | Unto the fathers.
- C | By the prophets.
- A | In these last days (i.e. in the opening of the New Testament).
- B | Unto us (The Hebrews).
- C | By His Son.

It is interesting to see that Theodoret uses the word “dispensation” and the reader may be further interested to know that Clement of Alexandria (192A.D.) uses the word at least fifty times in his writings. The way many believers speak today of “Dispensationalism” one would think that it was some newly invented catch-word of modernism; or even the copyright slogan of *The Berean Expositor*!

“In these last days.” When Paul refers to the last days in his epistles to Timothy, he is looking down the centuries to the closing days of the present dispensation; here in

Heb. i. 2 the closing days of the Jewish dispensation are intended. The true reading of Heb. i. 2 suggests the translation "at the end of these days" (see note in *The Companion Bible*). The Rabbis divided time into "this age" or "the coming age". Peter uses the expression in Acts ii. in this sense, "for to take his words in any other sense (as some do for the last days of the world) is to make an allegation utterly impertinent and monstrous" (Dr. J. Lightfoot). Some see in "these last days" the commencement of the new dispensation which goes right on unto the Second Coming of Christ. Alford's comment on this is, "It is not of a beginning, but of an *expiring* period, the writer is speaking". The Gospel according to Matthew is most obviously a continuation of the Old Testament, the new dispensation of the grace of God awaited the resurrection of the Saviour and the commission of the apostle Paul. The parable puts it like this:

"But last of all (not first of all) He sent unto them His Son, saying, They will reverence My Son" (Matt. xxi. 37).

The sending of the Son represents therefore a climax. It is evident from the reading of the A.V. that "the Son" is placed in antithesis with "the prophets", but the reader may wonder why the word *his* is printed in italics in the A.V. Usually the italicized words in the A.V. are added by the translators, but when we remove the word "His" it leaves an unreadable phrase, "by Son". We discover that the preposition translated "by" is *en* "in", but still we may feel "in Son" to be a strange way of speaking. God did not speak *through* the Son as He had spoken *through* the prophets or even as He had spoken *in* the prophets; at last *God became incarnate*, no longer using the mouth of an Isaiah, or a Jeremiah, but partaking of human flesh and blood, God spake "IN SON". Moses, the greatest of the prophets, we learn, was after all but a *servant*, Christ is the *Son* (Heb. iii. 5, 6).

God is invisible, Christ is the image of the invisible God. No one hath seen God at any time; in Old Testament days the Word revealed Him, and in the last of the days, the Word made flesh revealed Him. Theology often mystifies, and by such unscriptural expressions as "the eternal generation of the Son" has made the Word of God of none effect. We sometimes read or hear, "The Old Testament reveals the Father. The Gospels the Son, and the Epistles the Spirit"; this is untrue. Shut up to the Old Testament, what should we know of God as *Father*? The allusions to God as a Father may be counted upon the fingers; this is true also of the Son. Sonship and Fatherhood commence together; a man is not a father until his child is born. This in no wise touches either the Deity or the pre-existence of Christ, for as the Word He was in the beginning, and was God.

When the Word *became flesh*, then His glory, as the *only begotten* of the Father, could be seen. Christ was not man when "in the form of God", but when He took upon Him "the form of a servant" He was "made in the likeness of men" (Phil. ii. 6, 7). There is need for more care than has been used among us with regard to the titles of God; how many have used the argument to belittle Christ that the Father is greater than the Son. This has power only upon the mind if the word Father and God are considered synonymous. What we need to realize more is that the invisible God has manifested Himself to us in the Person of the Father as well as in the Person of the Son, and that

while, for the purpose of His grace, one manifestation may be spoken of as greater than another, this in no wise touches the question of essential Deity.

When Scripture itself urges us to consider the fact that the Word when made flesh came down, laid aside His glory, humbled Himself, was made subject even to earthly parents, we are led to expect that the Father would be greater than He. The Son continually speaks of Himself as “the sent One” (*see* John’s Gospel), and that the words He spake, the works He wrought were not His but the Father’s Who had sent Him; and this, and so much more, is brought to notice by the omission of the articles in Heb. i. 2. If we could but appreciate the un-English expression, “God spake in Son”, understanding it as we should, “God spake in flesh”, or “was manifest in flesh”, as “in English” or “in Greek”. The Hebrew *beth*, translated mostly “in”, must be studied before the full meaning of “in Son” can be realized. Take for example Exod. vi. 3, “I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, B’EL SHADDAI”, literally in God Almighty; again, in Exod. xviii. 4, the words “the God of my father was mine help”, are literally “was in my help”.

Psa. xxxix. 6 gives an example where the translators have sought to retain the “in” by changing the words that follow, “in a vain shew”; this is literally “in image”. Another confessed instance of this *beth essential* is found in A.V. of Prov. iii. 26, “for the LORD shall be thy confidence”, literally, “in thy confidence”.

In the Person of the Son, God has not merely added another name to the long list of prophets, He has provided a Theophany, He has spoken “in Son”, and “in flesh”.

When we consider the glorious titles that are given the Son in the very next verses, we shall have the Scripture’s own comment upon the meaning of the passage before us. May the grace of God herein manifested to us be thankfully acknowledged, and may the fact that He has sent His Son be to us the greatest thing in the world. The apostle has evidently led up to this extraordinary statement that characterized the last of the days, and apparently intended to develop at once the superiority of “Him that speaketh” over all the prophets and priests, but the wonder of this Person held his ravished attention. He could not go on until he had established Him as the altogether lovely One in the eyes of his readers. It is the very focus and centre of Hebrews that all else may perish and will perish, law, priest, sacrifice, yea creation itself, but the apostle exultantly teaches that so long as He “remaineth”, all is well. Consequently we gladly bide, while this lover of Christ brings some of the glories of the Son before the eyes of the Hebrews to whom he writes. We must devote ourselves later on to the Person of the Son, but before doing so, let us follow the apostle as he begins to enlarge upon the glories and the wonders of the Saviour.

The first of His glories is that God hath appointed Him HEIR OF ALL THINGS.

“The Son, as God, hath a natural dominion over all. To this He can be no more appointed, than He can be to God” (John Owen).

Did the passage stand alone, we might feel that the “appointing” here as Heir of all things took place at the Incarnation, the Baptism or some other period of the Saviour’s earthly life, but the statement that follows “by Whom also He made the worlds” takes us back to the beginning, and so forbids such an interpretation. It should be noted that God as the “Father” has not yet been mentioned by name. It is “God” (*Elohim*) Who spoke to the fathers by the prophets, it is “God” that ultimately spake “in Son”, as it is “God” that appointed this One Who in fullness of time became flesh and Whose glory as of the Only Begotten was seen; but we are anticipating our study of the sonship of Christ. As “The Word” (John i. 1) and as “The Image” (Col. i. 15) He created heaven and earth, visible and invisible, or as John puts it “all things were made by Him”. “All things” were made by Him and “all things” constitute His inheritance. Not only so, but we shall read soon that He upholds all things by the word of His power (i. 3); that all things are put under His feet (ii. 8); that all things are for Him and by Him (ii. 10). These give some idea of the extent of His inheritance. Colossians adds more “He is before all things, and by Him all things consist” and “In all things He has the preeminence” (Col. i. 16-18). His title “The Firstborn of every creature” is but another way of saying that He is the Heir of all things. He is not only the Firstborn of every creature, He has now become the Firstborn from the dead that *in all things* He might have the pre-eminence, and so we see that “all things” embraces not only the visible and invisible universe, its sun, moon and stars, its men, angels and principalities, but the new creation of the redeemed who will one day be presented to the Father, that God may be all in all.

In Rom. iv. 17 we read that when God said to Abraham “I have made thee a father of many nations”, Abraham and Sarah were “dead” so far as parenthood was concerned; the child Isaac was not born for some years after Abraham had been *made* a father of many nations. Again, even when Isaac was born, the “many nations” were in the distant future. Now the words “I have made” of Rom. iv. 17 and the words “He hath appointed” of Heb. i. 2 are both translations of the Greek *tithemi*. The only other occurrences of *tithemi* in Hebrews are in i. 13 and x. 13 where we read of enemies being *made* a footstool. This event also is future, the Son of God sits at the right hand of God “from henceforth *expecting* till His enemies be made His footstool”. The Saviour had a glory “before the world was”, a glory which He shares with none, not even the redeemed. He also has a glory which has been given to Him in His capacity as Kinsman Redeemer. This He shares with His own:

“And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one” (John xvii. 22).

The inherent glory of the Son of God is defined in 1 Tim. vi. 16 as being unapproachable, and a glory that “no man hath seen, nor can see”. As Creator, He most obviously *possessed* by right “all things” but as Redeemer He was *appointed* to be Heir of all things. This is the glory that was given to Him, an inheritance to be shared by the many sons He brings to glory. So in Heb. i. 4 He is said to have “by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than the angels”. But who needs to be told that He Who created all things visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities or powers, has a more excellent name than His creatures? It is as the Son, the only begotten, the Man Christ Jesus, the one Mediator, that Christ was appointed to be heir of

all things, and in *that* inheritance the redeemed find their portion, even as the two typical “heads”, Noah and Abraham, are called in this epistle “heir of righteousness” and “heir of the world”. In addition to this, Heb. i. 2 says “By Whom also He made the worlds”. At first reading this added statement seems to conflict with what we have already seen. The order seems to be:

- 1.) Creation.
- 2.) Appointment as Heir of all things.

But in this verse the making of the worlds *follows* this appointment. When John revealed the fact of creation and said “the world was made by Him”, he used the Greek word *kosmos*, “world”. When writing Heb. i. 2 the word “worlds” is not the Greek *kosmos* but *aion*. Moses Stuart says “The classical use of *aion* is (1) age, period of time. (2) age of man, time of life. *Aionas* (plural) then is used here for world, worlds, universe. Theodoret explains it as meaning ages: and so others have since done.” This is strange reasoning. *Aion* means age, yet the plural means world or worlds, Theodoret and others have maintained that *aion* means “age”, therefore it means “world”! Creation is ascribed to the Lord in Heb. i. 10, but the purpose of Heb. i. 2 is to show that the same Lord is Jehovah, the God of Redemption, Whose name is His memorial for the age and unto all generations, Who is the same, yesterday, and today, and unto the ages.

In like manner, we shall see that the “ages” are in view, and not the material creation, when we come to examine Heb. xi. 3. There is a majestic sound in such phrases as “eternal salvation” and “everlasting covenant”, but we may be sacrificing precious truth by adopting this high sounding and traditional translation. One objection to the translation “He made the ages” might be that the word “made” is more suggestive of the material creation, than of ages or dispensations. It may be useful therefore to note that in Hebrews we have the verb *poieo* “to make” used many times with the sense “appoint”. “Who maketh His angels spirits”, i.e. appointed them, they were already created, the sequel being “His ministers a flame of fire”. Christ is said to have been “faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house”. The margin turns us back to a parallel usage in I Sam. xii. 6, where the phrase “advanced Moses and Aaron” employs the Hebrew word “made” (*asah*) in like manner. The “covenant *made* with the fathers” does not mean “made” in the sense of creating. “Through faith he *kept* the Passover”, means “to celebrate”, the word used in the Old Testament for keeping the Passover being *asah*. Heb. i. 2 can therefore be translated:

“By Whom also He appointed the ages”.

As to the employment of the word *aion* in Hebrews, see what light is thrown upon the Mediatorial office of the Son if we translate Heb. i. 8:

“But unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is unto the age of the age”,

pointing on to the consummation, when God shall be all in all, the Mediatorial kingdom being at last rid of all enemies (I Cor. xv. 28). In like manner “Thou art a priest unto the age”, for the office of a priest indicates the necessity for mediation, suggests that the redeemed are still at some distance, that reconciliation, in its full experimental sense is

not yet complete. It is the glory of the age purpose of God, that *at last* sacrifice and priesthood will have so completed their appointed work that they will be ended and be no longer necessary.

“The powers of the age to come” is more to the point here. When the apostle wished to speak of the “world” to come he uses an entirely different word *oikoumene* “the habitable world” (Heb. i. 5). Again, instead of reading “eternal salvation”, “eternal redemption” and the like, read:

“He became the author of age abiding salvation”
“Having obtained age abiding redemption”
“The promise of age abiding inheritance”
“The blood of the age abiding covenant”

or better still, accustom ourselves to the use of *aeonian*, a word in the English dictionary that has the merit of leaving the precise meaning of the term to be settled by the usage and context. Readers may remember Tennyson’s use of the word in his poem “In Memoriam”.

“The sounds of streams that swift or slow
Draw down aeonian hills, and sow
The dust of continents to be.”

We rejoice to know that “The child born” or “The Son given” was seen in prophetic vision by Isaiah not only as “The mighty God” but as “The Father of the age”, “Father of futurity” (Rotherham), where there is no confusion of the Persons of the Father and the Son, the title here being one of pre-eminence in relation to the ages, as “Firstborn” gives Him pre-eminence both in Creation and in the Church.

No.5. “The Brightness of His Glory.” pp. 231 - 235

One verse in the opening of this epistle to the Hebrews speaks of times past and of the prophets to whom *God* spake, and then the SON dominates the rest of the book:

“Hath in these last days spoken unto us IN SON, Whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by Whom also He made, or appointed, the *eons*”.

From now on “The Son” is supreme, and is purposely contrasted not only with the prophets of “times past”, but with all other agents until time shall be no more.

The Son is contrasted with angels (Heb. i. 5-13).

“For unto which of the angels said He *at any time*, Thou art My Son let all the angels of God *worship* Him He maketh His ministers a flame of fire BUT unto the SON He saith, Thy throne, O GOD, is unto the *eon* of the *eons* BUT to which of the angels said He *at any time*, Sit on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.”

The Son is contrasted with Moses (Heb. iii. 1-6).

“Consider Him Who was faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house Moses verily was faithful *as a servant* But Christ *as a Son* over His OWN HOUSE.”

The Son is contrasted with Aaron (Heb. iv. 14; v. 4, 5; vii. 1, 3, 28).

“Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not Himself to be made a High Priest; but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son, to day have I begotten Thee.”

“Melchisedec made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, Who is consecrated for evermore.”

This superiority of the Son is further seen by the way in which the apostle uses the comparative “better”. As a result of His Mediatorial work, which made Him for a little lower than the angels, He is now “so much better than the angels”. He is the “Surety of a better covenant (testament)” which is established on “better promises”. The Sacrifice offered by the Son of God is “better” than all that were offered under the law, and His blood speaks “better” things than that of Abel. These wondrous words as they are found in Heb. i., range themselves under different dispensational categories, which it may help us to observe.

- A | Heb. i. 2. The Son. Better than the prophets.
- B | i. 2. Heir of all things—The Lord of time.
Ages appointed ---
- C | i. 3. Brightness of glory—Before the world began.
Image of Person ---
- B | i. 3. Upholding all things—The Lord of Creation.
Purged our sins --- and Redemption.
- A | i. 4, 5. The Son. Better than the angels.

But we have no need to go further than verse 3 of chapter 1 to be faced with some of the most stupendous qualities ever ascribed to any one since time began. Continuing from the fact that God has spoken “in Son” and so commencing an entirely new and wondrous phase of Divine dealing, we learn that not only was this Son appointed Heir of all things, and the One by Whom the ages were appointed, we go on to learn more of His personal attributes.

“Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the Word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high” (verse 3).

The matter awaiting our immediate study is in the first half of verse 3, the glory that was His before the world began, in contrast with that glory which was given to Him as a consequence of His Mediatorial work making Him “better than the angels”. There is an evident distinction to be noted between the words “Who being” of verse 3 and “being made” of verse 4. “Being” is part of the verb *eimi* “to be”, “being made” is part of the

verb *ginomai* “to become”. This is no mere academic distinction, it is vital to the true understanding of these momentous verses. This distinction is observed in John i. 1 & 3:

“In the beginning *was* (*eimi* to be) the Word.”
“All things *were made* (*ginomai* to become) by Him.”

Or in John viii. 58:

“Before Abraham *was* (*ginomai*), I *am* (*eimi*).”

The glory of Heb. i. 3 is the glory which the Saviour had as The Word, The Image, the Form of God, before the creation of the world, before the beginning. The glory of Heb. i. 4 is the glory which has been given to the Saviour as a consequence of His work of Redeeming Love. In the one glory none can share, it is “unapproachable” (I Tim. vi. 16); in the other glory, the redeemed *will* share (John xvii. 22).

We must not translate the word “brightness” as though it were a reflection:

“The Son of God is, in this His essential majesty, the expression and the sole expression of the Divine light—not, as in His incarnation, its reflection” (Alford).

Apaugasma, “brightness”, does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. *Augazo* the lesser form of the word occurs in II Cor. iv. 4 where it is translated “shine”. Other variants found in the New Testament are *auge* “break of day” (Acts xx. 11); *diaugazo* “dawn” (II Pet. i. 19) and where the Received Text reads *diaphanes* “transparent”, some critical texts read *diauges* in Rev. xxi. 21. Both Paul, and the Hebrews to whom he wrote, were familiar with the writings of the Apocrypha, and so would be reminded by his words of the passage in the Wisdom of Solomon, where speaking of Wisdom it says:

“She is the breath of the power of God she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of His goodness.”

Here, the word “brightness” is the Greek *apaugasma*, and standing alone in the Apocrypha, cannot but have some bearing upon the apostle’s intention in Hebrews. Most readers have a passing acquaintance with the findings of science, even though none of us would venture to express opinions in a domain so far removed from our personal experiences. But most, if not all of our readers, will know that light is itself INVISIBLE. Should any doubt this, a few experiments would help. For example, I see the paper on which these words are being written, because the light which is coming through the window, and which falls upon the sheet of white paper before me, is reflected by the surface of the paper to my eye, but I do not see the light that is reflected as a visible beam. Again, when I see a beam of sunlight tracing its gleaming path along a passage, it would be excusable perhaps to say “that shows that light is visible, you can see the beam”. Strictly speaking, you see thousands of gleaming motes of dust floating in the path of the light. If a red hot wire be introduced into the beam of light, a dark patch will surround the wire, simply because the dust reflectors are destroyed but the *light* itself goes on. Again, we are all familiar with the term “infra red” and “ultra violet” rays. These are rays of light that lie on either side of the spectrum (the rainbow colours); they are powerful in their action, but invisible to the eye. One can therefore assume that God

Who created light and knows its nature would use it as a figure with full intention, and we can demonstrate the apostle's use of the word "brightness" by appealing to the threefold disposition of light.

The Father.	Invisible.	Likened to the infra red rays.
The Son.	God Manifest.	Likened to the central rays of the spectrum, the only part of light by which we "see".
The Holy Spirit.	Invisible.	Likened to the ultra violet rays.

The only way in which we can "see" the glory of God, is "in the face of Jesus Christ", and the passage in II Cor. iv., which makes this statement, contains the only occurrence of *augazo* in the New Testament, namely in II Cor. iv. 4.

As the epistle to the Hebrews naturally speaks of the Tabernacle, its furniture, its priesthood and its offerings, it is a thing to be expected that, if Christ is set forth as "better" than all these types and shadows, then even in this initial setting forth of His office as "the brightness of His glory" we shall have a link with the typical teaching of the Old Testament. The cherubim are called "the cherubims of glory" in association with the mercy seat (Heb. ix. 5), and Psa. lxxviii. 61 uses the word "glory" as a name for the ark, and Phinehas' wife said "the glory is departed from Israel: for the ark of God is taken" (I Sam. iv. 22). The Son of God is therefore comparable to the Shekinah glory of the tabernacle. John i. 14 tells us that He "tabernacled" among us, and Col. ii. 9 that "in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily". Moses, it will be remembered, said "I beseech Thee, show me Thy glory", but the Lord told him "Thou canst not see My face and live I will take away Mine hand, and thou shalt see My back parts: but My face shall not be seen" (Exod. xxxiii. 18-23). This request apparently arose out of the promise "My presence shall go with thee" (Exod. xxxiii. 14). Although it was made clear to Moses here that he could not see the face of God and live, yet in the same chapter we read "And the LORD spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" (Exod. xxxiii. 11). These words seem to involve a contradiction. Verse 11 says that the Lord spake face to face with Moses, yet verse 20 says "Thou canst not see My face and live". The reader will readily call to mind other apparent contradictions. Jacob said:

"I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved" (Gen. xxxii. 30),

yet John i. 18 categorically denies that anyone at any time has ever seen God. In Numb. xii. 8 the Lord said concerning Moses:

"With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the LORD shall he behold".

"Apparently" is the translation of the Hebrew *mareh* "pattern" (Num. viii. 4); "appearance" (Num. ix. 15); "countenance" (Jud. xiii. 6) and Ezek. i. 26 "the appearance of" a man. The pattern was shown to Moses in the mount, and the comment in Heb. viii. 5 shows that all these "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things". The "appearance" of Numb. ix. 15 is the presence of the Lord rendered terrible

by the “appearance of fire”. When the parents of Samson realized that “the man of God, whose countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God” was indeed “The angel of the Lord” they said “we shall surely die, because we have seen God”. We remember how that at Peniel, where Jacob saw God “face to face”, we are told “a man” wrestled with him, which Hosea xii. 4 interprets as an “angel”. The word “appearance” comes over and over again in the opening visions of Ezekiel’s prophecy. Describing the “likeness” of the four living creatures, Ezekiel said “And this was their appearance; they had the likeness of a man” (Ezek. i. 5), and throughout the wondrous and perplexing imagery of these chapters that “likeness of a man” persists, and at the close of chapter i. the prophet said:

“And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of A MAN above upon it this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD” (Ezek. i. 26-28).

Let it be noted, Ezekiel saw the “likeness” of the firmament, the “likeness” of the throne, the “likeness” of the glory of the Lord. He even says:

“Upon the LIKENESS of the throne was the LIKENESS as the APPEARANCE of a man above upon it”.

Not merely “likeness”, but “likeness of appearance” stressing the interposition of type, shadow and similitude. The description of this man is striking:

“And I saw as the colour of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of One that spake” (Ezek. i. 27, 28).

Note again, Ezekiel is careful to say that what he saw was “as” the colour of amber, it was “as” the appearance of fire. He does not say he saw the “loins” of this man but “the appearance” of his loins. There can be no possible doubt that the vision granted to Ezekiel and the vision granted to John are of the same blessed Person.

“In the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of Man His eyes were as a flame of fire; and His feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace and when I saw Him, I fell at His feet as dead” (Rev. i. 13-17).
“The similitude of the LORD shall he behold” (Numb. xii. 8).

Just as Col. ii. :2, 3 declares that the mystery of God is solved in the person of Christ, so the apparent contradictions cited above of the experience of Moses, of Jacob, of Manoah and of Ezekiel, are all resolved into harmony by the revelation of Heb. i. 3, that He, Who in fullness of time was made flesh, was from the creation of the world, “God Manifest” even as later He stooped to become “God manifest in the flesh”. The brightness of His glory is followed by “the express image of His person”, an equally mighty theme that must occupy our worshipping attention in another article.

THE KEY OF KNOWLEDGE

OR

DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH

pp. 41 - 60

Supposing the reader is sure that “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God”, and that he is logical enough to believe that inasmuch as the Gospel according to Matthew is a part of “all Scripture”, it is therefore with the rest equally “inspired”, we ask the question would it be wise or right to decide to distribute freely among the unsaved the Gospel according to Matthew? We can well understand that such a question will be met in many cases with a most decided token of objection, and we hasten to assure the reader that no attack is being made on the Scriptures or on the Gospel according to Matthew, but that a serious objection is being laid against their “indiscriminate” use. Continuing our supposition, let us say that a copy of this Gospel according to Matthew has been placed in the hands of an unsaved man with the assurance that this Gospel is indeed and in truth the Word of God. He discovers that “everlasting life” is found in Matt. xix. 16, 29 and xxv. 46, and accordingly, being intensely interested, he reads these passages in the hope that the way of everlasting life may be made clear. He is somewhat disturbed to read the question,

“Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal (everlasting) life?”

and is even more disturbed to read the Lord’s answer,

“If thou wilt enter into life KEEP THE COMMANDMENTS,”

and he is not left in doubt concerning what commandments are in view (xix. 16-22). While pondering this legal and unattainable qualification for everlasting life he observes a second reference in the same chapter, and with some hope of discovering terms within his powers, reads:

“And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My name’s sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life” (xix. 29),

and is hard put to it to decide which of the two sets of conditions are the more difficult or the more hopeless. In any case he is not at all sure that these passages are “good tidings” so far as he is concerned. However, he learns that *one other* pronouncement on this vital theme is found in chapter twenty-five, and accordingly discovers that those who are denominated “the righteous”, who go into “life eternal” (everlasting), are those of the nations who have treated the Lord’s brethren with kindness, even though they confessed that they had no idea at the time that they were doing such acts unto the Lord Himself. In no instance is faith in exercise or the finished work of Christ in view, but in each case some element of merit is prominent. He can gain everlasting life by “keeping” the ten commandments, or by “forsaking” home and land, or by “ministering” to the

Lord's brethren, without consciously ministering unto Him, and he is rightly puzzled. There is one answer to this and every similar perplexity. There is a

KEY OF KNOWLEDGE

which a misguided prejudice has hidden from both tract distributors and seeking sinner, and that key is the much abused and much misrepresented

DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH.

Anyone who has been rightly taught, discriminates one part of Holy Scripture from another. Such *honour* the Word by believing implicitly ALL that it says. A *discriminate* believer, that is to say one who appreciates *dispensational truth*, would believe, *without reservation*, the limitations imposed on Matthew's Gospel by the words:

“Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not:
But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”
“I AM NOT SENT but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (x. 5, 6; xv. 24).

He would know of another gospel which speaks of and to “the other sheep”, which were not of “this fold”, namely, the Gospel according to John, and there, the seeking sinner would find in such passages as John iii. 15, 16, 36; v. 24; vi. 40, 47 and x. 28 that everlasting life is the unmerited gift of God, received upon believing His Son. Matthew is as equally inspired as is John, but it is not sufficient to believe II Tim. iii. 16 concerning “all scripture”, we must also as assuredly believe II Tim. ii. 15 and “rightly divide the word of truth” if we would be “unashamed” workmen, and ashamed will all be who indiscriminately use Matthew where John is dispensationally indicated, or in any other way fail to use this divinely given Key of Knowledge.

Before we elaborate this important principle of interpretation, let us be sure of our material, the words employed and their usage and meaning. The word “dispensation” occurs in the A.V. four times, and translates the Greek word *oikonomia*. This has come over into English in the form *economy*.

Oikonomia is a compound made up of *oikos* “house” and *nemo* “to administer”, its usage extending much further than the limits of domestic economy, but never completely losing sight of its homely origin. No examination of the word *oikonomia* can be considered complete or trustworthy that ignores the fact that it was in use in the Septuagint Version for over two hundred years before the N.T. was written. The usage in the LXX must of necessity influence the usage in the N.T. and moreover, by consulting the LXX we can turn back to the Hebrew O.T. and observe what Hebrew words were translated by *oikonomia* and *oikonomos* in that ancient version. In Isa. xxii. 19 and 21 the LXX uses *oikonomia* to translate two Hebrew words:

“I will drive thee from thy station” (Heb *matsab*).
“I will commit thy government (Heb. *memshalah*) into his hand.”

Shebna had been treasurer “over the house”. He was to be deprived of his office, and Eliakim the son of Hilkiah was to be installed in his place. What this office of *oikonomia* involved can be seen by the language used in verses 21 and 22:

“And I will clothe him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand: and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder, so he shall open and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none open.”

Matsab means station or garrison (I Sam. xiii. 23). In other forms it means to stand as a watchman (Isa. xxi. 8); a prefect or deputy (I Kings iv. 19). *Memshalah* means rule, dominion (Gen. i. 16), *mashal* (Gen. iii. 16). This word *oikonomia* is the one translated “dispensation” in I Cor. ix. 17; Eph. i. 10; iii. 2; Col. i. 25, and the associations of *oikonomia* and their Hebrew equivalents *must be kept in mind* when we come to the N.T. occurrences of this term. *Oikonomos*, i.e. the person who exercises this rule, and translated “steward” in Luke xvi. 1 and in I Cor. iv. 1, 2, is found eight times in the LXX version; two being found in the book of Esther, three in I Kings and three in II Kings. In Esther viii. 9 *oikonomos* translates the word “lieutenant” which in its turn is the Persian *achashdarpenim* “satrap”, which is found in Ezra viii. 36; Esther iii. 12; viii. 9 and ix. 3. In the plural this Persian word is translated “princes” in Daniel where it occurs nine times. This Persian word is translated in the LXX *dioiketes* Ezra viii. 36, *oikonomos* Esther viii. 9, *strategos* Esther iii. 12, *turanos* Esther ix. 3, *toparches* Dan. iii. 2, *hupatos* Dan. iii. 2, 3; vi. 7. *Dioiketes* means a treasurer, from *dioikes* to keep house, to manage affairs, to administer; *strategos* refers to a military leader, a “Captain”; *turanos* a tyrant, sovereign; *toparches* a governor, one who rules over a place (*topos*); *hupatos* supreme, a consul. Here, therefore, is the background of the term that emerges in the N.T. as a “dispensation”. It will be seen that it is no synonym for the ages, times or seasons. To speak of “ages and dispensations” however is not correct, for the ages are not simply the duration or flight of time, they give the *characteristics* of any one or more segregated periods during which the Lord deals with men, nations or assemblies, in some manner peculiar to the times. Old Testament usage, as we have seen, conjures up in the mind either a public official, or a house manager, a combination of Treasurer, Ruler, Consul, General, Satrap, Prince, Governor, all of which when extraneous characteristics are eliminated can be expressed in the one word “Steward”.

We now turn to the N.T. remembering that the language of the Greek N.T. is strongly influenced by the Greek version of the O.T. What *oikonomos* or *oikonomia* mean to the Greek-speaking Jew at the time of the advent of Christ, would be the meaning he would be supposed to attach to them, when for the first time he came across them in the Gospels and the Epistles, unless an inspired warning were given, telling of a change of meaning that must now be accepted. Of the four gospels, Luke’s is the only one in which the Greek words *oikonomeo*, *oikonomia* or *oikonomos* are used. These three words occur nineteen times. Of these, eight occur in Luke, ten are found in Paul’s epistles, and one only in Peter. The first reference is Luke xii. 42:

“Who then is that faithful and wise STEWARD (*oikonomos*), whom his Lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season?”

The particular concern of this steward is “rightly to divide” the portion allotted to each of the household. This is expressed in two ways, (1) “to give their portion of meat”; (2) “in due season”. *Sitometrion* is a compound of *sitos* “corn” and *metron* “measure”. Theophrastus, a disciple of Plato, when describing “a mean, sordid” persons, says “he will himself measure out the usual allowance to his domestics”. The custom was observed also among the Hebrews. Where the A.V. reads “feed me with food convenient for me” (Prov. xxx. 8), the margin reads, “Heb. of my allowance”. The only occurrences of *sitometreo* in the LXX are in Gen. xlvii. 12, 14:

“And Joseph nourished (*sitometreo*) his father, and his brethren, and all his father’s household, with bread, according to their families.”

In verse 14, the LXX reads:

“And Joseph gathered all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and the land of Canaan, in return for the corn which they bought, and he distributed corn (*sitometreo*) to them.”

Here it will be observed, Joseph is acting as an *oikonomos*, a steward, and he dispenses the food not only in amount but in quality, according as it would be appropriate for Jacob himself, for his brethren and for the household, *siton kata soma*, literally “corn according to body” or “corn suited to each person”. In this we have an early illustration of “dispensational truth” which takes into account the different ranks, and spheres of blessing, and also sees to it that *babes* have milk and *adults* have a full diet. Paul as a steward of the mysteries of God most carefully observed this essential rule, as may be seen in his reference to “babes and full grown” in I Cor. iii. 2, Heb. v. 11-14, Eph. iv. 14. In the fourteenth verse of the forty-seventh chapter of Genesis we see Joseph as a faithful steward, faithfully and honestly distributing the corn in exchange for the money taken for that purpose, and our mind immediately travels down the age to the unfaithful steward who said to his Lord’s debtors “How much owest thou? write down fifty” or “four score”.

This parable gives us the first occurrence of the Greek words *oikonomia* and *oikonomos*, which are found together in Luke xvi:

“There was a certain rich man, which had a steward (*oikonomos*); and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. And he called him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy stewardship (*oikonomia*); for thou mayest be no longer steward. Then the steward said within himselfmy Lord taketh away from me my stewardship when I am put out of the stewardship” (Luke xvi. 1-4).

Here we have three occurrences of *oikonomos* “steward” and three of *oikonomia* “stewardship”. The duties of this steward are manifest. He occupied a position of trust. He shared that position with no one else. He had control of the goods of his master, and could, if he were dishonest, alter the terms of contract between his lord and his lord’s debtors. The charge laid against this steward is that he had “wasted” his master’s goods. *Diaskorpizo* means to scatter (Luke i. 51), and one of the other meanings given in the Lexicons is “to DISPERSE”, the very opposite of “to DISPENSE”, for this is to

dispense in an evil sense. The preacher and teacher who boasts that he has no room for “hair-splitting” or for “ultra-dispensationalism” often ignores the distinctive dispensational features of the Scriptural message, e.g. “I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. xv. 24), “other sheep I have which are not of this fold” (John x. 16), “now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision” (Rom. xv. 8), “They gave to me (Paul) and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship: that WE should go to the GENTILES, and THEY unto the CIRCUMCISION” (Gal. ii. 9), “I Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles” (Eph. iii. 1), and dissipates or indiscriminately scatters to all and sundry, instead of giving “convenient” food in “due season”. This time note “in due season” it will be remembered was used of the faithful steward in Luke xii. 42, and is employed by the apostle Paul when speaking of the truth entrusted to him. It is a solemn fact that the preacher or teacher who ignores “the due season” will as surely dissipate the truth entrusted to him, as will the man who consciously handles the Word of God deceitfully. Dispensational Truth therefore is Truth for the Times.

We move now from the Gospel of Luke to the epistles of Paul, and there we find the word *oikonomos* used as follows “Erastus the *chamberlain* of the city” (Rom. xvi. 23). The R.V. replaces the word chamberlain by the word *treasurer*. In either case Erastus occupied a position of trust, that involved both the disposition of money and of service, and was used by the same apostle that had already applied the title *oikonomos* to himself (I Cor. iv. 1), and was to claim a special *oikonomia* as the Prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles (Eph. iii. 1). If Erastus of Rom. xvi. is the same as the Erastus of II Tim. iv. 20, it appears that he was the chamberlain of the city of Corinth. One feature which is almost too obvious to mention, but which the undispensational treatment of Scripture makes necessary, is that Erastus was chamberlain of *one particular city*. He had not right to interfere with the finances and the laws of any other city. Peter, James and John recognized this essential feature (Gal. ii. 7-9) but alas, dispensational frontiers have been so indiscriminately crossed and re-crossed to-day, that it is now considered to be a mark of enlightenment to say that they do not exist, except in the minds of those who hold the so called “Coles-Bullinger-Welch heresy”. Before Romans was written, Paul addressed two epistles to the city of Corinth, where Erastus exercised his office as *oikonomos*.

“Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and *stewards* of the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required in *stewards* that a man be found faithful” (I Cor. iv. 1, 2).

Let it be noticed and remembered, that the first time Paul uses the title “steward” of himself, he links it with the word *mysterion* “mystery”. The fitness of this we shall see in all its fullness when we come to the epistles of the Mystery, Ephesians and Colossians. The R.V. reads “mystery” instead of “testimony” in I Cor. ii. 1, as also does the revised text by Westcott and Hort. In chapters ii. and iii. we have a demonstration of the faithful stewardship of the mysteries of God entrusted to the apostle. The Corinthians were critical of the apostle’s manner of speech saying it was “contemptible” (II Cor. x. 10) and Paul was exceedingly sensitive to this criticism, so much so, that he reveals that he was with them in fear and much trembling (I Cor. ii. 3). This admission is bounded on either side by a reference to his “speech”.

“And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom declaring the MYSTERY of God,”

and then goes on to reveal something of the cause of his anxiety. Apparently the Corinthians, like many others, were desirous of having their ears tickled with high sounding phrases, but, said the Apostle, I resolved to limit my message among you, to “Jesus Christ and Him crucified”, even though he knew that by so doing he would arouse their antipathy. “Howbeit”, he continued, “we speak wisdom among them that are perfect we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery”. In chapter three he returns to this limitation which he had imposed upon himself saying:

“And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk and not with meat” (I Cor. iii. 1, 2).

The subject matter of Inspired Scripture is so vast that the reader, in order to comprehend with any clearness both the matter and the application of its teaching, naturally and rightly subdivides the material before him, arranging the teaching of the Word under such headings as:

- (1) Doctrinal Truth, e.g. “Justification by faith”.
- (2) Practical Truth, e.g. “Walk worthy of the vocation”.
- (3) Prophetic Truth, e.g. “The coming of the Lord”.
- (4) Church Truth, e.g. “The church which is His Body”.
- (5) Kingdom Truth, e.g. “The kingdom of heaven”.

We can well understand that both those who agree with us and those who do not, may say “Where in this list is DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH? why is *that* omitted?” It has been omitted with intent, for Dispensational Truth *cannot* share with any of these subdivisions, for ALL *Truth is Dispensational*, there is no other, and unless and until doctrine is correctly related with the dispensation which at the moment obtains, such a doctrine will be rendered false. Practice flows out of doctrine. Practice is the fruit of which doctrine is the root. I cannot “walk worthy of the *vocation*” of Ephesians, until I know wherein that vocation consists, and to know that, I must know its dispensational setting, otherwise I shall, as a member of one calling, attempt to put into practice the walk that is worthy of another, and end in confusion.

The bulk of prophetic truth pertains to Israel as a people, to Israel’s Messiah, and to the land and kingdom associated with the promises made to Abraham and to David. Until I, as a Gentile, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger from the covenants of promise, having no “fathers” in the Scriptural sense, see my true dispensational place, I shall be tempted to appropriate prophetic statements to myself, to distort the Scriptures so that where they say “Israel” I shall say “church” (as the headings of some chapters in the prophets of the A.V. actually do), and refer to chapters such as Matt. xxiv. and I Thess. iv., or passages in Daniel and the Revelation, as though they all speak of the blessed hope of the church of the *parenthetical dispensation* of the Mystery.

THERE IS NO TRUTH THAT IS NOT DISPENSATIONAL.

The attitude of many critics is therefore not only misleading but fatal. The cry “ultra-dispensationalism” which apparently is the battle cry of many of the self-styled defenders of the Faith, has really the same effect as the veil, by which the god of this world blinds the eye of the believer, dangling in front of him Scriptures that belong *to another* calling in order that he shall not see the truth *of his own*. That friendly person who says in effect: “Dispensational Truth is just a ‘bee in the bonnet’ of certain teachers, particularly followers of Dr. Bullinger and of Charles H. Welch. We do not object to you entertaining this peculiar idea, providing you keep it to yourself, and soft pedal this aspect of your teaching, allowing us to continue our mixture of Jew, Gentile and Church of God, heavenly places, earth, Jerusalem, body, bride and the like, and to continue in that state of ‘bliss where it is folly to be wise’ ” is but helping to veil the eyes of the believer. It is our conviction, which we hope to demonstrate in these pages, that Dispensational Truth, instead of being the pet theory of a fanatical few, is “the key of knowledge” which tradition, orthodoxy and “churchianity” have hidden from the seeking believer.

EVERY WORD NEEDED AND UNALTERED IS OUR CLAIM.

One great claim of those whose studies are *guided* and *guarded* by Dispensational Truth is, that under this system of interpretation, and under *this system alone*, every word that is written in Holy Scripture is seen to be necessary, not one statement needs to be altered, modified or omitted. Jew will always mean Jew, the Israel of God will not mean the church, Gentile will always mean Gentile. The meek that inherit *the earth*, cannot be the same company whose blessings are “in heavenly places”; the Church which is “the Perfect *Man*” (*aner*, male, bridegroom, husband) cannot be “the *Bride* the Lamb’s *wife*”. We therefore re-arrange the list set out on page 46 to show that the different subdivisions of truth are all subdivisions of the one great all-covering principle—Dispensational Truth.

«-----DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH-----»

Doctrinal Truth	Practical Truth	Prophetic Truth	Church Truth	Kingdom Truth
Law and Grace	Calling or walk	Israel or lo-ammi	Body or Bride	Kingdom of God or Kingdom of Heaven

It must be our privilege and our responsibility to consider these items and to show that apart from Dispensational Truth we are always liable to confound things that differ and to affirm as present truth that which has waxed old and is vanishing away.

By *dispensational truth* therefore we mean that particular revelation of God’s will to man during some particular administration or economy, and specially appertaining thereto. When we speak of some teaching or practice as being *undispensational*, we mean that owing to the introduction of a new administration, certain things that obtained under a previous regime have become obsolete. By the term *undispensational* teaching, therefore, we mean that the teaching peculiar to one dispensation has been imported into

another and differing dispensation, where the conditions of divine dealing render the practical application of such teaching quite inadmissible.

What do we mean by Doctrinal Truth? Doctrinal truth is concern with sin, salvation, justification and the like and from one point of view it would seem that such things remain unaltered by changes of dispensation. That this is not so, let Paul testify as he does in the epistle to the Galatians:

“Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing Christ is become of none effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace” (Gal. v. 1-4).

While Christ changes not, an undispensational view of the law, or of the imposition of the rite of circumcision, can make the finished work of Christ PROFITLESS and of NONE EFFECT! Who, after this, will say that dispensational truth can be ignored, or opposed with impunity? What a dilemma those are in who have no place for dispensational truth! If dispensational distinctions mean nothing to them, then such are in this awful predicament. Like the Galatians, if they *do not* submit to the rite of circumcision, they must be cut off from His people (Gen. xvii. 14) and if they *do* they fall from grace, and Christ profits them nothing. They are like the landless fugitive, having no claim to either heaven or earth, kingdom or church. The apostle Paul had no two thoughts about the bearing of dispensational truth in the place of the law and of the gospel. In his epistles the old covenant is called the “letter” that “killeth”, whereas the new covenant is the “spirit” that gives “life”. Yet *both* covenants are of God, and if Scripture is not to be “rightly divided” we must straddle this fence and juggle with law and grace until the day of doom. The Apostle calls the law “the administration of death” and its glory, something that was to be “done away”. He compares and contrasts the fading glory of the “face of Moses” with the knowledge of the glory of God in the “face of Jesus Christ”. *The law of Moses* is as fully inspired as is *the Gospel of Christ*, yet dispensational truth transfers the believer from the *Truth* that condemns, to the *Truth* that saves, and it is sad to realize that some in their antagonism to what they do not understand are actually assisting the god of this world, who veils the eye of the believer, forcing him to look at Truth that has become obsolete, so that Truth for the time shall neither be seen nor appreciated (II Cor. iv. 3, 4). Dispensational truth translates us “from glory to glory”, from the *fading* glory of the law to the *permanent* glory of the gospel. Who then will deny its efficacy and its grace?

Let us take one special feature of the law that is strongly urged upon the believer to-day; either from one extreme by such as the Seventh Day Adventists, or from another by the Lord’s Day Observance Society. Dispensational Truth alone puts both in their right place, and in no other way can these contrary claims on our obedience be really set aside. Among the explicit commands of God is the observance of the Sabbath day. It is an integral part of the ten commandments, its observance was not left to private judgment, and disobedience was punished by death.

“Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people” (Exod. xxxi. 14).

“And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day and the Lord said, The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp” (Numb. xv. 32-35).

How do you react to these passages of God’s Word? Should the reader make *the slightest movement* in the direction of the idea, that since the law was given by Moses, grace and truth has been brought in by Jesus Christ, he will be unwittingly advocating the supremacy of Dispensational Truth as a deciding factor and that it is indeed the key of knowledge. If we believe that consequent upon the resurrection of Christ, the first day of the week takes the place of the seventh, then we shall be sheltering under the much vilified protection of Dispensational truth, even though there is no evidence that the Lord’s Day of Rev. i. 10 refers to any day of the week, but much evidence to show that it refers to the great prophetic “Day of the Lord”.

If we deny the validity of dispensational truth, we must admit two things:

- (1) We are guilty of such disobedience that we should have been stoned to death long ago.
- (2) We have no scriptural and logical answer to the questions Why has this penalty not been enforced? or Has God failed as a Law-Giver?

Before leaving this subject, let us return to the verses quoted from Exodus and Numbers, and see for ourselves that the “key” is there waiting for us all the time and easy to be seen had prejudice not blinded our eyes. The words printed in italics constitute the dispensational items which completely and righteously exonerate all believers *to-day* from either the obedience to, or the penalty for breaking, this law.

“Speak thou also unto the *Children of Israel*, saying Verily My sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a *sign between Me and you* throughout your generations: that ye may know that I am the LORD that doth *sanctify you*. Ye shall keep the sabbath *therefore*; for it is holy *unto you* *It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel for ever*” (Exod. xxxi. 13, 14, 17).

The wards of this key of knowledge are visible to all: the Children of Israel, the sign between Me and you, the sanctifying of you, the consequence “therefore”, the pointed words “unto you”. No Gentile, called during this day of grace, called during the period of Israel’s dispersion, called during the parenthetical dispensation of the Mystery, called after Acts xxviii. 28, called while Israel are *lo-ammi* “not My people”, can have the remotest connexion with these words quoted from Exod. xxxi. or from Numb. xv. Before, therefore, any doctrine of the Scripture can be considered obligatory upon us, or addressed to us, we should seek an answer to the following questions:

- (1) Is the commandment addressed to Israel?
- (2) Is the commandment found in Paul’s epistles?
- (3) If so, is it found in epistles written before Acts xxviii., while the Jew was still “first”?
- (4) Or is it found only in those epistles written by the Apostle as the “Prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles” after the present dispensation came into force (Eph. iii. 1)?

When we have arrived at a Scriptural answer to these questions dispensational truth will either open or shut the door, give entrance or forbid access according to whether the command does or does not belong to the present economy.

“To whom, when, where and why” are the wards on this key of all truth. Quite a number of the Lord’s people sweep aside all these questions as unprofitable, and say that all they are interested in is “practice”. These are the people who seem to have a great fondness for “brass tacks” for calling a “spade a spade” the very opposite of these fantastic hair splitters, known by the unworthy title “Ultra-dispensationalists”. Let us face this matter squarely. Christian practice arises out of Christian doctrine. The Christian doctrine of grace differs from Mosaic doctrine of law, consequently before we can “practice” we must know what is our calling, whether we are under law or under grace, whether we are dispensationally a “wild olive graft contrary to nature” into the olive tree of Israel (Rom. xi.), or whether we belong to that newly created “one new man” the other side of the demolished “middle wall of partition” (Eph. ii.).

One word employed in the Scriptures to designate “practice” is the word “walk”. This is true under law or under grace, but surely the walk enjoined upon those who were under the law cannot be the same as the walk of those who are under grace, for the full statement of this practical outworking of truth is that all such “walk” must be worthy. Now the word worthy (*axios*) suggests the beam of a balance, a correspondence, an equivalence, and following the exhortation of Eph. iv. 1, the walk enjoined must be “worthy”, it must correspond with the “vocation” or “calling”. We must believe and know Eph. i.-iii. before we can do and follow iv.-vi. Until a builder sees and studies the plans that have been drawn up and approved, he cannot commence “work”. Should he “saw” wood, “lay” bricks, or execute any other of the processes involved in building before consulting his plans, he would but waste precious time and material. In the same way, a believer who does not know his calling cannot walk “worthy” of it. It is useless to stress Eph. iv.-vi. when Eph. i.-iii. is either ignored, misunderstood or denied. If we place ourselves in the Acts of the Apostles, with its *two* baptisms we shall find it impossible implicitly to accept the *one* baptism of Eph. iv. We shall find ourselves attempting to explain away this insistence on “one”. We repeat our contention that when once we accept the all covering authority of dispensational truth we need *all* that is written, just *as* it is written, *to* whom it is written, without alteration, modification or private interpretation. Practice is the *fruit*, Doctrine is the *root*, the character of both depends upon the tree that has been planted, the soil in which its roots are fed, the climate that decides the growth and produce. In other words both doctrine and practice are governed and decided by the dispensation to which they belong. I have seen date palms and orange trees growing in the open garden of a friend, but if I imagined that it was mere “ultra-horticulturalism” to tell me that a back garden in a London suburb was “all one and the same” as a vineyard in the South of France, nature would go its own way in spite of all my labour, prayers and so-called “faith”. *I should get no fruit*. Such gardening would have ignored time, place and condition, in other words, it would be undispensational to attempt to grow plants whose habitat is so different from the one I know. Some objectors to dispensational truth adopt the attitude that so long as we are

“sincere” we can afford to ignore all this “hair-splitting”. However, on one occasion I was able to demonstrate the futility of such “sincerity”. I was standing in a bus queue, and a man in front of me made it known that he wanted a bus to X. I said to him in effect, “however sincerely you may *believe*, however *convinced* you may be that all the rest of the queue are wrong and you alone right, you will never arrive at X if you wait here, *there* is your bus, and that is your queue, some fifty yards further along the street”. Happily this particular person did not airily wave my information aside as “mere dispensational hair-splitting”. The fact that he had his return ticket or his fare, the fact that he was a believer in buses, the fact that he sincerely hoped to get to X, all was of nothing worth *while he stood in the wrong queue*. In like manner neither doctrinal nor practical truth come into the picture until dispensational truth adjusts the focus.

What is true of doctrine and practice is equally true of prophecy and its interpretation. The prophecy of Isaiah is concerning Judah and Jerusalem (Isa. i. 1) and the primary interpretation of this prophecy must relate to that people of that city. The application of its teaching when tempered by true dispensational understanding opens its treasures for all believers, but the rule remains unchanged, namely, that while all Scripture is FOR our learning, not all Scripture is TO us or ABOUT us. Callings must be discriminated. It is impossible within the limits of this article to attempt a survey of prophecy, as a whole, we will therefore limit ourselves to the consideration of one important phase of prophetic truth, namely the Second Coming of Christ. Matt. xxiv. is the sequel to early chapters of that same gospel. There Christ is seen as “born King of the Jews”, in Bethlehem, the city of David. Before Him, in fulfillment of Isa. xl., went John the Baptist. The temptation in the wilderness reaches its climax in the vision of the kingdom and glory of the world. When the disciples used the expression “the end of the world” (Matt. xxiv. 3) the *sunteleia*, they used a well-known term, found in Exod. xxiii. 16 “the feast of the ingathering”. While all attempts to compute the date of the second coming of the Lord are forbidden, two periods of time are nevertheless given in Matt. xxiv. The second coming of that prophetic chapter will take place “AFTER the tribulation” (Matt. xxiv. 29, see verse 21) and DURING the last week of Dan. ix. (Matt. xxiv. 15; Dan. ix. 27). These items provide a dispensational test that must not be ignored, and effectually prevent us from reading into Matt. xxiv. the hope of the church of the Mystery. Again, it is not the teaching of this chapter that all nations will have been *evangelized* before the end comes, but that “*this* gospel of the *kingdom*” shall be preached in all the *oikoumene* (the prophetic earth) for a *witness* unto all nations (Matt. xxiv. 14). Those who accept the Divine rule of dispensational truth, have no need to alter mentally “this gospel of the kingdom” with its miraculous signs, to “the gospel of the grace of God” without miraculous gifts, they do not stretch the limited word *oikoumene* to include the ends of the earth, they do not alter the words “for a witness” to read “unto salvation” or “unto everlasting life”. Dispensational truth rejoices to accept without alteration or demur, every word given by inspiration of God. Can one ask for more? *Can those who deny dispensational truth say as much?* Rom. xv. says of the hope that was before the church during the Acts period, and while Israel were still a people, and while the Jew was still first:

“There shall be a root of Jesse, and He that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles: in Him shall the Gentiles trust (hope, *elpizo*). Now the God of hope (*elpis*) fill you with all joy and peace in believing” (Rom. xv. 12, 13).

While Isa. xi. contains a gracious promise, the Millennial conditions there anticipated and shared by the Church during the Acts are not, and cannot be the hope of the church of the Mystery. Again I Thess. iv., with its insistence on “the archangel” links the phase of the second coming with Israel, for Michael the archangel stands for Israel (Dan. x. 21; xii. 1, 2). In like manner the second coming of I Cor. xv. 52 is related to “the last trump”. The hope of the Mystery, set out in Col. iii. 1-4, “the manifestation in glory” is a fitting climax to those promises that speak of heavenly places, far above all (Eph. i. 20, 21) and is a different aspect of that coming that is intended by the words “in the air” (I Thess. iv. 17), and “on the Mount of Olives” (Acts i. 11; Zech. xiv. 4). Hope in Scripture is either the *realization* of a *calling*, or the *fulfillment* of a *promise*, and the Church of the Mystery, is entirely disconnected with the promises made unto the fathers (Eph. ii. 12) whereas this was the prerogative of Israel (Rom. ix. 3-5). Dispensational Truth recognizes that Israel is the key to prophetic truth while they are a “people” before God, the promises made to the fathers, the Millennial glories, the Headship and Kingly-Priesthood of Israel must colour the hope set before the believer. When Israel became *lo-ammi* (not my people) in fulfillment of Hosea i. 9, iii. 1-4, Israel the appointed channel of blessing being temporarily removed, God introduced the dispensation of the Mystery, using the apostle Paul as the Prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, as the mouth-piece to “make all men see” (Eph. iii. 1-14; Col. i. 23-27). We cannot expect to walk worthy of this calling, or to know what is the hope of this calling (Eph. i. 18; iv. 1) if we persist in ignoring the distinction that Scripture makes between the purpose of God with Israel as a people, and the purpose of God while Israel are scattered abroad in unbelief—in other words if we persist in ignoring the sovereign rights of Dispensational Truth in the realm of its interpretation of Holy Scripture. What has been said along this line is enough to convince any who will examine the matter without bias, and to multiply examples will not necessarily strengthen the argument, and so there we must leave this aspect of the matter. It might however be, that where the reader will not listen to the arguments we have brought forward, he may feel obliged to listen to the example of his Lord. Consequently, we ask him to turn to the record of the Saviour’s opening ministry, as recorded in Luke iv., and see for himself that the Lord recognized dispensational truth.

“And He came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read.

And there was delivered unto Him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when He had opened the book, He found the place where it is written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised.

To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.

And He closed the book, and He gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on Him.

And He began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears” (iv. 16-21).

The passage quoted by the Lord is Isa. lxi. 1, 2. If we turn to that passage we shall see that the second verse continues “and the day of vengeance of our God”. Consequently the Saviour broke off His reading at the first sentence, and the comma found in the A.V. of Isa. lxi. 2 represents a period of nineteen hundred years at the very least, for the day of vengeance *has not yet come*. Had the Lord continued with the second sentence of this second verse, *He could not* have said “*This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*” but He graciously honoured the principle of “Right Division” (II Tim. ii. 15). He accepted the key of interpretation “Dispensational Truth” and reserved the “Day of Vengeance” for His Olivet prophecy (Luke xxi. 22).

Two important facts emerge from our Lord’s use of Isa. lxi.

- (1) Stopping as He did when reading verse 2, He acknowledges the dispensation principle.
- (2) Quoting the remainder in His prophetic reference to His second coming, He showed that while Dispensational Truth divides the truth according to its legitimate time and place, *it never denies* that at the appointed time all must be fulfilled. “That all things which are written may be fulfilled” is only completely realized when dispensational truth is allowed its full force and sway.

While much more could be brought forward from the Scriptures, we believe sufficient Scriptural data has been placed before the reader, to justify, at the least, a suspension of judgment until all the implications of these examples are weighed in the balances of the Sanctuary. The one grand principle of interpretation is that given by Paul to Timothy, namely, “Rightly Divide the Word of Truth” (II Tim. ii. 15). A principle that distinguishes spheres of blessing, character of calling and the different ways that God has dealt with men since Adam fell, while the purpose of the ages has been unfolded and the stages in the attainment of the goal of Redeeming Love have succeeded one another; in which Patriarchal rule has been succeeded by Law, Kingdom by Church, and all making a perfect and harmonious whole; wherein no discordance can be heard, no contradiction tolerated, no confusion admitted, but where all is seen as the worthy product of Infinite Wisdom, Love and Grace, where all Truth resolves itself into DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH in which, while there may be “differences of administrations” it is “the same Lord” and “the same God which worketh all in all”.

Dispensational truth has something deeper and richer than an academic interest, it is essentially

TRUTH FOR THE TIMES

If the reader has followed the argument of this article so far, he will have arrived at the conclusion, that each dispensation has its own “body of truth” and that those epistles written by Paul as “The Prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles” constitute “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 “for the times”. Secondly, that such a discrimination is proper and Scriptural, and thirdly, that four* epistles (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, II Timothy) minister truth for the present dispensation, as no other part of Scripture can.

[* - Philemon does not treat of the distinctive character of the dispensation of the mystery, its gracious spirit permeates all the epistles by whomsoever written.]

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 to-day as when it was first instituted. Yet, not one of those who read these words has ever kept all those laws, which are true, nor has he any intention of doing so. The law of Moses, as we have already seen, 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 of 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, as we have already observed, 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). And again, to the same effect, “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 Dispensational Truth, the principle “Right Division”, in other words “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 Bride and 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 purposes of God.

Now, Thirdly: 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 youward” (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 we read further 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.

To the believer, brought up in orthodoxy, accustomed to the phrase “the church began at Pentecost”, taking to himself as a matter of course the words “we are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand” (Psa. xcv. 7), the results of the application of “right division” and the somewhat startling claims of “dispensational truth”, may seem after all to rest upon the somewhat uncertain basis of human deduction and inference. It may be that if we can discover that those dispensational changes which subdivide the purpose of the ages, have always been *announced*, and that spiritual deduction only finds its place after, and not before, the announcement has been *made public*, the recognition of the differences that claim attention and which are vital to the full acknowledgment of our calling may be simplified.

In the endeavour to discern the changing dispensations, we may collect together “things that differ”, we may observe that one calling is associated with the period “before the foundation of the world”, and another with a period “from (or since) the foundation of the world”. We may observe that in one calling Christ is “King”; in another He is represented as “Priest after the order of Melchisedec”, in another He is denominated “Head over all things to the church which is His body”. We may observe that some believers are “to inherit the earth”, but that others find their place in the “New Jerusalem”, and yet others are blessed with all spiritual blessings “in heavenly places”, and that this sphere of blessing is “where Christ sits at the right hand of God”. We might moreover bring forward the prevalence of miraculous gifts and the persistence of the hope of Israel, right through the Acts of the Apostles to the last chapter, and compare and contrast this state of affairs with the teaching of “Prison Epistles”. These, and many other studies are a legitimate approach to the study of the Scriptures, and fulfil the

injunction “comparing spiritual things with spiritual”. In this present study the key word is the word “witness”, and our contention is that *every dispensational change is introduced, or accompanied by an accredited witness*. We are not left to our own searchings or deductions, we find witnesses at intervals along the way, who declare in the name of Him that sent them that this or that change has taken place. If this be so, then we should spare no pains to become acquainted with so important a feature in the unfolding of the divine purpose.

The first thing that we must do is to discover who, and what are called “witnesses” in the New Testament and, in order to avoid cumbering ourselves with unwanted material, we shall ignore references to “false witnesses” or those witnesses referred to who have no bearing upon the subject in hand.

- (1) JOHN THE BAPTIST. “The same came for a witness” (John i. 7).
- (2) THE LORD JESUS CHRIST. “I am one that bear witness of Myself” (John viii. 18).
 - (a) The Father bears witness of Christ.
“The Father that sent Me beareth witness” (John viii. 18).
 - (b) The Holy Spirit’s witness of Christ.
“He shall testify of Me” (John xv. 26).
 - (c) The Scriptures bear witness of Christ.
“They are they which testify of Me” (John v. 39).
- (3) SUPERNATURAL GIFTS AND SIGNS.
 - (a) To Christ.
“The works that I do, bear witness of Me” (John v. 36).
 - (b) To apostles.
“God also bearing them witness with signs” (Heb. ii. 4)
- (4) PETER and THE TWELVE. “Ye shall be witnesses unto Me” (Acts i. 8)
- (5) THE APOSTLE PAUL,
 - (a) *Paul, before Acts xxviii.* “His witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard’ (Acts xxii. 15).
 - (b) *Paul both before and after Acts xxviii.* “A witness both of these things which thou hast seen and of those things in the which I will appear” (Acts xxvi. 16).
 - (c) *Paul after Acts xxviii.* “The testimony of our Lord nor of me His prisoner” (II Tim. i. 8).

It is written of John the Baptist “John did no miracle” (John x. 41), and there is neither sign, wonder nor miracle recorded of the apostle Paul after the change of dispensation which took place at Acts xxviii. We therefore distribute the witnesses in the New Testament as follows:

- A | John the Baptist. No miracle.
- B | Christ, and His apostles until Acts xxviii.
Sign, wonder and miracle.
- A | Paul the Prisoner. No miracle.

It should be noticed with heart searching seriousness, that each one of the “witnesses” enumerated in the list above, were actually “martyrs”. John the Baptist was *beheaded*, The Lord Jesus Christ was *crucified*, Peter was forewarned by the Lord as to the *death* he should die and spoke of the near approach of his “decease” in his second epistle, and Paul wrote his second epistle to Timothy in view of his approaching death which tradition says, as well as the evidence of the epistle, was by *execution*. They were witnesses in the double sense of the word. It cannot be too strongly emphasized therefore that only in a secondary sense can any one of us to-day be called “witnesses”.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.—“How far was he an eye-witness”?

“The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto Him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. THIS IS HE OF WHOM I SAID and John bare record (*martureo* same word ‘bear witness’ John i. 7), saying I SAW the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him. And I knew Him not; but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon Whom thou shalt SEE the spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost” (John i. 29-33).

THE TWELVE.—“How far were these eye-witnesses”?

“Wherefore of these men which had COMPANIED with us ALL the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, BEGINNING at the baptism of John, UNTO that same day when He was taken up from us, MUST one be ordained to be a WITNESS of His resurrection” (Acts i. 21, 22).

PETER.—“He was seen of Cephas” (I Cor. xv. 5).

PAUL.—“Chosen see that Just One and hear His voice’ (Acts xxii. 14).

As we trace the unfolding purpose in the New Testament we observe that at each central epoch, a witness is raised up.

Witnesses for Pentecost and its message are abundant in the early Acts. Even the number “twelve” had to be made up—for had not the Lord spoken of “twelve thrones” that must be occupied by the “twelve apostles”?

With the call and commission of Paul, however, a new witness appears and his advent indicates another dispensational change. He is given a number of titles, “A chosen vessel” being the earliest recorded. Paul was to bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles, and Kings and the children of Israel. “Gentiles” occupying the first place even as they do in the prophetic utterance of old Simeon (Luke ii. 32). The emphasis upon the Gentiles in these passages, cannot be disassociated from the withdrawal of favour from Israel.

“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” (Acts xiii. 46).

From Acts xxii. 6-15 we learn more fully the commission given to Paul following his conversion on the road to Damascus:

“For thou shalt be His witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard” (15).

and referring to this first ministry which ends with the shadow of prison in Acts xx., he summed it up as “testifying (or witnessing) both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ” (21).

In his defence, the Apostle more than once linked the two sections of his ministry by the word that is translated either “witness” or “testify”.

“As thou hast *testified* of Me in Jerusalem, so must thou *bear witness* also at Rome”
(Acts xxiii. 11).

In like manner, Paul’s prison ministry, the ministry that unfolded the new dispensation of the mystery, the ministry that finds its exposition in the “Prison Epistles”, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and II Timothy, this too is a “witness” or a “testimony”. The first ministry comes to an end in Acts xx., and the new ministry is envisaged. Referring to the prophecies that spoke of “bonds and afflictions” Paul said:

“But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, TO TESTIFY the gospel of the grace of God” (Acts xx. 24).

This implies something more than preaching the gospel as an “evangelist”, it includes this, but it gives meaning to the emphasis which is laid on “the grace of God”, for in the Prison Epistles we read that “the dispensation” which had been given to the apostle as “the Prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles” was “the dispensation of *the grace of God*” (Eph. iii. 1, 2).

Again, in his defence before Agrippa the apostle spoke of his twofold ministry, again using the word translated either “witness” or “testimony”.

“I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a WITNESS both of these things *which thou hast seen*, and of those things in the which *I will appear* unto thee, delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee” (Acts xxvi. 16, 17).

The apostle’s prison ministry is called “the testimony (or witness) of our Lord” and of Paul “His prisoner” (II Tim. i. 8). The special teaching which Timothy was enjoined to commit to faithful men, was a teaching which he had heard of Paul “among many *witnesses*” (II Tim. ii. 2). So, in his first epistle to Timothy, Paul speaks of the great message concerning “One God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, Who gave Himself a ransom for all”, he adds (our translation):

“THE TESTIMONY IN ITS OWN PECULIAR SEASONS” (I Tim. ii. 5, 6).

Then immediately following this most discriminating claim, he adds:

“Whereunto I am ordained a preacher and an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity” (I Tim. ii. 7).

The words translated “in due time” in I Tim. ii. 6, which we have rendered “in its own peculiar seasons”, are the Greek words *idios* and *kairos* in the plural dative. *Idios*

means something peculiarly one's "own", and is so translated in I Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12. A similar phrase, similarly translated in the Authorized Version is found in Titus i. 2, 3:

"In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before age-times (*pro chronon aionion*); but hath in due times (*kairois idiois*) manifested His word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour."

Here we find it is a "God that cannot lie" which strikes the same note as the interjected words of I Tim. ii. 7 "I speak the truth in Christ I lie not", and suggests that this peculiar dispensational claim here "attested" would be strongly "contested", a fact that most of those associated with *The Berean Expositor* will endorse. Here also we have a message "committed" to Paul in harmony with a "commandment of God", which is but another way of saying "whereunto I am ordained" (I Tim. ii. 7).

The revelation of the mystery and the dispensation of the grace of God, especially committed to Paul the Prisoner with its accompanying Gospel of the grace of God (?), and its teaching concerning the one Mediator Who gave Himself a ransom for all, as distinct from the more limited reference in Matt. xx. 28, which was "for many", this new ministry was a testimony or a witness that had its own peculiar season for its manifestation and announcement. Therefore every fresh unfolding of the dispensations has been accompanied at its inception, with a specially equipped and commissioned witness. Dispensational truth, like all other aspects of truth, can be supported, illustrated and enforced, by comparison, by study and by every other legitimate means, but it is an occasion for thanksgiving to have seen, that its discovery does not depend upon the WIT of man, but stands solidly and unassailably upon the WITNESS of God. From the days of John the Baptist until the end of time, each and every dispensational change could be heralded with the words employed by Paul "A testimony in its own peculiar season".

Dispensational Truth is "Attested Truth".

Dispensational Truth is "Truth for the Times".

Dispensational Truth is "The Key of Knowledge".

[*Attested Truth*, pp. 95-99 - be-xxxvi]

Grapes of Eshcol

A sequel to the booklet "The Dispensational Frontier"

pp. 161 - 180

A cluster of peculiar blessings, brought from the high calling of the Mystery, and exhibited to the Lord's people in much the same spirit as prompted the witness of Caleb and Joshua.

The book of Deuteronomy opens with the words of Moses "on this side Jordan" in the wilderness over against the Red Sea, but the record is interrupted at the second verse, by a parenthetical observation:

"There are eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea" (Deut. i. 2).

Somewhat comparable, and at first sight as difficult to understand, is the strange interruption of the narrative of Acts i. 15:

"And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples and said, the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty, Men and brethren, this Scripture, etc., etc." (Acts i. 15, 16).

We have purposely omitted the marks of parenthesis (. . . .), there being none in the original to intensify the strangeness of this interpolation. The structure reveals that there is a correspondence between this 120 with the addition of Matthias to the "eleven", thus making up the number of the apostolate (12) (Acts i. 26), and with the number of different countries represented at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 9-11) which are twelve, because it was essential, if Israel were to be called once more to repentance, that there should be "twelve" thrones judging the "twelve" tribes of Israel. So, returning to Deuteronomy, the break in the narrative is inspired and purposeful. Let us ponder its meaning and its implications. At Horeb, the solemn covenant had been made between the Lord and this people, and from Mount Sinai to Kadesh there are twenty-one stages indicated (Numb. xxxiii. 16-37) and some of these were marked by gross disobedience as at Kibroth-hattavah, so that Israel took much longer than "eleven days" to traverse the route laid down in Numb. xxxiii. Disobedience and unbelief apart, the direct route would have occupied just eleven days, and the implication is that *one more day* would have seen Israel over the border, and into the land. Instead, Moses reminded Israel:

"The space in which we came from Kadesh-barnea, until we were come over the brook Zered, was thirty and eight years" (Deut. ii. 14).

The thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Numbers set out the tragedy of Kadesh-barnea at some length. The twelve spies search the land from one end to the other, and at Eshcol, a valley in the vicinity of Hebron (Numb. xiii. 22, 23), very near the Southern border of the land of promise, they cut a cluster of grapes which they bore between two upon a staff, and brought it as an evidence of the goodness of the land

towards which the Lord, through Moses, was leading His people. Alas! while Caleb and Joshua testified to the goodness of the land, and to the faithfulness and power of the Lord to fulfil His promise and give them the land for their inheritance, the ten spies intimidated the people by their report concerning the giants, the sons of Anak, so that the faithful two were threatened with stoning for their pains.

In this booklet we too are bringing as it were “a cluster” from Eshcol even at the risk of being as badly treated for our pains as were Caleb and Joshua. The country which we have searched and on which we report is represented by the epistle to the Ephesians, and in the history of the Church, Israel’s defection has been, alas, only too faithfully copied to its loss. Paul, like the faithful spies, was forsaken at the close of his life. “All in Asia” turned away from him; the precious revelation of the truth of Mystery which it was his glory to make known was discounted, and so completely was his testimony rejected that no vestige of it is discernible in the writings of the “Fathers” who go back to the early portion of Acts, and wandered in *their* wilderness, even as Israel did in theirs. Should the reader not quite appreciate this analogy, we suggest that the earlier booklets of this series be consulted, namely “The Dispensational Frontier, Acts xxviii. 23-31” and “Who then is Paul?” otherwise we shall have to occupy much of our limited space in going over ground already covered.

We have however prepared a pamphlet pointing out that leading men among the early “Brethren” saw the distinction between the calling of the church formed during the Acts and that of the church called afterwards, and before producing some of the high glories of the Ephesian epistle, called by us “The Grapes of Eshcol” in reference to this halt and withdrawal at our spiritual “Kadesh-barnea” we will reproduce that pamphlet here, in the hope that some may be led to deprecate the attitude that not only refuses to go on into the high calling of the Mystery, but which threatens to “stone” those who would emulate the simple trust of Caleb and Joshua.

An appeal, addressed to readers of the writings of B. W. Newton and C. H. Macintosh, concerning the unique character of the dispensation of the Mystery and of Acts xxviii. as a dispensational frontier.

In 1907 and 1908, J. J. B. Coles wrote a series of articles in “Things to Come” under the Editorship of Dr. E. W. Bullinger, entitled KADESH BARNEA, in which he saw in the timidity of many believers, when faced with the teaching of Eph. iii. 1-13 and Col. i. 24-28, and the unpleasant consequences of accepting that claim of the Apostle to have received a dispensation for the Gentiles, a repetition of the attitude of the ten spies who said “we be not able to go up” (Numb. xiii. 31). While literal “stoning with stones” (Numb. xiv. 10) has not been resorted to by Christians who condemn our insistence upon Acts xxviii. as a dispensational frontier, the spiritual equivalent alas, has not been unknown in the past, can still be sensed in the present and will possibly be intensified in the future, if we do not misinterpret certain signs. It is not our custom to quote the opinions of others, or to cite their teaching, whether it be for or against our own, but to occupy our time, strength and resources in giving positive teaching, leaving the vindication of our witness or its refutation to the Saviour Whom alone we recognize as “Master and Lord”. However, in this leaflet, we are making some quotations from the

writings of men who were prominent teachers among “The Brethren” whose testimony, had it been followed, would have led the believer over the dispensational frontier of Acts xxviii., into the exclusively new and parenthetical dispensation of the Mystery, leaving intact Matt. xxiv. with its association with Dan. ix., as the hope of Israel, and yet allowing the position laid down in Rom. xi. to colour the teaching, as it should and does, of the early epistles of Paul, namely Galatians, Hebrews, I and II Thessalonians, I and II Corinthians and Romans. These epistles while giving the great *doctrinal basis* of Justification by Faith for *all time*, revealed that Israel was still “first”, that the Gentile believer though “justified” was, dispensationally, a “wild olive” grafted contrary to nature into the existing olive tree of Israel. The organ of the Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony (Watching and Waiting, March-April 1953) gives the testimony of one such teacher among the early Brethren. He saw that the *lo-ammi* condition of Israel since the rejection of their Messiah, demanded some compensatory change in the dealings of God with the Gentile world, and practically demanded the church of the new calling which was revealed to Paul as the prisoner of Jesus Christ. The article in question is entitled:

HOW B. W. NEWTON LEARNED PROPHETIC TRUTH

and one or two statements there recorded indicate how near that man of God came to ascending the hill country of the Amorites and entering into the high calling of the dispensation of the Mystery.

“The question is (says J. J. B. Coles in his opening article in ‘Things to Come’, March 1907), have *we* entered Canaan by way of the mountain of the Amorites? or, are we going with the multitude by the way of Jordan? The lesson of Kadesh-Barnea has been lost to many, and Caleb’s whole-heartedness has found but few imitators. We must of course be careful not to press an Old Testament type beyond a legitimate *application*.” B. W. Newton’s immediate quest was the true interpretation of Prophecy, but Scripture is one in its testimony, so that to approximate to the truth of Prophecy will necessarily lead to the illumination of related revelation.

First we quote B. W. Newton’s interpretation of Rom. xi.:

“Romans Chapter 11 Considered

Circumstances, however, occurred, that led me to consider with care the eleventh chapter of Romans. I could not close my eyes to the fact that the future history of the *literal* Israel was there spoken of; and that it was put in marked contrast with the history of those who are *at present* being gathered out from among the Gentiles, *during* the time of Israel’s unbelief. I saw the words ‘there shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob’ could not be explained of any past act of Grace that has hitherto been shown, either towards Jews or Gentiles. I saw that it could be explained only of the *future* forgiveness of Israel, *as a nation*. I saw also that Israel when nationally converted, are not to be merged in the present Gentile Church, for then they would have been represented in this chapter as grafted in upon the Gentile branch, which constitutes in Rom. xi., the symbol of the present professing Church. On the contrary, it is said in this chapter that, as a *distinct* branch, they shall be grafted back into their own olive tree. These, and a few other connected truths, I began to discern, though dimly and imperfectly.”

B. W. Newton goes on to give clear and uncompromising testimony to the failure of the Preterite system of Prophecy, in which so much that is really future is interpreted of the past, and with this, we are in complete agreement, but his conviction now to be cited, *that there is a threefold division of time in Israel's history*, pointed so clearly to the present dispensation of the Mystery, that one is still left amazed and distressed that eyes so touched by the spirit of grace should not have seen the open door, and have entered into all the blessings that are revealed in the great Epistle of the Mystery, Ephesians. We quote again from B. W. Newton:

“THREE PERIODS IN ISRAEL’S HISTORY

I observed also, that the history of Israel during the time of their punishment and subjection to the Gentiles is distributed into three distinct divisions: the first extending from Nebuchadnezzar to their dispersion by Romans, the second being *the present Period of their dispersion*, the third, the yet future period of their natural re-establishment in unbelief; so, the prophetic visions of Daniel are to be divided into three parts, corresponding to these three periods. But I observed this likewise, that when the first of these periods terminated, *historic detail terminated*. As soon as the dispersion of Israel was effected, and they ceased to have a recognized national existence in their land, there is a *pause* in the historic detail of Daniel—no person, no place, no date is mentioned during the present period of dispersion. But when the third period of their unbelieving history commences, when they again have returned in unbelief to their own land, then the historic detail of Daniel *re-commences*, and is given even with greater emphasis than before. So entirely is Gentile history made in the Scripture to revolve around Jerusalem as its centre. Whilst Jerusalem nationally exists, the history of the nations that are brought into connexion with it is given; but when Jerusalem ceases to exist nationally, the history of the Gentiles in Scripture ceases too.

We are in the *interval*, the period of dispersion, now. It will terminate when Jerusalem is nationally reconstituted. (Watching and Waiting, March-April 1953).”

Look at the words “no person, no place, no date is mentioned during the present period of dispersion”. These words cry aloud that Dispensational Truth demands during the period of Israel’s blindness which commenced at Acts xxviii. 23-31, that no O.T. Prophecy is being fulfilled. Matt. xxiv. also must belong, not to the present calling of the Mystery, but to the “third period” when the “historic detail of Daniel recommences”; that a new revelation, with a new sphere, constitution and hope must be given by God if any Gentile is to be saved and blessing during the setting aside of the hitherto exclusive channel of blessing—Israel. Accepting B. W. Newton’s view and taking it to its logical conclusion, we have the following threefold division of Israel’s history:

FIRST DIVISION	SECOND DIVISION	THIRD DIVISION
From Nebuchadnezzar to Dispersion by the Romans, 70A.D., a few years after Acts xxviii.	“There is a pause.” Here comes the dispensation of the Mystery, a parenthesis, unconnected with Israel, Prophecy or Covenants. From Acts xxviii. to the resumption of prophecy.	Unbelieving history commences, histories detail of Daniel recommences. Dan. ix. in intimately linked with Matt. xxiv. (Matt. xxiv. 15) and so completely disassociated from the Second Division.

To the making known of the unique calling of this “Second Division” wherein Israel is “dispersed” the writer of this present leaflet has devoted the bulk of his life and energies, yet those who advocate the teaching of B. W. Newton as set out in the above quotation, can, at the self same time see nothing incongruous in seeing in Matt. xxiv. with its incisive reference to Dan. ix., characteristics of the hope of the church to-day. Is it too much to believe that a few, after pondering these things may be led, Berean like, to “search and see”?

The May issue for 1952, “Questions and Answers”, edited by Dr. Harold P. Morgan, Riverton, New Jersey, U.S.A. opens with the following headline:

WHAT WERE THE TEACHINGS OF EARLY PLYMOUTH BRETHREN REGARDING THE CHURCH, THE BODY OF CHRIST?

Quotations are made in answer to this question from two teachers among the early Brethren, namely C. H. Macintosh, and Richard Holden.

“The thought of a church composed of Jew and Gentile ‘seated together in the heavenlies’ LAY FAR BEYOND (*our emphasis*) the range of prophetic testimony We may range through the inspired pages of the law and the prophets, from one end to the other, and find no solution of ‘the great Mystery’ of the Church Peter received the keys of the kingdom, and he used those keys, first to open the kingdom to the Jew, and then to the Gentile. But Peter never received a commission to unfold the mystery of the church” (“Life and Times of Elijah the Tishbite”).

How strange to find C.H.M. and C.H.W. saying the same things, yet how strange to note the way in which “The Brethren” have honoured the one, and repudiated the other!

In 1870 Richard Holden wrote a work entitled:

THE MYSTERY, THE SPECIAL MISSION OF THE APOSTLE PAUL. THE KEY TO THE PRESENT DISPENSATION.

Here is a brief quotation from this very precious testimony:

“To make all see what is the dispensation, or in other words, to be the divinely-appointed instructor in the character and order of the present time, as Moses was in the dispensation of ‘law’, is that special feature in the commission of Paul in which it was distinct from that of the other apostles If then it shall appear, that, far from seeing ‘what is the dispensation of the Mystery’ the mass of Christians *have entirely missed it*, and, as the natural consequence have almost completely misunderstood Christianity, importing into it the things proper to another dispensation, and so confounding Judaism and Christianity in an inexpressible jumble; surely it is a matter for deep humiliation before God, and for earnest prayerful effort to retrieve with God’s help, this important and neglected teaching.”

It seems almost unbelievable that a movement that could produce such a testimony, could nevertheless perpetuate that “inexpressible jumble” namely of confusing the NEW COVENANT or TESTAMENT, made *only* “with the house of Israel and with the house

of Judah” (Jer. xxxi. 31), and make it the very centre of that worship and assembly, thereby “confounding Judaism” with the truth of the Church of the Mystery, the present dispensation and calling, in which *no covenant* new or old finds a place, but a choice and a promise made “before the foundation of the world”.

We send forth this leaflet with the prayer that the Lord may direct its distribution, so that some, at present distracted by the “inexpressible jumble” entertained by the successors of such writers as C. H. Macintosh and Richard Holden, may have their eyes opened to see “what is the hope of His calling”.

A reference to the closing words of J.N.D. in his “Synopsis” on Acts xxviii., will show that he too believed at the setting aside of the Jew, believers enter into “*another sphere on other grounds*”, yet his followers definitely turn back from this Kadesh-Barnea, and build upon the epistle to the Corinthians for their assembly and its communion, and say hard things, as did Israel, of those who have accepted this position and who have followed out its logical conclusions.

This interim dispensation is called in Eph. iii. 9, R.V. “The dispensation of the mystery, which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things.”

THE MYSTERY

“WHAT IS THE DISPENSATION OF THE MYSTERY?” (Eph. iii. 9 R.V.)

For the guidance of the earnest inquirer after truth, most books of the Bible contain one or more key words, which if faithfully accepted and applied, unlock treasures of truth that must otherwise remain undiscovered. Some time ago attempts were made to teach that the epistle to the Hebrews and that to the Ephesians taught the same truth, ministered to the same calling, belonged to the same dispensation. Nevertheless, however many parallels may have been discovered, no unbiased mind could resist the fact that whereas the central feature of Hebrews is THE NEW COVENANT, explicitly referable to the prophecy of Jeremiah (Heb. viii. 8-13; Jer. xxxi. 31-34); the central feature of Ephesians is THE MYSTERY, explicitly said to have been “hid in God” (Eph. iii. 9), and “hid from ages and from generations, but now made manifest” (Col. i. 26). It is not our intention to take up this controversy here, but in this booklet it will be our endeavour to set out as clearly as grace will enable, an answer to the question “What is the dispensation of the Mystery?” Before considering either the occurrences of the word “mystery” or its several contexts and connexions, it will be necessary to seek the essential meaning of the term.

THE MEANING OF “MYSTERY”

In the first place we observe that the Greek word *musterion* has not been translated, but carried over from the original and expressed in English letters. The word is derived from *muo* “to close, to shut” as the lips or the eyes and so to preserve a secret. This root *mu* appears in other languages than the Greek, with much the same significance. “Mute”, dumb, comes *via* the Latin *mutum*, the Greek *muo* and the Sanskrit *muka*, and so also is

derived “mutter”, and such words as mum, mum-chance, mum budget, mumble, all of which have the idea of something shut or hidden, as a common factor. There are other terms found in the N.T. that indicate an intended contrast with the pagan mysteries which were in active operation in the earth. The many references to “the perfect” is one such term, the word indicating one who had been “initiated” into the mysteries.

“Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are *perfect* the wisdom of God in a *mystery*” (I Cor. ii. 6, 7).

“Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded” (Phil. iii. 15).

When the Apostle said “in all things I am instructed” (Phil. iv. 12) he used the Greek word *mueomai* “to be initiated into a mystery”. It is significant that where some of Israel are shown to be blind and the proclamation of the near advent of the kingdom of heaven gives place to “the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven” that the word *kammuo* is used, “to close, and to shut” the eyes (Matt. xiii. 15), *kammuo* being a compound of *kata* “down” and *muo* “shut”. While it must ever remain true, that if God hides a thing, no human wisdom or power will ever lead to its discovery, it is also true that, when once such a mystery has been made known, it is as understandable as any other subject of revelation, and the following passages make this feature quite clear.

“It is given unto you TO KNOW the mysteries” (Matt. xiii. 11).

“Ye should not be IGNORANT of this mystery” (Rom. xi. 25).

“According to the REVELATION of the mystery” (Rom. xvi. 25).

“We SPEAK the wisdom of God in a mystery” (I Cor. ii. 7).

“Though I UNDERSTAND all mysteries” (I Cor. xiii. 2).

“Having MADE KNOWN the mystery” (Eph. i. 9; iii. 3).

Other passages could be cited but these are sufficient to show that there is nothing “mysterious” about the mysteries of Scripture, they are secrets, hidden by God until the appointed time for the revelation arrives and thus they form a part of the truth that pertains to the time then present.

MYSTERY OR MYTH

The word translated “fable” in I and II Timothy, Titus and II Peter is the Greek *muthos*, another derivative of *muo*. At the end of his ministry, the apostle Paul warns of perilous times, and among other things says:

“All they which are in Asia be turned away from me.”

“They shall turn away their ears from the TRUTH, and shall be turned unto MYTHS”

(II Tim. i. 15; iv. 4).

We can see this sad turning away from Paul and his teaching to-day, and the ever-increasing substitution of the “myth” with all its blight and deception, for the “mystery” with all its glory and grace.

The first occurrence of *musterion* “secret” or “mystery” is in the book of the prophet Daniel, and there is significance in that simple fact. Daniel may be likened to the apostle Paul. Both were “prisoners of the Lord”, both had a special message for the “Gentiles”,

both exercised their ministry consequent upon the failure of Israel. The relationship of Daniel, Israel, Gentile and Mystery may be seen in the following sequence:

Daniel	Kingdom of Israel suspended.	Times of Gentiles begin.
Matt. xiii.	The mysteries of the Kingdom.	Isa. vi. 9, 10.
Acts xxviii.	Kingdom and hope of Israel suspended.	Mystery "For you Gentiles".

So far as Israel is concerned it can be written:

"When HISTORY ceases, MYSTERY begins."

It can be demonstrated from the O.T. records, that on more than one occasion the prophetic clock stopped, and while mundane time goes on, time as related to Israel is limited to their being as *ammi* "My people"; it ceased to be reckoned by God, when Israel become *Lo-ammi* "not My people", and during the waiting period spoken of in Hos. iii., the parenthesis of the present dispensation of the Mystery was introduced by God at Acts xxviii. No prophecies, other than those found in Paul's epistles, especially those dealing with "the last days" in I and II Timothy, will be fulfilled during the dispensation of the Mystery. Israel are the people of the prophecy and when they emerge from their long exile and look upon Him Whom they have pierced, the present dispensation will have come to a close.

ISRAEL AND THE MYSTERY

When we consider all that God has said concerning the place that Israel occupies in the outworking of His purposes, when we remember that the Lord Himself acknowledged that "Salvation is of the Jews" (John iv. 22) any failure on their part to live up to their high destiny, must inevitably bring about catastrophic consequences, and whether we believe that at Acts xxviii., that great dispensational rupture occurred or not, the events that happened both to Israel and Jerusalem in 70A.D. make a change of the attitude of God to the Gentile imperative if salvation is not to die out of the earth. What God would do, should Israel fail, no one could tell, for such an event is neither foreshadowed nor discussed. No one living before Acts xxviii. became history, except possibly Paul himself, knew that *before* the foundation of the world, God had foreseen and provided against such a condition, and until this new truth was revealed to Paul as the Prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles, it necessarily remained a "mystery" in the fullest sense of the term. That aliens and strangers, Christless, Godless, hopeless Gentiles could ever be the objects of such superlative grace, that of such it could be written:

"And hath raised us up together, and made us SIT TOGETHER in heavenly places in Christ Jesus,"

never entered the mind of man, and even to-day is received by comparatively few.

When the seventh angel sounds, the mystery of God will be finished. Had there been no sin, no death, no failure, no serpent, Satan or Devil there would have been no need for mystery or secret. Israel's failure at the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom is

met by the introduction of the “*mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven” in which the long deferred end is related to the words of the second parable “an enemy hath done this”. The mystery of the gospel as spoken of in Rom. xvi. 25, something that had been “hushed” since the world began, looks to Rom. xvi. 20 where Gen. iii. 15 is brought into light, and the enmity between the two seeds is seen to be the background. As we go through the several mysteries of the N.T. that impinge upon our calling, we shall find that this feature is constant. The Mystery is the answer of the *Wise* God to the machinations of His *wily* foe. He reveals His will, but does not always make known what might be the “mystery” of His will (Eph. i. 4, 5, 9). It was the revealed “will” of God that if Adam disobeyed the Lord’s command, “in the day” he would surely die. It was the *mystery* of His will, and all unknown to Adam, to provide a Redeemer “before the foundation of the world” (I Pet. i. 19) and so take the wise in his own craftiness and outwit the Devil in all his ways.

THE BAPTISM INTO MOSES

(The baptism from which water was excluded)

We who publish this booklet have been, by that faith which is the substance of things hoped for, into a land of promise, a land not bounded by earthly frontiers, not flowing with milk and honey, not the seat of an earthly Jerusalem, containing no “Dead Sea”, but of which the earthly land of promise can be used as a type. We have been redeemed by the precious blood even as Israel were by the Passover (Eph. i. 7), and have had our Red Sea experience at least in one vital sense. Israel, on leaving Egypt were “baptized INTO Moses” (I Cor. x. 1) we have been baptized INTO Christ. *This is the first of all baptisms and the most neglected.* Christian societies have concentrated so much attention on the baptisms that were introduced into the tabernacle worship, which the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of as “divers baptisms and carnal ordinances, imposed on them” (Heb. ix. 10), that the one essential baptism has been overlooked and neglected.

In most places where the Red Sea crossing is mentioned in the Scriptures, our attention is drawn to the singular fact that Israel went “on dry land in the midst of the sea”.

“The children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the DRY GROUND the children of Israel walked upon DRY LAND.” (Exod. xiv. 22, 29).

“The children of Israel went on DRY LAND in the midst of the sea.” (Exod. xv. 19).

“The Lord DRIED UP the waters of the Red Sea.” (Josh. ii. 10).

“The Lord your God DRIED UP the waters of the Jordan from before you as the Red Sea.” (Josh. iv. 23)

“He turned the sea into DRY LAND: they went through the flood on foot.” (Psa. lxxvi. 6).

“He rebuked the Red Sea also, and it was DRIED UP: so He led them through the depths, as through the wilderness.” (Psa. cvi. 9).

“That led them through the deep, as an horse in the wilderness.” (Isa. lxxiii. 12, 13).

“By faith they passes through the Red Sea as by DRY LAND.” (Heb. xi. 29).

If we believe that “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God” then this repeated insistence upon “dry land” is *essential truth*. If we believe that the O.T. types foreshadowed N.T. realities, we cannot, we dare not use *water* baptism to fulfil the type

of the baptism of Israel into Moses. The church of the Mystery is baptized into Christ, and there is the same insistence upon the absence of water. In the unity of the spirit (Eph. iv. 3-5) there is but “one” baptism, whereas during the Acts there was baptism in both water and spirit (Acts x. 47). This unity will not tolerate two baptisms, anymore than it will tolerate two Bodies, two faiths or two Lords. Before there can be any participation in the high glories of the Ephesian teaching, this one baptism, typified by the baptism of all Israel “into Moses” without a spot of water in the process must become a fact.

“Buried with Him in *baptism*” (Col. ii. 12) follows “In Whom also ye are circumcised with the *circumcision made without hands* by the circumcision of Christ”,

and when it can be proved that the church of Colosse were instructed to perform the rite of literal circumcision, it will be time enough to argue that the burial with baptism that follows takes place at the font by sprinkling or at the pool by immersion.

Assuming that the reader has traveled with us in spirit so far and is willing to examine the clusters of blessings that may be represented by this bunch of the grapes of Eshcol, let us turn our attention to some of the unique features of this great Epistle to the Ephesians.

ALL SPIRITUAL BLESSINGS (Eph. i. 3)

Writing to the believer before the great dispensational landmark of Acts xxviii., Paul speaks of “the blessing of Abraham” coming on the Gentiles, but Abraham is never mentioned in the “Prison Epistles”, and no blessing of Abraham is associated either with “heavenly places” or “before the foundation of the world”. There are some terms used in the Scriptures, which by their very nature and the place they occupy in the scheme of salvation, come over and over again in the writings of the apostle. Such terms as “faith”, “redemption”, “justification” will come to the mind immediately, and are found in many of the epistles whether written before or after Acts xxviii. No one moreover could deny the use of the word “blessing” when speaking of these great doctrines of salvation, yet the fact remains that Rom. xv. 29 “the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ”, I Cor. x. 16 “the cup of blessing which we bless” and Gal. iii. 14 “the blessing of Abraham” are the only other occurrences of the word in Paul’s epistles. So far as the Prison Epistles are concerned Eph. i. 3 stands alone, the word “blessing” meeting us in the very opening words of the new revelation and never again employed in any capacity by the apostle. Terms such as “seated together” and “blessing” receive emphasis by their glorious solitariness. They stand alone and are beyond compare.

Green, in his handbook says that where the adjective *pas* “all” in the singular number is written without the article “the”, it signifies “every”, but with the article it means “the whole of” the object which it qualifies. Thus *pasa polis* means “every city”; *pasa he polis* or *he pasa polis* “the whole city” and *he polis pasa* would have a slightly different meaning—either “the city, all of it” or “the city in every part”.

The church of the one body is blessed “with *every* blessing that is spiritual”. This is even wider in its scope than to say “all spiritual blessings”, for if the number of blessings

were but few—say four, they could still be defined as “all spiritual”, whereas the mind reels as it endeavours to grasp the fact that there is no blessing that comes under the category of “spiritual” that is omitted. It is highly improbable, that, while we are in this life, we shall be able to appreciate a tithe of what is here so freely bestowed.

In complete contrast with the spiritual blessings of the Mystery, are the “carnal” or “natural” blessings of the law.

“Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field blessed shall be thy basket and thy store the Lord shall command the blessing upon thee in thy storehouses the Lord shall make thee plenteous in goods” (Deut. xxviii. 1-3)

“Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord: that walketh in His ways. For thou shalt eat the labour of thine hands: happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee. Thy wife shall be as a faithful vine by the sides of thine house, thy children shall be like olive plants round about thy table” (Psa. cxxviii. 1-3).

How completely opposite all this is from the experience of the believer under the dispensation of grace. Like Paul, he may know what it is to suffer need, to be in want, to know what it is to be continually in trouble. He will have no guarantee of a settled dwelling-place, he has no promise of special protection during periods of danger, his “basket and store” may show impoverishment, while the ungodly may appear to prosper. It would be foolish to assess a man’s spiritual worth to-day by the size of his bank balance, or any other material standard. Eph. i. 3 does not speak of daily bread, of dwelling place, of home comforts or of business success. It visualizes a new plane, the spiritual, which is on resurrection ground. The earnest of our inheritance is not a bunch of grapes as it was when the spies returned with the grapes of Eshcol, neither are our enemies men of flesh and blood, but they are spiritual Canaanites, principalities and powers.

IN HEAVENLY PLACES (Eph. i. 3)

We have said elsewhere that this phrase is unique, that it occurs in the epistle to the Ephesians and nowhere else. The unwary can easily be moved when they read that, in spite of what we have said, *epouranios* occurs in fifteen other places outside of Ephesians, as widely distributed as Matthew, John, I Corinthians, Philippians, II Timothy and Hebrews. We have been accused of misleading God’s people and of misquoting scripture, and yet, in spite of all that has or can be said we repeat that the phrase “in heavenly places” *en tois epouraniois* is unique, occurring nowhere else than in the epistle to the Ephesians. The word “heavenly” *epouranios* most certainly occurs elsewhere, this we have never denied, we read in Matt. xviii. 35 of “My heavenly Father” and in John iii. 12 of “heavenly things”, in I Cor. xv. 40 of “celestial bodies” and in Hebrews of those who “tasted of the heavenly gift”. No one, so far as our knowledge permits us to say, has ever maintained that those Hebrews who had tasted of the heavenly gift, had actually ascended up to heaven itself in order to taste it! Many things may be heavenly in origin and in character that are not enjoyed “in heaven”, and this is the point, it is this feature that is unique. The reader will agree that the word

“places” answers the question “where?” and our first consideration must be to examine the Scriptures to see whether “this is so”.

Hou is an adverb of place, and is used elliptically instead of the full expression *eph hou topou* “in what place”. We read in Col. iii. 1 “seek those things which are above WHERE Christ sitteth at the right hand of God”. Presently we shall see that “heavenly places” is synonymous with “where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God”, and that it is moreover allied with the word *ano* “above”, which also is directly connected with these heavenly places.

This one passage, Col. iii. 1, establishes that Christ is represented as being someWHERE, and if He is said to be *seated at* the right hand of God in heavenly places in Ephesians, no more need be said on that score. That such a statement is true every reader is aware, for Eph. i. 20, 22 directs our wondering attention to the exalted position of Christ, Who being raised from the dead was set “at His own right hand in the heavenly places”. This sphere of exalted glory is further defined, it is said to be “far above all principality and power” (Eph. i. 21). Now the simple connective *ano* is sufficient to take us to “where” Christ sitteth at the right hand of God (Col. iii. 1), consequently the intensive *huperano* employed by the Apostle, and translated “far above” in Eph. i. 21, cannot certainly mean less, it must mean more than the simple *ano*. If we allow the Apostle to speak for himself we shall be left in no doubt as to the nature of this exaltation. In the fourth of Ephesians we read:

“He that descended is the same also that ascended up *far above all heavens*, that He might fill all things” (Eph. iv. 10).

Let us notice one or two important features in this passage “He ascended up” *anabaino* literally means “to go up” as one would a mountain (Matt. v. 1); or as the false shepherds who “climb up” some other way (John x. 1). The Ascension is put in contrast with His “descent” *katabaino*. This also primarily means “to go down” as rain descends (Matt. vii. 25), or when one descends a mountain (Matt. xvii. 9). Eph. iv tells us that His descent was to “the lower parts” *kaloterous* and that His Ascent was “far above all heavens”, and lest we should be tempted for any reason to set a limit to this ascent, we are further informed that this Descent and this Ascent was in order that He may “fill all things”. Consequently, the Saviour ascended to the highest conceivable position in glory. Now this position described as *huperano* “far above all heavens” is found in Eph. i. 21, “far above all principality and power”. *They are co-extensive in scope and meaning*. In other parts of the New Testament we read of this Ascension and one or two passages give further meaning and point to the phrase we are examining. The apostle speaks of the Ascension when writing to the Hebrews, says of Christ that He “is passed *into* the heavens”, which the Revised Version corrects to read “passed *through* the heavens”. The word here is *dierchomai* “passed through” as Israel passed through the Red Sea (I Cor. x. 1) or as the proverbial camel is spoken of as going through the eye of a needle (Matt. xix. 24). Again, in Heb. vii. 26 Christ is said to have been made “*higher* than the heavens”. We can therefore understand that the *epi* in the compound *epouranios* does really indicate position and place—every reference so far considered points to that one fact, this is “where” Christ sits, this is “where” all spiritual blessings will be enjoyed.

However, we have not yet concluded our examination. Christ is said to be in “heaven” (Heb. ix. 24) in the self same epistle that says He “passed through the heavens”. How can this be? The Hebrew reader acquainted with the first chapter of Genesis would need no explanation. The heaven, which is “at the right hand of God” is the heaven of Gen. i. 1. The heavens through which Christ “passed” and above which He ascended is called the “firmament” or “expansion” in Gen. i. 6. This “heaven” spread out during the ages “as a curtain” and “as a tent to dwell in” is to pass away. The Lord is far above this limited “heaven” and *so is the sphere of blessing* allotted to the church of this dispensation. (**EPHESIANS36**, pp.21-24)

Here then are two unique features of this high calling of Ephesians.

It is not possible, nor even desirable, that we should take notice of every difference of opinion that is current, but in the present instance silence could be misinterpreted and damage done to the cause of truth. An honoured teacher who has stood for the great principle of right division for many years has published his findings in the matter of “heavenly places” in a booklet that is headed:

“The Earth, not Heaven, is the future home of God’s redeemed”.

“This is what I believe. It is a belief that is not based upon tradition, upon emotion, or upon wishful thinking. It is not a conclusion that I have arrived at hurriedly.”

This brother’s contention is that the words translated in Eph. i. 3 “in heavenly places” should be rendered “among heavenly beings”.

In the first place if the addition of the word “beings” be permissible so also can the addition of the word “places”. If Eph. i. 3 were the only occurrence of the Greek phrase thus translated, we should have to admit that there was just as much reason to accept one translation as the other. This however is not so. We turn to the second occurrence of this phrase, namely in Eph. i. 20.

There the reference is to the Ascension which, as Eph. iv. 10 shows, placed the Lord “far above *all heavens*”, that He might fill all things, even as Eph. i. 20-23 reveals that Christ our Head is seated at the right hand of God “*far above all principality and power*”.

Christ is not represented here as being seated AMONG these heavenly beings but ABOVE them. The apostle even goes so far as to include “every name that is named” either now or in the future and clinches his argument by the quotation “and hath put all things under His feet”. Paul has not left us in doubt as to what this quotation implies.

“For in that He put *all* in subjection under Him, He left *nothing* that is not put under Him” (Heb. ii. 8).

“But when He saith *all* things are put under Him, it is manifest that *He is excepted*, which did put *all things under Him*” (I Cor. xv. 27).

With this as our guide, we must decline to accept any conclusion, however slowly arrived at, that would read into this passage that the seated Christ is only conceived of as AMONG and not FAR ABOVE every heavenly or spiritual being, "GOD" alone being the most glorious exception.

We are more sure than ever that we have been blessed with all spiritual blessings IN heavenly places, and while thankful for the contrary opinion that has compelled us to "search and see", we cannot but be concerned about those who may not be able to examine such suggestions for themselves.

Summarizing so far, the "grapes" of our "Eshcol" include:

- (1) Every blessing that is spiritual, which will be enjoyed
- (2) In heavenly places, where Christ sits at the right hand of God.

BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD (Eph. i. 4)

This unique company "the church which is His Body" is not only blessed with every blessing that is spiritual, not only blessed in heavenly places, but was chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. This too is unique. We have a number of passages which speak of those who are associated with a choice and a call FROM or SINCE the foundation of the world, but one company only is ever said to have been chosen BEFORE. Let us set the Scriptures that use these terms before the eye:

FROM THE FOUNDATION.

- (1) With reference to the use of parables, in speaking of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.
"That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will write things which have been kept secret *from the foundation of the world*" (Matt. xiii. 35).
- (2) With reference to the separation of the nations at the second coming of Christ.
"Then shall the king say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you *from the foundation of the world*" (Matt. xxv. 34).
- (3) With reference to the character of those who killed the prophets sent to them:
"That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed *from the foundation of the world*, may be required of this generation" (Luke xi. 50).
- (4) With reference to the typical character of the Sabbath:
"As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My rest: although the works were finished *from the foundation of the world*" (Heb. iv. 3)
- (5) With reference to the character of the offering of Christ:
"Nor yet that He should offer Himself often for then must He often have suffered *since the foundation of the world*" (Heb. ix. 25, 26).
- (6) With reference to names written in the book of life:
"Everyone whose name hath not been written *from the foundation of the world*, in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain" (Rev. xiii. 8 R.V. margin).
"They whose name hath not been written in the book of life *from the foundation of the world*" (Rev. xvii. 8 R.V.).

BEFORE THE FOUNDATION.

- (1) With reference to Christ alone:
 - (a) “Thou lovedst Me, *before the foundation of the world*” (John xvii. 24).
 - (b) “As of a lamb without blemish and without spot; who verily was foreordained *before the foundation of the world*” (I Pet. i. 19, 20).
- (2) With reference to the Redeemed:

“Chosen in Him *before the foundation of the world*” (Eph. i. 4).

Comment upon the most obvious difference between these two sets of passages is unnecessary. Let us, however, not miss one precious item of doctrine that is revealed by comparing the three references to “before the foundation” together.

In John xvii. 24 Christ was “loved” *agapao*; in I Pet. i. 19, 20 He was “without blemish and without spot” *amomos*. In Eph. i. 4 the believer is said to have been chosen before the foundation of the world “in love” *agape*, to be “blameless” *amomos*.

Here, those who were chosen in Christ, were looked upon as being so closely identified with Him, that the same terms are used. No wonder that as we proceed we read of further identification with the Beloved, that not only speaks of being “crucified together with Christ” but “raised together” as in the early ministry of Paul, but “seated together” and ultimately to be manifested together with Him in glory in the epistles of the Mystery.

These two sets of terms “before” and “since” indicate two distinct time periods. Further studies will show that “before” or “since” the age times is a somewhat similar set of terms, but before these can be allied we must arrive at some understanding of the meaning of the word “foundation”.

Now, happily, we have a New Testament quotation in Heb. i. 10, where the word “foundation” is expressed by the word *themelion*, but when we turn to any of the passages where the words “before” or “from” the foundation of the world occur, *themelion* is not found, but instead the word *katabole* is employed.

Now it is impossible to argue that Paul, for some peculiar reason, would not and did not employ the word *themelion*, for it occurs as the translation of the foundation of a temple in Eph. ii. 20, “the foundation of the apostles and prophets”, and again in I Cor. iii. 10 and II Tim. ii. 19. Therefore, there must be some good reason for choosing so different a word as *katabole*. This word has entered into our own language as a biological term, metabolism, being the name given to the process in an organism or a living cell, by which nutritive material is built up into living matter and this process is divided into (1) constructive metabolism which is called *anabolism*, by which protoplasm is broken down into simpler substances to perform special functions; and (2) destructive metabolism, which is called *katabolism*.

In its biological use, *katabole* indicates “destruction”. It is strange, that if this word means “to place upon a foundation”, it should have been adopted by scientists to indicate the very opposite, namely disruption. Very clear evidence of the essential meaning of *katabole* can be gathered from the usage of the verbal form *kataballo*. This verb *kataballo* is used three times in the New Testament:

“*Cast down*, but not destroyed” (II Cor. iv. 9).
“The accuser of our brethren is *cast down*” (Rev. xii. 10).

indicate very clearly the meaning of the word. The other reference is Heb. xi 11 where it is translated “conceive”.

In Heb. vi. 1 the word is used with *themelion*, the true word for a foundation, but this addition alters the whole intention, and there it appears to have its primitive meaning “cast down”, but whether in the sense of overthrowing, or of laying a foundation, only a most exhaustive study of the context can decide. Job xii. 14, quoted below, has a bearing.

Kataballo occurs twenty-nine times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament Scriptures. It will strengthen the faith of many, and deepen the conviction of most, if these references which contain the word *kataballo* are quoted, but to avoid occupying a disproportionate amount of space, verses will not be given in full. We will also quote from the A.V. instead of giving a translation of the LXX version, except in those cases where the LXX uses an entirely different text. Those who have access to the LXX will not be hindered by this course and those who cannot refer to it will be helped.

“Joab battered the wall, *to throw it down*” (II Sam. xx. 15; LXX II Kings).
“Ye (they) shall *fell* (felled) every good tree” (II Kings iii. 19, 25; LXX IV Kings).
“As one was *felling* a beam” (II Kings vi. 5; LXX IV Kings).
“I will cause him to *fall* by the sword” (II Kings xix. 7; LXX IV Kings).
“They *slew* him with a sword” (II Chron. xxxii. 21).
“Behold He *breaketh down*, and it cannot be built again” (Job xii. 14).
“He *teareth* me in His wrath” (Job xvi. 9).
“He *breaketh* me with breach upon breach” (Job xvi. 14).
“To *cast down* the poor and needy” (Psa. xxxvii. 14; LXX xxxvi.).
“Thou *casteth* them *down* into destruction” (Psa. lxxiii. 18; LXX lxxii.).
“To *overthrow* them in the wilderness” (Psa. cvi. 26, 27; LXX cv.).
“She *hath cast down* many wounded” (Prov. vii. 26).
“The words of a talebearer are *as wounds*” (Prov. xviii. 8).
“Like a city that *is broken down*, and without walls” (Prov. xxv. 28).
“Esebon and Eleale *have cast down* thy trees” (LXX translation, Isa. xvi. 9).
“The lofty city He *layeth it low*” (Isa. xxvi. 5).
“I will cause them to *fall* before their enemies” (Jer. xix. 7).
“I will *cast down* your slain men before your idols” (Ezek. vi. 4).
“Thy remnant *shall fall* by the sword” (Ezek. xxiii. 25).
“They *shall destroy* the walls of Tyrus, and *break down* her towers” (Ezek. xxvi. 4).
“He *shall cast down* with his swords” (LXX translation, Ezek. xxvi. 9).
“He *shall cast down* thy walls” (LXX translation, Ezek. xxvi. 12).
“I will leave thee *thrown* into the wilderness” (Ezek. xxix. 5).
“I will cause the sword to *fall* out of his hand” (Ezek. xxx. 22).
“Have him *cast down* upon the mountains” (LXX translation, Ezek. xxxi. 12).

“Will I cause thy multitude *to fall*” (Ezek. xxxii. 12).
“Thou *shalt fall* upon the mountain of Israel” (Ezek. xxxix. 4).
“He *shall cast down* many ten thousands” (Dan. xi. 12).

This is rather a formidable list, and the verification of each reference is no light task, as in one or two passages there is no obvious Hebrew equivalent, yet we believe it is impossible for any reader not to be impressed with the solidarity of its witness. Every single reference is for the translation “overthrow”, not one is for the translation found in the A.V. of Eph. i. 4.

This however is not all. If each reference be read in its context, the references will be found to be those of battle, of siege, of destruction, of judgment, which tilt the beam of the balances still further. If in addition we discover what Hebrew words have been translated by *kataballo* in the LXX our evidence will be complete. These we will supply, for the benefit of any who may not have the facilities to discover them.

<i>Naphal.</i>	“To cast down, to fall” (LXX, II Sam. xx. 15 and sixteen other references).
<i>Charas.</i>	“To crush” (LXX Job xii. 14; Ezek. xxvi. 4, 12).
<i>Shachath.</i>	“To mar, corrupt or destroy” (LXX Ezek. xxvi. 5).
<i>Natash.</i>	“To leave, spread out” (LXX Ezek. xxix. 5; xxxi. 12).
<i>Nathats.</i>	“To break down” (LXX Ezek. xxvi. 9).
<i>Parats.</i>	“To break forth” (LXX Job xvi. 14; Psa. xxv. 29).
<i>Taraph.</i>	“To tear” (LXX Job xvi. 9).
<i>Satam.</i>	“To hate” (LXX Job xvi. 9).

Not a solitary Hebrew word that means to build, to lay a foundation, to erect, is here but a variety of words everyone meaning destruction, is spoiling, or causing to fall. This is “proof positive”, no reasoning is necessary except the most elementary recognition of fact when it is presented. From every point of view, the word *katabole* in Eph. i. 4 should be translated “overthrow”.

The Church of the One Body consequently is blessed with peculiar blessings, these blessings are to be enjoyed in a peculiar sphere, and this Church is the only company connected specifically with the “overthrow of the world”. Proof that this “overthrow” is referred to in Gen. i. 2 will be found in the articles on Ephesians in Volume XXXVI of *The Berean Expositor*. (*EPHESIANS36*, pp.61-65)

ACCEPTED IN THE BELOVED (Eph. i. 6)

When we think of the wonder of redeeming love, and can turn to such passages as I Cor. i. 30 or iii. 22, 23 where Christ is made unto the believer “wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” and where we read “ye are Christ’s and Christ is God’s” we may well demur at the suggestion that to be “accepted in the Beloved” is one of the unique blessings of the dispensation of the Mystery. Let us see for ourselves. The words “made accepted” translated the Greek *charitoo* which occurs in but one other place in the N.T. It is the salutation of the angel to Mary.

“Hail thou that art HIGHLY FAVOURED” (Luke i. 28).

So unique is this term that the Greek word is unknown to classical Greek, and surely no one will deny that Mary the mother of our Lord held a unique place in the history of womankind. To have focused upon her the prophecy of Gen. iii. 15 and Isa. vii. 14 and ix. 6, and to be associated as she was so intimately with the mystery of Godliness (I Tim. iii. 16) gives this lowly woman a place that is indeed one of high favour. It is *this word* that the Apostle singled out from all the words that were available, because NO OTHER CALLING is so related to Christ in His super-heavenly position as this church of the Mystery. The title of Christ “The Beloved” too is as rare as it is lovely. The title is found in Matt. iii. 17, xii. 18 and xvii. 5 in which we read the added words “well pleased”. In Colossians, which belongs to the same dispensation as Ephesians, Christ is called “The Son of His love” (Col. i. 13), but Eph. i. 6 is the only occurrence of the title “Beloved” outside the Gospels. Both the “acceptance” therefore, and the One in Whom this acceptance is found, are unique.

We have now exhibited some of the blessings that belong exclusively to this dispensation of the Mystery. We do most earnestly plead with the reader to ponder them as before God, to re-read the exhortation given by Caleb and Joshua (Numb. xiv. 6-9) and the awful alternative of Numb. xiv. 10. There are, however, more unique blessings to exhibit, and the next is a title given to the church of the one body that seems too wonderful to be true. It is called:

THE FULNESS OF HIM THAT FILLETH ALL IN ALL (Eph. i. 23)

The Saviour descended into the lower parts of the earth, and ascended *far above all heavens*, that He might *fill all things* (Eph. iv. 10, 11), and the church which is His Body is the fullness of Him that filleth all in all! This church has a standard, it is nothing less than “The measure of the stature of the FULNESS of Christ” (Eph. iv. 13). Where in the whole range of the Scriptures can such a position or such a title be found? To this most high and wondrous calling the Apostle refers in Col. ii. 9, 10:

“For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are FILLED TO THE FULL in Him, which is the Head of all principality and power.”

The following comment, by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., is suggestive:

“We now come to what is perhaps the most remarkable expression in the whole epistle. It is the phrase in which St. Paul further describes the church, which he has just declared to be Christ’s Body, as ‘the fullness of Him Who all in all is being filled’. When the Apostle thus speaks of the church as the *Pleroma* or Fullness of Christ, and in the same breath speaks of the Christ as ‘being fulfilled’, he would appear to mean that, in some mysterious sense, the church is that without which ‘the Christ’ is not complete, but with which He is or will be complete”

Just as in Philippians we read that for the purpose of salvation, the Lord “emptied Himself” (*heauton ekenose* Phil. ii. 7), so, still in relation to the redemptive purpose, and in no way intruding into the realm of essential Deity, that “self-emptying” of His most wonderful DESCENT into humanity, is more than compensated, by this equally wonderful counterbalancing “filling” associated with His ASCENSION as Head of this company. He shall indeed in every sphere be “satisfied” (Isa. liii. 11).

Following close upon this most wonderful revelation of the Divine purpose in this unique church, is the equally overwhelming statement, that this company is potentially

MADE TO SIT TOGETHER IN HEAVENLY PLACES IN CHRIST JESUS (Eph. ii. 6)

This church shares with those whose calling is found in the epistle to the Romans, in that both are reckoned to have been quickened together, raised together with Christ, but never in all the highest flight of teaching, or of exultant worship, has any believer of any other calling, ever been seen as “seated together” where Christ sits at the right hand of God. *Sunkathizo* occurs but once more in the N.T namely in Luke xxii. 55 which passage has no bearing on the subject before us, leaving Eph. ii. 6 unique in the record of blessing. *Kathizo* means “to sit” but there are comparatively few passages where the idea of authority is absent. This aspect of the word has come over into our language; *cathedra* is a chair, to speak of *ex cathedra* is to speak with authority, and a *cathedral* is so named for the “seat” or throne of the bishop which it contains. When we read in Eph. i. 20-22, it seems almost unbelievable that any believer, let alone those who were Gentiles, should be so closely joined to the Lord, as to be reckoned not only to have been raised up together, but made to sit together in those heavenly places “far above all”, but such is the glory of His grace. The epistle to the Hebrews emphasizes the fact that Christ is seated at the right hand of God, but nowhere throughout that epistle is the believer ever said to be “seated together” in heaven’s holiest of all. The Hebrew believers were bidden to “draw near”, the Ephesian saints were “made nigh” and wondrous as the calling revealed in Hebrews is, there is nothing comparable to Eph. ii. 6 to be found in any other epistle.

CONCLUSION

Here, under the symbol of the grapes of Eshcol, we have presented a few of the unique blessings that are to be found ONLY in the Dispensation of the Mystery, and which are peculiar to the epistles of Paul which were written by him after Israel were set aside and became “Lo-Ammi” at Acts xxviii.

Should the present reader be unable to accept the idea that Acts xxviii. constitutes a “Dispensational Frontier” he is recommended to see the evidences set out in the pamphlet of that name. If after searching to see, the reader remains unconvinced, we must accept some measure of blame for the manner of our presentation, but on the other hand such readers may belong to another calling, for no amount of argument can ultimately over-ride the initial choice of the believer to this high calling that was made

“before the foundation of the world”. We are but instruments through whom that sovereign choice may at times be implemented. “How shall they hear without a preacher?”

On the other hand it has been, and still will be, our joy to see the light dawn, and to see those who by nature are aliens and without either promises, covenants or fathers, entering into the blessings of the highest calling of God made known in the Scriptures.

Such can come without further preparation; they have no need to invent for themselves such titles as “spiritual Israel”, such have no need to thrust themselves into a “covenant” made specifically with “the house of Israel and with the house of Judah” and which cannot be implemented while the contracting parties are called by God Himself “NOT MY PEOPLE”.

May many be led to emulate the faith shown by Caleb and Joshua, to shun the unbelieving attitude of the ten spies, to accept the evidence of these “Grapes of Eshcol”, believe, accept and thank the Lord for such overwhelming grace to those so far off, and then seek to walk worthy of such a high calling.

**ZION, THE OVERCOMER,
AND THE MILLENNIUM**

The Berean Expositor

Acts xvii. 10, 11

Volume XXXVIII. No.11 - September, 1956

EDITORS: CHARLES H. WELCH,
33, Union Road, London, S.W.4

STUART ALLEN
Sulhamstead Abbots, Reading

THE EDITOR

TO HIS FRIENDS

While the Apostle's message was not "yea and nay", the arrangements which he made, and the journeys he planned were not so fixed (II Cor. i. 17-19). They were always liable to alteration as circumstances indicated or the will of the Lord was made known.

In the January number of this magazine, we told our friends that we did not contemplate entering into discussion concerning the Millennium, feeling that our limited space was all too short for the making known of the glory of our high calling. However, we have (in the spirits of II Cor. i. 17) been obliged to change our plans. We have met enough undigested exposition as to demand some positive presentation of the truth. We are moved to take up the question of the Pre-Millennial kingdom, because we see only too clearly that there will be one, and it is outlined in Rev. xiii.-xix., but it is the kingdom of the Anti-christian Beast! It is a horrible thing to contemplate, that an earnest believer might unconsciously be preparing those who accept his teaching, to receive the false for the true, for we are warned that the deception will be such that the very elect would be deceived apart from Divine interposition.

We have read many books and pamphlets on the Millennium but few, if any recognize that there are only ten verses in the Scriptures that speak positively of that period. To that inspired and basic passage we hope to devote a portion of each issue of the Berean Expositor during 1957-58.

The claims of the Testimony of the Lord's Prisoner have been paramount, and the Apocalypse has in consequence not been given so much attention. However, what we now lay before the reader is incipient in the article published in the Berean Expositor for May 1916, but not expanded until the present article in September 1956.

We urge all who may read this exposition to put everything to the Berean test. Remember the example of Barnabas. He stood firm with Paul, he dissembled with Peter (Gal. ii. 13). Let all

“Search and see” if what is written is “so”.

FOREWORD

II Timothy ii. 14-26 has been before us in writing the following, somewhat provocative article.

- (a) Striving, and striving about words to no profit, is forbidden (14, 24).
- (b) The only approval we should seek is that of God (15).
- (c) To misplace a truth, may eat as a gangrene (17, 18).
- (d) While we have no fears concerning the “sure foundation”, we have a responsibility to “depart from iniquity” (19).
- (e) We have no call to attempt to “purge” other servants of God, but if we would be “meet for the Master's use” we must “purge ourselves” from any complicity with known error (21).
- (f) Such exhortations as “shun”, “depart”, “flee”, “avoid”, cannot be ignored (16, 19, 22, 23). We cannot sit on the fence.
- (g) All at length leads to “IF GOD PERADVENTURE”. Here we stop and God alone carries forward (25, 26).
- (h) The dreadful alternative being II Timothy iii. 7.

ZION, THE OVERCOMER,

AND THE MILLENNIUM

The Millennium

We have doubtless heard of the little old lady who drew such comfort from “that blessed word MESOPOTAMIA”, and have passed it over with indulgent smile. Yet we all seem to have been bewitched by the word MILLENNIUM, for no such term is found in Scripture. The word has passed beyond the confines of Scriptural exegesis, to the world outside, so that a Member of Parliament may dismiss a suggestion as “thinking we can bring about the Millennium!”

“All engineering commences on the drawing board.” A moment’s reflection will show how sane this observation really is. If only expositors of the Scriptures would get the overall plan of Prophecy before them, and then see how far their theories fit or fail, what a deal of trouble, misunderstanding and false teaching would have been spared. The reader will perceive that this principle is before our mental vision in all the attempts in this analysis to piece the intricate subjects of Prophecy together. For example, we were at first attracted by the teaching known as “The Pre-Millennial Kingdom” but before committing ourselves we took it to the Drawing Board, in other words, looked at the overall picture of Gentile dominion in Dan. ii. We defy anyone to find a loophole for any such kingdom in verses 44, 45, and so, in spite of the claims of friendship and sincere admiration, that pleasant vision had to be set aside. We hope that every one of our readers will do the same with every suggestion made *in this Analysis*, for it is, alas, only too possible that we have a clearer view of the errors of others than of our own.

The Key Passage

It is time we rubbed our eyes, took off the spectacles that prophetic students have supplied, and exercised the *Berean spirit*, which is so highly commended in the Word of God. All that is *positively* stated in the Scriptures on the subject will be found in TEN VERSES of Rev. xx.; all other descriptions, promises, characteristics, are introduced into this period by *inference*, rightly or wrongly, but by inference only. Books on the Millennium pay little attention to the actual wording of Rev. xx. 1-10, but expatiate and enlarge upon peace and prosperity, with superlatives that find no warrant in the *key passage* of Rev. xx. We have moreover, by continually speaking of “The Millennial Kingdom”, unwittingly limited the Reign of Christ to a thousand years; whereas a true statement would speak of that period as “the first thousand years of a kingdom, which, commencing with the coming of Christ and the end of Gentile dominion, goes on unbroken (*it shall never be destroyed, and shall never pass away* Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14, 27) until the Son having put all things under His feet (*for He “must reign” until this is accomplished* I Cor. xv. 25,26 *which reaches to the Great White Throne judgment and beyond*), delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all”. *This is the reign of Christ*, the Millennial reign being but a portion of it, and possibly a small portion at that. ALL that the Scriptures SAY in Rev. xx., about a Millennium are the words *ta chilia ete* “the thousand years”.

The Thousand Years

These words are in themselves no more “blessed” than the word “Mesopotamia”. They may be a thousand years of misery for all that this term “Millennium” teaches. Some of us have come to our conclusion as to the character of this Millennial kingdom *only by ignoring* what is actually written in the Apocalypse. The prophetic clock does not automatically stop at the end of the thousand years; what does come to an end is the reign of the OVERCOMERS. “The King of kings” does not abdicate. The day of the Lord is to be succeeded by the day of God, just as the Davidic kingdom characterized by the presence of the enemy and of war, was succeeded by the Solomonic kingdom of Peace. Is it too much to ask the reader, with these challenging statements before him, to lay aside for the time being at least, whatever he may have held and taught, and approach this important subject afresh? We turn therefore to the key passage:

“And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. 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. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever” (Rev. xx. 1-10).

The Three R's

Three features stand out in this record :

- (1) The Restraint of Satan.
- (2) The Reign of the overcomer.
- (3) The Rebellion at the close.

Here are three R's that are fundamental and ignored at our peril. Satan is only loosed for “a little season” yet the response to his deception is immediate: “they went up”. The objection, that this is beyond the Millennium, is invalid. What takes place in 1958 is intimately connected with what was done and thought in 1957. The nations who are thus deceived are differentiated from the people of Israel. The nations are called Gog and Magog, and inhabit the four quarters or corners of the earth, whereas Israel, we must

assume, occupy the beloved city and form the camp of the saints (Rev. xx. 9). The antichristian character of this rebellion in spite of the intervening thousand years, is indicated by the titles Gog and Magog. The writer of the Apocalypse assumes acquaintance with Ezekiel.

Gog and Magog, Used With Intention

“Son of Man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him” (Ezek. xxxviii. 2).

In association with Gog and Magog, are Persia, Ethiopia, Libya, Gomer and all his bands, the house of Togarmah of the north quarters and all his bands; and many people with thee (Ezek. xxxviii. 5, 6). This invasion by these hordes will be met by the Lord Himself.

“I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws” (Ezek. xxxviii. 4).

“It shall come to pass at the same time when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, saith the Lord GOD, that My fury shall come up in My face” (Ezek. xxxviii. 18).

“Thou shalt fall upon the mountains of Israel, thou, and all thy bands, and the people that is with thee: I will give thee unto the ravenous birds of every sort, and to the beasts of the field to be devoured. And I will send a fire on Magog” (Ezek. xxxix. 4-6).

“I will give unto Gog a place there of graves in Israel and seven months shall the house of Israel be burying of them” (Ezek. xxxix. 11, 12).

“Speak unto every feathered fowl, and to every beast of the field, Assemble yourselves, and come ye shall eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of the princes” (Ezek. xxxix. 17, 18).

The parallel of this passage with Rev. xix. 17-21 is INESCAPABLE. There again we have the call to the fowls to eat the flesh of captains and kings. Here the warring hosts are gathered by the Beast who is cast into the lake of fire.

The “Millennium” is bounded *on each side* by an invading army, led either by the Beast or deceived by Satan, either gathered against “Him that sat on the horse” or “against the beloved city and camp of the saints” and both end in fire, being destroyed as were the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha. If only a handful of rebels were discovered at the close of the thousand years, it would cause us to question the idea of universal peace or righteousness, but this is no “handful”. The number is said to be “as the sand of the sea”, nothing but the overriding desire to hold to a personal pre-conception could ever lead a child of God to belittle this description.

Sand of the Sea---Numberless

From the blessing of Abraham in Gen. xxii. 17 to Hosea i. 10 this figure is used consistently:

“Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be MEASURED nor NUMBERED” (Hos. i. 10).

This unnumbered host with antichristian intent go up “on the breadth of the earth” and even though this should be limited to the “land” of Palestine the implication is obviously the same as in Isa. viii. 8 and Hab. i. 8 where the *overwhelming* nature of the invasion is thereby depicted.

No rhapsody, no poetic phrase, no private interpretation, no wishful thinking can alter the fact, that the “Millennial Reign” ends, as it began with a terrible rebellion. The Millennium is not the FIRST of a new series, but the LAST of an old one, in which man has been tested under different forms of government, and in every case been found wanting. This Millennial kingdom is the LAST OF DELEGATED authority. David may have reigned on earth as vice-regent, the twelve apostles may have sat on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, the overcomers may have reigned as priests of God and of Christ, but all in vain. Christ must put down ALL authority, *whether good or bad*, and reign alone and supreme if ever the goal of the ages is to be reached.

Characteristic Features

We turn our attention for the moment to a series of features that characterize the Millennium, this closing period of man’s probation.

- (1) The restraining of Satan.
- (2) The restraining of transgression.
- (3) The sealing up of sin.
- (4) The rule of a rod of iron.
- (5) The willing obedience of Israel.
- (6) The feigned obedience of many of the nations.

The final weeks of the seventy weeks of Dan. ix. immediately precede the thousand year reign, and carry into that period the blessings indicated in verse 24. The first thing that will be accomplished when the Seventy Weeks attain their goal is said to be “to finish the transgression” (Dan. ix. 24). This translation, however, leaves much to be explained. Will transgression be “finished” in the sense that it is so completely accounted for by Atonement and Forgiveness, that it will never again raise its head? (Heb. *kalah*). Will transgression be “finished” in the sense of the Hebrew word *shalam*? The answer is no, the Hebrew word being *kala*, which though it resembles the Hebrew *kalah* must not be confounded with it. *Kala* is translated as follows :

Forbid 1, keep 1, keep back 1, refrain 2, retain 1, shut up 4, withhold 2, be stayed 2, be restrained 2, be stayed 1, and finish 1.

This is not *mere opinion*, but evidence and evidence which cannot be neglected or denied without spiritual disaster. Be it noted, that the only reference in the A.V. that contains the translation “finish” is Dan. ix. 24, which the margin corrects by saying “or restrain”. The word is used of the imprisonment of Zedekiah and of Jeremiah and the noun forms *kele*, and *beth kele* are translated “prison”. Dan. ix. *does not* teach us that when that prophecy is fulfilled transgression will be “finished”, it will be RESTRAINED

or IMPRISONED. This will be also the condition of Satan through the Millennial Kingdom, he will be “bound” for a thousand years, but he will by no means be “finished”. In like manner, sins will be SEALED UP, as the margin indicates against the reading “to make an end of sins”. The Hebrew word *chatham* is translated as follows :

Seal 16, seal up 6, be sealed 2, mark 1, be stopped 1, and the Chaldaic word in Dan. vi. 17 seal.

Proof of Feigned Obedience

We gather from the marginal references in the A.V. that some of the nations will yield “feigned obedience”. Is this translation justified? Let us see. The passages under review are Psalms xviii. 44; lxvi. 3; and lxxxi. 15. The A.V. and the R.V. read “feigned obedience” in the margin, and the note “Hebrew *lied*”. Is this marginal interpretation correct? We could refer to such expositors as Perowne, Hengstenberg, Young’s Literal translation and Rotherham. Rotherham reads “Come CRINGING unto me”. Of course this unanimity among scholars *may be* but the blind leading the blind, on the other hand they *may* express the mind of God. There is only one authoritative test. The consistent *usage* of the word and a frank exhibition of its occurrences. The Hebrew word *kachash* occurs twenty-eight times, and *in no other passage* than the three Psalms quoted is it translated “submit”. The remaining references are translated as follows :

Fail 1, be found liars 1, belie 1, deal falsely 1, deceive 1, deny 5, dissemble 1, fail 2, lie 5, lies 4, lying 1, and leanness 1.

In no passage is it possible to substitute “obedience” or “submit” in any one of these twenty-four occurrences. If “usage” has any weight, then “feigned obedience” must stand. To *deny* it is to *defy* the testimony of Scripture. Deut. xxxiii. 29 which employs the Hebrew *kachash* reads:

“And thine enemies shall be *found liars* unto thee”.

The scholarly Lexicon of Brown, Driver and Briggs gives the meaning of *kachash*:

“Be disappointing, deceive, fail, grown lean”,

and in reference to the Psalms in question, their note reads:

“Cringe, come cringing, make a show of obedience”.

The Hebrew *Kachash* is Very Rigid

We cannot sweep aside this unanimous testimony without betraying that ulterior motives are prompting our decision. Further, although the LXX is not infallible, yet surely we must allow Hebrews of that early age to understand their own tongue, *at least as well* as the best of us today. The LXX uses *epseusanto* “they lied” in Psa. xviii. 44 and Psa. lxxxi. 15 *exactly* as they do in Deut. xxxiii. 29. We believe the candid student will be convinced that the Hebrew *kachash* is very rigid in its meaning, and cannot be

made to favour a period of universal peace and righteousness. To accept the rendering “to yield feigned obedience” shatters the unscriptural dream of The Millennium. That thousand year reign is not the perfect kingdom on earth.

Psa. xviii. 44, 45 places in correspondence these features:

“The strangers shall submit themselves (margin, yield feigned obedience) unto me. The strangers shall fade away, and be afraid out of their close places (and come trembling).”

Their submission is false.

Psa. lxvi. 3, 5-7. The immediate context refers to the exodus from Egypt.

“How terrible art Thou in Thy works!
Through the greatness of Thy power shall thine
enemies submit themselves unto Thee.
(whether willingly or unwillingly is not revealed here)
He is terrible in His doing toward the children of men.
He turned the sea into dry land
Let not the rebellious exalt themselves.”

Pharaoh is an example of such forced submission.

We learn from Zech. xiv. 16-19 that some of the nations will rebel against the command to go up to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles, yet at the selfsame time and period Israel will be so soundly converted and blessed, that the sacred words, originally limited to the Mitre of the High Priest, namely “Holiness unto the Lord”, shall be on the bells of the horses and on the very pots in the kitchen of this blessed kingdom of Priests, *yet their holy presence does not prevent disobedience rearing its head among the surrounding nation.*

The Rule of the Rod of Iron

Another revealing feature is the use of the rod of IRON. It is beside the point to dwell on the meaning of the Greek word *rhabdos* or its Hebrew equivalent, the word that clamours for consideration is the word IRON. No tender shepherd uses a rod of IRON for the shepherding of his flock, he uses *that* as a weapon of defence against their enemies, the robber, the lion and the wolf.

Psa. ii. 9; Rev. ii. 27; xii. 5 and xix. 15 speak of “breaking” or “ruling” with a rod of IRON, and it is this quality of IRON that demands *attention*, and if *ignored* leads to untruth and bondage (II Tim. ii. 25, 26). When the prophet would impress us with the terrible nature of the fourth beast of Dan. vii., he speaks of its “great IRON teeth” (Dan. vii. 7). In the same way, when the image that symbolizes Gentile dominion is described, it deteriorates from gold to iron, *with this comment:*

“Forasmuch as iron *breaketh in pieces* and subdueth all things: and as iron *that breaketh all these*, shall it *break in pieces and bruise*” (Dan. ii. 40).

That is the inspired comment on iron; “it breaks in pieces”, it bruises, and shall we object to or attempt to correct the language of Holy Writ, without coming under the charge of yielding feigned obedience? Iron is mentioned in the Psalms five times. Apart from Psa. ii. iron is used of *fetters* and likened to *affliction*, and the bars of a prison (Psa. cv. 18; cvii. 10, 16; cxlix. 8). Iron is introduced into the Scriptures as one of the attempts of the line of Cain to alleviate the curse that had come on the earth (Gen. iv. 22). Egypt is likened to “an iron furnace” (Deut. iv. 20), and no tool made of iron was permitted to fashion the stones used in building an altar (Deut. xxvii. 5), and a heaven above and an earth beneath likened to iron, was a disciplinary judgment (Lev. xxvi. 19; Deut. xxviii. 23). Several times we read of the “chariots of iron” employed by the Canaanites (Josh. xvii. 16, 18; Judges i. 19; iv. 3, 13). The question of Jeremiah “shall iron break the northern iron and the steel?” (Jer. xv. 12) is answered in the Millennium. *The rod of iron will do this*. The devouring great iron teeth of the Beast, the down treading feet of iron and clay of the image will be met and more than met by the rule of the rod of IRON. The Hebrew word *raa* to break, is used in Psa. ii. 9; Jer. xv. 12, and its equivalent Chaldaic word in Dan. ii. 40. These are facts which no amount of special pleading can set aside. Again let us note the testimony of Psa. cx.:

“The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool. The LORD shall send the ROD OF THY STRENGTH out of Zion: rule Thou *in the midst* of Thine enemies” (Psa. cx. 1, 2).

Blessing Radiates from Jerusalem

If the words “The LORD said unto My Lord” undoubtedly refer to Christ (Matt. xxii. 44), then the objection that the proximity of “the Lord” and “His Anointed” rules out Christ from Psa. ii. is shown to be invalid. Here the Lord is seen ruling not in a world of universal peace, but “out of Zion” and “in the midst” of enemies. At the same time, and at the very same period in which many of the nations will yield *feigned obedience*, we read:

“Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power” (Psa. cx. 3 A.V.).

“Thy people offer themselves willingly (margin, are freewill offerings)” (Psa. cx. 3 R.V.).

Here we have inspired comparison. The nations yielding feigned obedience; Israel, at last, offering willing obedience. This leads on to another feature associated with the fact namely that the blessing of this Millennial kingdom and afterwards is *first of all* focused in Jerusalem as a radiating centre, and from that centre light and truth will be spread until the knowledge of the Lord fills the earth, as the waters cover the sea.

“They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain”,

that is the first statement.

“For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea” (Isa. xi. 9),

that is the sequel. The answer to the rebellion of the kings of the earth is found in Psa. ii. 6,

“Yet have I set My King upon My holy hill of Zion”.

Beyond this holy hill the heathen in the uttermost parts are to be disciplined with a rod of iron, and the rebellious kings and judges of the earth are given counsel and warning.

“Lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little”
(Psa. ii. 12).

This divinely appointed centre is the theme of Isa. ii.:

“And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD’S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; *and all nations* shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for *out of Zion* shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem” (Isa. ii. 2, 3).

First the rod of His strength shall be sent “out of Zion” where the Lord will rule in the midst of His enemies (Psa. cx. 2). He will, as Psa. ii. 12 threatened, “strike through kings in the day of His wrath” (Psa. cx. 5). After the Lord returns unto Zion, and Jerusalem becomes “a city of truth” (Zech. viii. 3) “many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you” (Zech. viii. 22, 23). When the glory returns to Jerusalem and the temple is built according to the specifications given in the closing chapters of Ezekiel, then the title of the Lord will be indeed Jehovah Shammah “The Lord is there” (Ezek. xlvi. 35).

Rebellion at Close of Millennium

The Millennial kingdom ends as we have seen with a rebellious rising of the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, the number of which is so great as to justify the figure “the number of whom is as the sand of the sea” (Rev. xx. 8). Rebellion therefore was incipient during the 1,000 years. No such rebellion will mar the day when I Cor. xv. 28 is fulfilled, but that lies beyond the limits of the Millennial kingdom and is not spoken of in the Book of the Revelation. We may discover that much that we have imagined belonged to the Millennium will prove to belong to the period that follows. The day of the Lord is followed by the day of God, the Sabbath, followed by “the first or eighth day”.

If we keep *strictly to the record* of Rev. xx. we shall see that the so-called Millennial kingdom is the period when the suffering overcomer who has refused to recognize the Beast or his authority, will “live and reign with Christ, a thousand years”, but nothing is said of the bulk of the nation of Israel, except to reveal that there was also on the earth at the same time “the camp of the saints” and “the beloved city”. To a large extent this phase of the kingdom is God’s answer to *the only pre-millennial kingdom* known in the Apocalypse, namely the Pre-Millennial kingdom of the Beast! When Jerusalem is

created a rejoicing and her people a joy, it is *then* that the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and (yet, at the selfsame time) dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain, saith the Lord (Isa. lxxv. 18, 19, 25).

The reference to the serpent here suggests that the perfect kingdom has not yet arrived, and in line with this, in the midst of this section which speaks of "Millennial" blessedness when "as the days of a tree" shall be the days of His elect (Isa. lxxv. 22), we learn that a "child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed" (Isa. lxxv. 20). While the age of Methuselah is proverbial, and the age of many of the patriarchs of Genesis chapters i. to xi. approached to the 1,000-year limit, not one ever reached it. "The days of a tree" may mean a thousand years, and for any one in that day to die at a hundred years of age would be like a child dying. The fact, however, that it can be contemplated that a "sinner" should "die" at a hundred years of age or be "accursed" (however difficult may be the true exposition of Isa. lxxv. 20), makes one thing certain, it comes *before* the descent of the New Jerusalem to the earth, for *then* there will be "no more" sin, death or curse. This together with the reference to the SERPENT in verse 25, makes it evident that during the "Millennial" kingdom there will be *some* who will be punished for their sin, even as there will be a *multitude* as numerous as the sand of the sea, that shall be devoured by fire that comes down from God out of heaven at the close (Rev. xx. 8, 9). Gog and Magog must have been ready; it only took "a little season" to gather them. We must look to the "eighth day" beyond the Millennial Sabbath for the perfect kingdom. The subject before us is of sufficient consequence to call for a summing up before examining some most extraordinary items that await us in Rev. xx.

A Summary of Millennial Features

- (1) Positive teaching concerning the Millennium is limited to ten verses in Rev. xx. All else is a matter of inference, legitimate possibly, but to be treated with necessary reserve.
- (2) The term "the Millennium" is not a Scriptural title for the period covered by Rev. xx. 1-10, for the word is simply Latin for 1,000 years and that is the number of years covered by this prophecy, and expressed six times over, in verses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The term however must not be invested with meanings and characteristics that belie or ignore what is written in Rev. xx.
- (3) It is correct to speak of this period as a "kingdom", for the overcomers not only "live" but "reign" with Christ a thousand years (Rev. xx. 4, 6). The Greek word for kingdom is *basileia*, the Greek word for reign is *basileuo*. (See article KINGDOM in *An Alphabetical Analysis*, part 2, p. 227).
- (4) Strictly speaking the overcomer (Rev. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21; xii. 11; xv. 2 and xxi. 7) is the thread that links all the prodigious events of this Prophecy together, and unites both passages under Rev. iii. 21 thus:

	<p style="text-align: center;">"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).</p>
--	---

<p>“And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the BEAST, and over his IMAGE, and over his MARK, and over the NUMBER of his NAME, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God” (Rev. xv. 2).</p>		<p>“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).</p>
---	--	---

The words of Rev. xx. 4 “for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God”, form a link with the opening statement of Rev. i. 9, 10 when John was taken in spirit to the day of the Lord from the isle called Patmos where he shared the tribulation of these overcomers, before their time “for the word of God, and for the witness of Jesus”.

The Pre-eminent Feature

“The Millennial kingdom” seems to have been used by writers on prophecy as a convenient period in which to place passages that are somewhat difficult to fit into the overall scheme, and this has blunted the edge of the testimony of Rev. xx., which places as a *pre-eminent feature*, the reward for the Overcomer, and hardly refers to any other company, people or calling. Regarding the statement “This is the first resurrection”, it cannot mean the first that ever was, but the former of two. The reference to the beloved city brings with it the numerous passages of Old Testament prophecy which speak in glowing terms of the restoration of Israel and Jerusalem. Isa. liv. 6-17 reveals a city of jeweled splendour, echoing the glories *on earth* of this heavenly Jerusalem itself. Even so, the chapter ends with a reference to those who will gather together against Jerusalem, with the comforting words:

“No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper”,

even as we have read in Rev. xx. 8, 9. If the inhabitants of the land during the Millennium are those of Israel who looked upon the Lord Whom they had pierced and repented, if the nations are those who were “alive and remained” at the Second Coming, we have no “problem” about Isaiah lxxv. 18-25, for there we read of the possibility of dying and being accursed, and of the length of life being “as the days of a tree”, which, however extended, cannot be a synonym for life eternal and certainly not of immortality.

The Overcomer

Let us observe how these “overcomers” of Rev. xx. 4 are intertwined with the prophetic revelation of the last days. The rewards held out to the overcomers in the seven churches are :

- (1) To eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of *the paradise of God* (Rev. ii. 7).

- (2) Not to fear, he shall not be hurt of *the second death* (Rev. ii. 10, 11).
- (3) He will eat of the hidden manna, have a white stone and a new name (Rev. ii. 17, see Rev. xix. 12).
- (4) He shall rule the nations with *a rod of iron* (Rev. ii. 27).
- (5) He shall be clothed in white, and his name shall not be blotted out of *the book of life* (Rev. iii. 5).
- (6) He will be made a pillar in the temple, and have the name of *the new Jerusalem* written upon him (Rev. iii. 12).
- (7) He will be granted *to sit with Christ on His throne*, even as Christ also overcame, and is set down with His Father in His throne (Rev. iii. 21).

All is linked with the book of the Revelation itself, even as we see that in Rev. xx. 4, none live and reign except those who were martyred under the Beast of Rev. xiii. 18.

“The Millennial kingdom” is a very exclusive kingdom. We are not told in so many words that Israel is a restored people, we can only infer that from the reference to the beloved city and the camp of the saints. If Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David, have been raised from the dead at this time, they do not enter into the picture drawn in Rev. xx. They have no place in “the first resurrection”. The inspired qualification limits this resurrection to martyrs of the last three-and-a-half years of Antichristian Dominion. Two resurrections, and two only are envisaged here and they form a pair :

- (1) The overcomers, every one a martyr. This is “the first” resurrection.
- (2) The rest of the dead. No other resurrection takes place until that of the great white throne at the end of the thousand years. And these two resurrections complement one another and make a pair—“overcomers” v. “the rest” not “saints” v. “the wicked dead”, as is usually taught.

It will be seen we trust, that so far as the record of Rev. xx. is concerned, the Millennial kingdom is preeminently the sphere of reward for those who have suffered unto death during the persecution instituted by the Antichristian Beast of the time of the end. We only learn from that passage that there are “nations” on the earth at the same time, by the reference to the rebellion at the end. We learn at the same time that the beloved city and the camp of the saints have a place there too, but these are not the theme of the Apocalypse.

Only one resurrection is recorded as taking place in this kingdom, and the names of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David are not even mentioned.

We realize that inasmuch as the Millennium is the immediate outcome of the Second Coming of Christ to the earth, all other prophetic features associated with *that phase of the coming* must find a place here. We learn from other passages that *there will be* a resurrection of Israel (Dan. xii. 1-3 and Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14). These too must find a place. It is possible that some prophetic passages refer to the period that follows the

Millennium, when the Heavenly Jerusalem shall descend to the earth and be the glorious administrative centre of the earth for we read that:

“The nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life” (Rev. xxi. 24-27).

The period immediately following the Millennium is marked by five outstanding features :

- (1) The rise of Gog and Magog like the sand of the sea, and their destruction.
- (2) The casting of the Devil into the lake of fire.
- (3) The Great White Throne.
- (4) The New Heavens and the New Earth.
- (5) The descent of the New Jerusalem.

The Former of Two

The resurrection of the overcomers, is said to be the “first”. “When two ordinal numbers are used in such a connection as this, they are used *relatively* hence in English we always say, in such cases, *former* and *latter*” (Dr. E.W. Bullinger). The resurrection of the overcomers is the *former of two*, the resurrection at the Great White Throne being the second or concluding member of the pair. But whoever has heard this Scriptural association even hinted at? We have been too ready to look at the Great White Throne as the judgment of the *wicked dead* or of the *untold millions* who never heard of Christ, and by so doing we have separated what God has joined together. However, merely saying this, proves nothing; “to the law” and the “testimony”. Here is the sequel to the statement of Rev. xx. 4:

“Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection (i.e. the former of two): on such the SECOND DEATH (i.e. connected with the second resurrection of the two) hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years” (Rev. xx. 6).

Whoever heard of any one comparing and contrasting the being “Priests” of God, with the character and fate of those who stand before the Great White Throne? What congruity is there in saying:

“Either they will be overcomers, and reigning Priests” or they will be “the countless millions of wicked dead, multitudes of whom never heard the name of Christ”?

Yet John, writing Rev. xx. 6 does not appear to have any qualms. If the Great White Throne judgment deals with the mass of mankind, *what need was there to assure these overcomers* that the second death had no power over them? The second death as generally interpreted can have no power over *any saved sinner*, let alone over an OVERCOMER. What this passage actually does is to put in opposition :

The second death, and reigning with Christ.

The apostle writing to Timothy said :

“It is a faithful saying, for :

A | “If we died with Him, we shall also LIVE with Him.

B | If we suffer, we shall also REIGN with Him.

B | If we deny Him, He also will deny us.

A | If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful
He cannot deny Himself.”

A similar discrimination is found in I Cor. iii. 12-15. A believer can “suffer loss” but he cannot be LOST.

The Seven Churches

Let us turn to the exhortation given to the churches of Rev. ii. and iii. Look at the church of Smyrna. Not one word of rebuke or censure is given, but an exhortation to remain faithful until death with the promise “I will give thee a crown of life” (Rev. ii. 10). And in addition to the overcomer, the Saviour adds:

“He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death” (Rev. ii. 11).

Can anyone who holds the generally accepted view of the Great White Throne, explain how it is possible to bring together the assurance of the CROWN of life, and exemption from the SECOND DEATH? They have no common ground. The writer of these lines is a believer in Christ. He is saved and knows it, and even though his Christian life and witness be of the poorest quality, he can say as before the Lord, that *he needs no assurance* that he will not be hurt of the second death. The question does not arise. This being so, we are forced to believe that the second death here has been misunderstood.

The Book of Life

Let us look at the church of Sardis (Rev. iii. 1-6). Here there was ground for reproof, their works were not found “perfect before God”. However, to those who were undefiled, promises were made, and we read:

“He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I WILL NOT BLOT OUT HIS NAME out of the Book of Life, but I will confess his name before My Father, and before His angels” (Rev. iii. 5).

Again, if the accepted view of the Great White Throne is true, then this promise is gratuitous, the second death *could never happen any way*, while Rom. viii. 38, 39 remains. However difficult it may be to harmonise with the rest of Scripture one fact emerges from these considerations, namely that the Millennial kingdom and the Great White Throne are *two parts of one whole*. The Book of Life figures in the Revelation five times, thus:

- A | iii. 5. Promise to the overcomer “I will not blot his name out of the book of life”.
- B | xiii. 8. These shall worship the beast.
- xvii. 8. These shall wonder at the beast.
- xx. 12. The book of life opened.
- xx. 15. Those not in the book of life.
- A | xxii. 19. Threat to take the name out of the book of life.

To this list we might add Rev. xxii. 18 where the plagues recorded in this book will be added to any who add to the things written, thus rounding off the intimate connection that exists with the earlier and closing sections of this prophecy.

A List of Evils Related to Apostasy

Another challenging passage is Rev. xxi. 7, 8. Over against the overcomer, who is to inherit all things, is placed a list of evils, that at first glance belongs only to the wicked, the ungodly and the unsaved. Yet remembering what we have already seen, and observing *once more* that it is in contrast with the OVERCOMER, not with the average believer, that this list is presented, perhaps the reader will hesitate to pronounce judgment until the Scriptures are permitted to speak for themselves. Here is the list:

“The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death” (Rev. xxi. 8).

Can such a list have any relation with a professed believer? Before this study we might have pronounced an unhesitating “no” but perhaps we are not quite so sure now. Let us “search and see”.

“The fearful” Greek *deilos*. This word occurs only three times in the New Testament. “Why are ye so fearful, O ye of little faith?” (Matt. viii. 26; see also Mark iv. 40).

These words are addressed to the DISCIPLES. *Deilia* occurs but once, and it is used by Paul in his letter to Timothy in view of the perilous position Timothy was about to step into:

“God hath not given us the spirit of FEAR be not ashamed” (II Tim. i. 7, 8).

Deilia occurs but once, namely in John xiv. 27:

“Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid”.

The LXX uses *deilos* of Rehoboam who was young and “tender hearted” and so understood not “the children of Belial” (II Chron. xiii. 7). In like manner, and connected with the overcoming character, Deut. xx. 8 uses *deilia* for the soldier who is “fearful and faint-hearted”. Here therefore is proof, that the “fearful” can and does include many of those who are nevertheless saved, disciples or servants of the Lord.

“The Unbelieving” *apistos*. That it is possible for a believer to have “an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God”, Heb. iii. 12 makes clear, and the context

likens this attitude to the character of those who, though redeemed from Egypt, nevertheless “fell in the wilderness” (Heb. iii. 17) and in contrast with the two “overcomers” Caleb and Joshua (Heb. iii. 16). II Tim. ii. 13 has already been quoted as showing that though the words “if we believe not” can alas apply at times to those who nevertheless “shall live”, they cannot be said of those who both “live and reign”.

“The Abominable”, *bdelussomai*. This word is used with reference to “the Abomination of Desolation” spoken of by Daniel the prophet (Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14; Rev. xvii. 4, 5; xxi. 27). The fearful, the unbelieving, the abominable, are all related to the state of mind that the terrible persecution of the Beast at the time of the end will induce.

“The Murderer”, *phoneus*. The reader may with some reluctance have followed so far, but at the word “murder” will probably draw back. Yet Peter did not feel it necessary to explain and excuse the introduction of so dreadful a term, when he wrote:

“Let none of you suffer as a *murderer*, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men’s matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian”
(I Pet. iv. 15, 16).

To us, it seems odd to link “murder” with “being a busybody” or of using such an exhortation to “Christians”, but Peter did not feel that way evidently. Paul likewise, when writing to the Galatians puts together “emulations, envyings, drunkenness and revellings” with “murder” (Gal. v. 19-21), and adds to all such, not to murder only, “such shall not inherit the kingdom of God”. That self-righteous Pharisee, who became the beloved apostle of the Gentiles, could say of his early life “touching the righteousness which is in the law” that he was “BLAMELESS” yet he had set out on a mission breathing out threatenings and MURDER (*phonos*) against the disciples of the Lord (Acts ix. 1).

When the Man of Sin is in the ascendant, when no one will be permitted to either buy or sell that has not the mark of the Beast, then many shall “betray one another” and deliver up the true believer to be “killed” (Matt. xxiv. 9, 10). To those thus betrayed will come the promise:

“Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death” (Rev. ii. 10, 11).

“The Whoremongers” *pornos*. This word and its variants refer to any allegiance, in the day of the Lord, to that evil system associated with “The mother of Harlots” (Rev. xvii. 1).

“The Sorcerers” *pharmakeus*. These sorcerers are mentioned in Rev. ix. 21 and xviii. 23 and reveal the Satanic powers that will be at work in the day of the Lord. In the list already quoted from Gal. v., Paul includes “witchcraft” (*pharmakia*). These awful powers are seen at work in Rev. xvi. 13, 14:

“And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.”

“Idolaters and all liars” conclude this dreadful list. The apostle did not hesitate to say when writing to the church at Corinth “If any man that is called a BROTHER be an idolater” (I Cor. v. 11), neither did he feel it unnecessary to say “neither be ye idolaters as were some of them” (who did not overcome like Caleb and Joshua) (I Cor. x. 7). See I Cor. ix. 24 where this passage is introduced, not with salvation, but with prize and crown, and with the possibility of being a “castaway” or “disapproved”.

The worship of the image of the Beast (Rev. xiii. 15) when resisted led to the martyrdom and the crown of those who reign during the thousand years (Rev. xx. 4). Finally “all liars” is extended in Rev. xxi. 27 as “whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie” and in Rev. xxii. 15 is further expanded to “whosoever loveth and maketh a lie”. “The lie” is of the Devil, it is “his own” (John viii. 44). “The lie” is associated with the Man of Sin and the working of Satan, together with those who received not the love of the TRUTH and have pleasure in unrighteousness (II Thess. ii. 9-12). In the church, those who posed as apostles were found “liars” (Rev. ii. 2), and the liar is definitely associated with Antichristian denial (I John ii. 22). This list of dreadful sins is all related *to the time of stress which comes upon the world under the domination of the Beast and the False Prophet*. To lean towards that blasphemous teaching, to submit rather than suffer, becomes an act of treachery on a field of battle, and the treatment of all such offenders must be drastic in the extreme.

There remains to be considered one more feature, and one that may cause considerable feeling; that is the bringing into the realm of the church (Rev. ii. 3) the possibility of ending up in the Lake of Fire. Traditional theology in the past has entertained few qualms as it contemplated the countless millions of unevangelized heathen being consigned to that dreadful place, but it may be the nearer approach will stimulate a keener interest. The Lake of Fire is implicit in the two references to the churches, the second death, and the Book of Life already considered (Rev. ii. 11; iii. 5). In the first place, this dreadful doom was not prepared for the sons of men, it was “prepared for the Devil and his angels” (Matt. xxv. 41) and in the Revelation, the first to enter are The Beast, the False Prophet, and the Devil (Rev. xix. 20; xx. 10).

In times of peace, the punishment for some act directed against a Government might be several years’ imprisonment, but the selfsame act in time of war might be punishable by death. Into the churches of Rev. ii. and iii. we can perceive the infiltration of the fifth columnists, false apostles, liars, Nicolaitanes, the blasphemy of those pretending to be Jews, but who are of the synagogue of Satan; Satan’s throne, the doctrine of Balaam, the woman Jezebel, the threat to “kill her children with death”, the depths of Satan, a name to live yet dead. These constitute the associations of some of those who, having sold themselves to Satan, received the mark of the Beast, and so will be counted worthy of suffering the same fate as that infernal trinity, the Beast, the False Prophet, and the

Devil. The Psalms, many of which are prophetic, are full of complaints and prayers concerning the enemy, the deceitful man, the persecutor, the betrayer.

Where Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, the believing remnant of Israel, and of “all Israel” that will ultimately be saved come in this period and sphere, must be gathered from other Scriptures. Abraham, we know from Heb. xi., will find his place in the heavenly Jerusalem but this does not descend to the earth until the thousand years are finished. The one positive teaching of Rev. xx. 1-6 is that the martyrs of the final three and a half years of Gentile dominion, shall “reign” and be “priests” of God and of Christ.

Three Days

Before we consider the teaching of Rev. xx., concerning the Great White Throne, let us gather what we may from the testimony of 2 Peter chapter iii. He speaks of:

- (1) The day of the Lord (II Pet. iii. 10).
- (2) The day of God (II Pet. iii. 12).
- (3) The new heavens and earth (II Pet. iii. 13).
- (4) The day of the age (lit.) (II Pet. iii. 18).

The wording of the A.V. obscures the relation of the day of the Lord with the day of God, the R.V. is nearer to the original.

“But *the day of the Lord* will come as a thief; IN THE WHICH the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up.”

“Looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of *the day of God* BY REASON OF WHICH the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?” (II Pet. iii. 10-12 R.V.).

“In the which”, “by reason of which” clearly distinguishes the one from the other. The day of God succeeds the day of the Lord and is beyond the dissolution of heaven and earth. For that day, said Peter, we look, and that day of God is explained further to be :

- (1) The new heavens and new earth.
- (2) The Day (pre-eminently) of the age *hemera aionos* (II. Pet. iii. 18). The Millennium is not the goal, the goal is the Day of the Age, the Day of God, symbolized in the typical Scriptures as “the eighth day” the first day of a new week.

When we consider the opening of the seals, we find that the sixth seal (Rev. vi. 12-17) takes us to the frontier of the Millennium. The sun becomes black, the moon like blood, the heavens depart as a scroll, the day of His wrath is come. There can be no more than one occasion when the heavens depart as a scroll.

Psalm ii. speaks of the gathering of the kings and rulers of the earth and is quoted in Acts iv. 26, 27 of Christ. The kindling of the wrath of the Son is parallel with the passage quoted from Rev. vi.

The Great White Throne

Let us now turn our attention to the Great White Throne. We observe that this judgment is twofold. First there is a judgment of works, and this is followed by the judgment that issues in life or the second death. The judgment that will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha can scarcely be made to fit in here, neither can the judgment of the unevangelized Gentile world be easily aligned here as it is described in Rom. ii. 6-16. The latter at least is a judgment according to “deeds” (Rom. ii. 6), and of course may be all one and the same as this judgment of Rev. xx., but for the moment the decision is not vital to our quest. The Gospel preacher often refers to the Great White Throne in language that exceeds anything written in Rev. xx. Instead of this chapter telling us that “whoever stands before the Great White Throne is necessarily damned”, the reverse is the truth. John ceases to speak of multitudes, he descends to the singular *kai ei tis eblethe* “If ANYONE He was cast”.

The Great White Throne resurrection and judgment is the complement of the Overcomer’s resurrection and judgment and being so, may have no reference to the millions of unevangelized dead.

Here for the moment we stay. Much re-adjustment will be necessary and this requires time, care and prayerful study. We believe sufficient has been brought forward in this analysis to justify a re-examination of many existing theories, and if it only calls a halt, and sends us all back to the neglected yet central portion of Scripture in this connection, namely Rev. xx. 1-10, enough will have been achieved to justify publication. By speaking of the “Millennial” kingdom we have blinded our eyes. We ought to speak of the first thousand years of a kingdom that shall have no end until the Son of God delivers up a perfected kingdom to God the Father, that God may be all in all.

Delegated Authority

The “Millennium” is the last of the rule of God upon earth that employs DELEGATED authority. David in resurrection, will be the Saviour’s Viceroy. The twelve apostles will sit upon the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, the martyrs of the Antichristian persecutions will reign with Christ, and even then, the 1,000 years ends in rebellion. The reign that follows is the age of the Son of Man alone, and this ushers in the day of glory. We are conscious that much that we have written in this article is rather disconcerting, but we ask only one thing of our readers. Have we built squarely upon the revealed Word of God? Have we introduced any private interpretations of our own? We earnestly desire to be corrected if we have unconsciously done the latter, but we make no apology for any of our teaching that is in harmony with the Scriptures.

The interested reader will find in *The Berean Expositor*, Volume VI, page 66, that what we have here expanded was there foreshadowed, but the claims of the Dispensation

of the Mystery made demands that put the question of the Millennium on the shelf. Recent suggestions have prompted us to the present analysis.

Two challenging items must conclude this survey.

Whose Works Will be Judged?

(1) At the Great White Throne there will be a judgment of WORKS. If those judged are the wicked dead, why differentiate between sins and works? Commentators seem to be unanimous that this judgment refers to the teeming millions of unevangelized heathen. But, seeing that Rev. ii. 11 and iii. 5 and xx. 6 tie the whole of the Apocalypse together and must not exclude xx. 12-15, and seeing that “works” are definitely a subject of “judgment” in Rev. ii. 2, 5, 9, 13, 19, 26; iii. 1, 2, 8, 15 and *the rewards* of these same chapters all point forward to the same closing scenes of the Apocalypse, does it not cry out for recognition that “the works” of Rev. xx. 12, 13 are NOT the works of the unevangelized millions but of those who could not be included in the FORMER resurrection of the overcomers, both characters being found in the seven churches?

(2) Again, the Book of Life is defined in Rev. xxi. 27 as “The *Lamb’s* book of life”, even as it is in Rev. xiii. 8 in direct reference to the worship of the Beast. Heb. xii. 23 will help us here. Heb. xii. 5-7 deals with sons, the theme of Heb. xii. 18-29 is the especial blessing of the “firstborn” in connection with “Mount Sion the heavenly Jerusalem”. The names of those firstborn are “WRITTEN IN HEAVEN” and the threat or the exemption concerning the “blotting out of the name from the book of life” has reference to those who during the three years and a half of the great tribulation, become *either* “overcomers” or wait for the resurrection at the Great White Throne.

We particularly ask every reader—Do you, or will you START all your investigations of this great subject of prophecy with the key passage—Rev. xx. 1-10? Dr. Bullinger used to say “Some use the Scriptures as a BUTTRESS, to support their convictions. Others go to the Scriptures as a BUCKET let down into the well of truth, and come up full of the water of life”. Which kind are you? We had thought to head this article “Beyond the Millennial Reign” but we have done little else than clear away some of the accumulated rubbish that has prevented genuine building (Neh. iii. 1-32; iv. 10). We doubt not but that we shall have to build not only with trowel, but as Nehemiah did with a sword near at hand (Neh. iv. 18) but it will be a well worth fight (II Tim. iv. 7). The ages that follow the thousand years must be the theme of future studies.

The following study may help us to recognize the place that the overcomer plays in prophecy.

Readers overseas may be pardoned for thinking of London as one great city, but in reality there are two Londons. The one a square mile, with place names still indicating the gates of the city, such as Bishop’s Gate, Aldgate, Cripplegate, etc. and odd remnants of the old city wall. This is “The city of London” with its ancient history, its city police,

its city giants, and its valued citizenship. Greater London is governed by the London County Council and differs in many essential respects from the city.

So, it is easy for the reader to think of Jerusalem as of one undivided city, but closer examination of the Scriptures will lead to a discrimination between the city Jerusalem and the stronghold of Zion. As certain aspects of truth are especially related to Zion, this distinction must be kept in mind. The first reference to Jerusalem, is in Josh. x. 1 where we find it ruled by the Amorite king Adoni-zedek “the Lord of righteousness”, Satan’s substitute for Melchizedek “King of Righteousness” (Gen. xiv. 18). Although Jerusalem was taken by Joshua we read:

“As for the Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day” (Josh. xv. 63).

Zion and the Overcomer

Coming to the days of David we find the first reference to Zion. David reigned first over Judah in Hebron, and then over all Israel in Jerusalem (II Sam. v. 5), but we learn that there was a “stronghold” held by the Jebusites that defied him. So confident were they in the impregnability of Zion that they manned the walls with the halt and the blind in derision. A secret entrance called “the gutter” became known to David, and he announced that whoever could get up this gutter and capture the stronghold of Zion should be made Chief Captain. This Joab accomplished, climbing up a shaft that connected what is now called “the Virgin’s Fount” with the interior of Zion (II Sam. v. 6-9). In I Chron. xi. 4-6 this exploit is recorded, and there we have not only the added note “So Joab the son of Zeruijah went first up, and was chief” but the remainder of the chapter is significantly devoted to enumerating the names and the exploits of “the first three”, “the thirty” and a list of “valiant men” all marked out for conspicuous bravery. The first reference to Zion, links it with the “overcomer”.

Sion is Equivalent to the Heavenly Jerusalem

When we turn to the New Testament we find this association preserved. “Ye are come to Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem the church of the firstborn which are written in heaven” (Heb. xii. 22, 23). Sion is mentioned also in the book of the Revelation where we see the 144,000 overcomers stand on Mount Sion with the Lamb (Rev. xiv. 1, 4). Hebrews xii. and Gal. iv. place Mount Sinai in contrast with Mount Sion, and in Gal. iv. the apostle speaks of “Jerusalem which is above” (Gal. iv. 25, 26). Paul would be familiar with the fact noted by Josephus that Sion was referred to as “The upper city” using the same word *ano* as is found in Gal. iv.; *he ano agora, he ano Ierusalem*. Putting these references together, we perceive that Sion differs from Jerusalem in that it is associated with overcoming, it is the Upper City, it is the alternative title to the heavenly Jerusalem. In the Old Testament this heavenly city is unrevealed, and Zion refers there to the centre of the Lord’s administration not in days of perfect peace, but in the midst of enemies:

“The LORD shall send the rod of Thy strength out of Zion: rule Thou IN THE MIDST OF THINE ENEMIES.”

“The Lord at Thy right hand shall STRIKE THROUGH KINGS in the day of His WRATH” (Psa. cx. 2, 5).

This passage is comparable with Psa. ii. There we have the kings of the earth setting themselves against the Lord, and against His anointed, but He that sitteth in the heavens shall have them in derision, and when He speaks to them, it is in His WRATH, saying:

“Yet have I set My King upon My holy hill of Zion.”

This King whose dominion includes “the uttermost parts of the earth” shall “break them with a rod of iron” and these kings are enjoined to “Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, When His WRATH is kindled but a little” (Psa. ii. 6, 8, 9, 12).

The Millennium follows *immediately* upon the Coming of Christ (Rev. xix. 21; xx. 1, 2). There is no interval for a Pre-Millennial kingdom in the records of the Apocalypse *except* it be the kingdom of the Beast. When Christ comes, He comes to Zion:

“The Redeemer shall come to Zion Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the LORD is risen upon thee” (Isa. lix. 20 to lx. 1).

At the selfsame time, namely at the coming of the Lord to Zion “darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people and Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising the nation and the kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea those nations shall be utterly wasted” (Isa. lix. 20; lx. 1, 2, 3, 12). Again we read in the prophecy of Joel:

“Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in My holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the LORD cometh, for it is nigh at hand The LORD also shall roar out of Zion and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the LORD will be the hope of His people, and the strength of the children of Israel for the LORD dwelleth in Zion” (Joel ii. 1; iii. 16, 21).

The Millennium opens (1) with the Lord reigning in Zion, or (2) it does not. *If it does*, then the Millennium cannot be a kingdom of universal peace, to say so denies the testimony of Scripture. When the Lord reigns in Zion it is in the midst of enemies. Wrath is to be feared. Rule will be severe—a rod of IRON. Nations are in danger of perishing and so are kings, and the nation and the kingdom that refuse to serve Israel shall perish “Yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted” (Isa. lx. 12). This will be the day when Israel shall be named “The Priests of the Lord” and “Ministers of our God”, the day when those that mourn “in Zion” shall have beauty for ashes (Isa. lxi. 3, 6).

So we could continue. We must either believe that when the Lord reigns in Zion, it will be on an earth where enemies still exist, or we can believe one or other of the theories with which the Millennial kingdom has been invested, but it is impossible to believe both.

The Last Test

The Millennium is man's last opportunity and test. Here, when sin is restrained and the Devil bound, man still proves utterly unable to stand, and the Millennium is the last of a series that commenced with Eden, and which continued under patriarchal rule, the dominion of law, and the reign of David, even to the advent of the Son of Man in His humiliation on earth.

Right Division Obtains Here

We have evidently placed in the Millennium prophecies that belong to a succeeding age, and not to the reign of the overcomer. A day follows the Millennium when the heavenly Jerusalem descends to the earth, to be the jeweled centre of a new earth, and Peter tells us that the day of God follows the day of the Lord. The new heavens and the new earth to which Peter directed his readers (II Pet. iii. 13) where, he said, "dwelleth righteousness" is an aspect of truth to which we turn our attention in subsequent articles.

Reckoning and Reality

(A sequel to the series entitled “Emmanuel, God with us”)

No.1. The Seven Steps to Reality.

pp. 39, 40

Our first concern must be to establish the connexion, suggested in our title, between the present series of studies, and the series already in progress under the title “Emmanuel, God with us”. To avoid repeating what has already been written, we represent this connexion by means of a diagram. We trust that this, together with the accompanying explanation, will suffice to make the point clear.

- - - Illustration - - - (BE-XXXVIII.39).

At His birth the Saviour became Emmanuel (“God with us”) but, although this condescension is beyond the power of man to compute, it did not itself accomplish redemption from sin. It was only a step in that direction. The preposition *meta* (“with”) does not indicate union, but association. By His very sinlessness the Saviour was “separate from sinners”. The Incarnation provided the body by which He was to make the one all-sufficient sacrifice for sin. The last occurrence of the word *meta*, before He endured the cross, is found in the record of Mark xv. 28, “He was numbered (reckoned) with (*meta*) the transgressors”. At this point a new principle is introduced, the principle of “reckoning”. By this principle “He Who knew no sin” could be made sin for us, even as we who had sinned, could be made “the righteousness of God in Him”.

Because of this principle of “reckoning” (Rom. iv. 10), or “counting” (Rom. iv. 3), or “imputing” (Rom. iv. 22-24), as the word *logizomai* is variously translated, we are enabled to “reckon” ourselves “dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. vi. 11). In connexion with this “reckoning” a new preposition *sun* is introduced, displacing the preposition of mere proximity *meta* by the preposition of union. We are made one with Christ, not in and by His birth, but in and by His death.

This new bond of union which commences at the cross, leads on to the glorious climax of being “manifested with Him in glory” (Col. iii. 4), where “reckoning” is exchanged for “reality”.

There are seven rungs in the ladder of grace, commencing with the Cross and ending in Glory. We will arrange the seven passages concerned in the order in which they appear in the development of the doctrine, and also in such a way that the first rung in the ladder shall be the lowest on the page.

(7) “Manifested with” in glory (Col. iii. 4).	<i>Sun phaneroo.</i>	REALIZATION.
(6) “Seated with” in heavenly places (Eph. ii. 6).	<i>Sugkathizo.</i>	RECKONING.
(5) “Raised with” (Col. iii. 1).	<i>Sunegeiro.</i>	RECKONING.
(4) “Quickened with” (Eph. ii. 5).	<i>Suzoopoieo.</i>	RECKONING.
(3) “Buried with” (Rom. vi. 4).	<i>Sunthaptomai.</i>	RECKONING.
(2) “Dead with” (II Tim. ii. 11).	<i>Sunapothnesko.</i>	RECKONING.
(1) “Crucified with” (Rom. vi. 6).	<i>Sustauroo.</i>	RECKONING.

The first six steps in this blessed ascent are taken during the present life: the seventh and last step awaits the resurrection. The first six steps are taken while we are still mortal; the seventh and the last step awaits immortality. The first six steps are ours only by “reckoning”. Steps 1, 2 and 3 are beyond our personal participation. Steps 4, 5 and 6 are a kind of first fruits. The seventh and last step will be ours in “reality”.

Not until every vestige of the old nature has gone completely can there be any “real” union with the holy Son of God. During this life that union is by “reckoning”, but in the life to come the believer can be truly united with the Risen Christ by virtue of the New Life which is the gift of God through the offering of His Son, and conferred upon the believer at the Resurrection. Here at length all barriers to complete union will have been dissolved, and what was hitherto enjoyed by the gracious principle of reckoning will then be enjoyed in reality.

No believer has been actually “crucified with Christ”; he can be graciously “reckoned” so, but no more. No believer has actually “died with Christ”; he can only do so by “reckoning”. This principle of “reckoning” is the first true link between the Saviour and the saved. He, the sinless One was “reckoned” with the transgressors, so that they could be “reckoned” with Him in His sacrificial work. No longer is He “with” us only (*meta*) in close association; He is also one with us (*sun*) in a blessed and eternal union.

Every one of these seven steps has already been dealt with in the course of our exposition of Romans, Galatians, Ephesians and Colossians, but there is more in them than any one exposition can ever hope to reveal, and the consideration of them as a series is demanded by reason of their extreme importance.

When these seven steps to full Realization have been examined, there will be necessitated a still further series, which must include those other references to the believer’s union with Christ that lie outside this great ascent.

No.2. “Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise.”
A preliminary study.
pp. 70 - 73

The first of the seven steps to reality, in which the believer is said to be “with” Christ, is connected with His crucifixion. Two passages make use of the verb *sustauroo* “to crucify with”. Of the seven terms, five are not used in any other connexion than that of the union of the believer with his Lord in being either buried with Him, quickened with Him, raised with Him, seated with Him, or manifested with Him. The first two however, are used in other connexions than those immediately referring to union with Christ, and this we must first of all investigate. For the time being we are limiting our inquiry to the term “to crucify together”. *Sustauroo* is used three times in the Gospels, to speak of the thieves who were “crucified with” the Lord (Matt. xxvii. 44; Mk. xv. 32; Jn. xix. 32).

“Then were there two thieves crucified with Him, one on the right hand and another on the left” (Matt. xxvii. 38).

“And they that were crucified with Him reviled Him” (Mark xv. 32).

“Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with Him” (John xix. 32).

For the purposes of this present study we do not feel it would be of any help to make a digression and discuss the question whether there were two only who were thus crucified with Christ, or whether there were two thieves, and two malefactors. The interested reader will find all the relevant data in Appendix 164 of “The Companion Bible”. Luke does not use the words “crucify with” but expresses the fact in another way saying “There they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left” (Luke xxiii. 33).

The passage in Mark xv., which gave us the first great “reckoning” “He was numbered with the transgressors”, supplies us also with the one occurrence in that gospel of the words “to crucify with” (Mark xv. 27, 32). As used by Mark, this word *sustauroo* does not mean union, but physical proximity and similarity of execution, but as used by Paul the new and wonderful doctrine of identification intensifies the meaning of the words.

While Luke does not employ the words “crucify with”, he alone reveals the conversation, the conviction, and the confession of the dying malefactor, and the contrasted mental attitude of the two malefactors provides a transition of meaning, where mere physical proximity passes over into blessed union expressed in the promise “Thou shalt be with Me in paradise” (Luke xxiii. 43).

Let us note the words of the dying malefactor. In answer to the railing of his companion in condemnation, it is written:

“But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?”

What did this man mean when he said “the same condemnation”? Did he mean the same condemnation that he himself was in, or did he look at the dying Saviour and say in effect “we are all being treated alike, we are in the same condemnation”? There seems to be no point in this rebuke unless it refers to the crucifixion of Christ. Both the Holy Saviour and the guilty sinners were “in the same condemnation”, the One being reckoned with the transgressors, the others, as the malefactor continued:

“And we indeed justly. We receive the due reward of our deeds; but this Man hath done nothing amiss” (Luke xxiii. 41).

Here is a series of statements, each of which foreshadow the great doctrine of the epistles of Paul. They can be arranged under the following heads:

- (1) Both the Lord and the malefactors were in the same condemnation.
- (2) In the case of the malefactors, this condemnation was a just reward for their deeds.
- (3) But “this Man” had done nothing amiss, and so was either:
 - (a) Suffering because of a miscarriage of human justice; or
 - (b) Suffering as a Substitute; or
 - (c) Suffering both because of a miscarriage of human justice, and at the same time by Divine appointment.

“Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain” (Acts ii. 23).

“For He hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him” (II Cor. v. 21).

While, therefore, the first use of *sustauroo* “crucify with” meant only physical association, it becomes apparent as the record proceeds, that one of these dying malefactors becomes the first great type of believer, who by faith is “reckoned” to have died with Christ the great Substitute and Head. If this be so, we must become more fully acquainted with the transaction recorded in Luke xxiii. 41-43, before we turn to the two passages in Paul’s epistles, where the doctrine of crucifixion with Christ is fully enunciated.

Having made the threefold confession concerning his own condemnation, the sinlessness of the Saviour, and yet the sharing with them of the same condemnation, the dying malefactor turned to “this Man”, this forsaken, crucified Man, Who had been “numbered with the transgressors”, Who had saved others, but refused to save Himself, he turned and addressed this dying Man of Nazareth as “Lord”; he saw beyond the crown of thorns and the mockery of the superscription that He was indeed “King”. The words “when Thou comest into Thy kingdom”, should be translated “when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom”, even as Matt. xxv. 31 “When the Son of Man shall come in His glory”. The verb “comest” is the chief word of this clause, and the words “in Thy Kingdom” the

qualification. This dying malefactor saw more clearly than the apostles themselves did, before Pentecost, that here, crucified at his side was the Messiah, the King of Israel.

“And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with Me in Paradise” (Luke xxiii. 43).

The reader will be aware that the orthodox interpretation of these gracious words, is that the soul of the malefactor, fully conscious after death, entered into the intermediate state on the very day of the crucifixion, and as far as we know, he is there still “unclothed” and will remain so until the day of resurrection. Let us examine these words afresh.

Paradise. This is evidently the well-known paradise of Scripture for the Greek has the article “The Paradise”. The word “paradise” occurs in three passages in the Hebrew O.T., “forest” (Neh. ii. 8), “orchard” (Eccles. ii. 5; Song of Sol. iv. 13).

The word is not strictly a Hebrew word, but is rather a term borrowed from the Persian, where it signified a pleasure garden. The word is found in the *Sanscrit* as *paradeesha*.

The word *paradise* is found in the Septuagint Version of the O.T., five times in Gen. ii. and eight times in Gen. iii., where it translates the Hebrew word for “garden”. Apart from the reference in Luke xxiii. 43, the word *paradise* occurs but twice more in the Greek N.T., namely at II Cor. xii. 4 and Rev. ii. 7.

It is extremely difficult to interpret Rev. ii. 7 as of the intermediate state, for the reference to the tree of life implies a garden and the reference is made so evidently to what is described in Rev. xxii. 1-5, as to make any reference to Hades and the intermediate state impossible.

II Cor. xii. 2 and 4 speaks of Paul being “caught up to the third heaven” and “caught up to paradise”, *harpazo*. This word which is translated “caught up” is incorrectly invested by such a rendering with a sense of direction. There is nothing in the word itself to show whether the catching is “up” or “away”. Its primary meaning is that of the action of a beast prey as in John x. 12. This idea underlies the variants of the word, as for example *harpago* extortion, spoiling (Matt. xxiii. 24; Heb. x. 34); *harpax* ravaging (Matt. vii. 15); *harpagmos* robbery (Phil. ii. 6). Wild beasts, spoilers, robbers, do not necessarily catch or snatch *up*. Philip was “caught away” by the Spirit of the Lord and transferred to a desert (Acts viii. 39), even as the wicked one “catcheth away” the word of the kingdom (Matt. xiii. 19). Where the context demands an upward direction, that can be included as in I Thess. iv. 17. Paul therefore could have been caught away to the future Paradise which, as Rev. xxii. shows, is on the earth. This paradise comes after the mention of the new heaven and new earth of Rev. xxi. In Gen. i. 1 we have the first heaven and earth, in Gen. i. 3, Rev. xx. 15 we have the second heaven and earth, and in Rev. xxi.-xxii. we have the third heaven and earth. To this period Paul was caught away. There is no Scripture that gives the slightest warrant for transferring paradise from earth, either to hades beneath or to heaven above.

When the Lord therefore said to the malefactor “Thou shalt be with Me in paradise”, He was looking to the end of the age and the consummation of His great work. There, this poor dying rebel will find a place. Before we go further with this aspect of the subject, we must consider the bearing upon all this of the words “To-day”. It is assumed that the Lord assured the dying malefactor that on that very day of crucifixion he would be in paradise. Let us look at two passages in Luke’s gospel, where there is no shadow of doubt as to the meaning.

“And He began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears”
(Luke iv. 21).

No one would dream of detaching the words “This day” from the rest of the Lord’s utterance. They form an integral part of what He said. Moreover, He Himself did not say the preceding words “And He began to say unto them” they are the words of Luke.

“And Jesus said unto him, This say is salvation come to this house” (Luke xix. 9),

and again, we must understand that the words “This day” form a part of what the Lord actually said to Zaccheus.

Now these two passages taken from the same writer differ in one essential particular from the wording of Luke xxiii. 43. In both passages, the actual words spoken by the Lord are prefaced by the particle *hoti* “that”, and the presence of this particle in Luke iv. 21 and xix. 9 proves that the words “This day” belong to the remainder of the sentence. When we examine Luke xxiii. 43, we discover that the particle *hoti* is not used. The common Hebrew idiom is fully represented by the Lord’s reply in Luke xxiii. 43.

“I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land” (Deut. iv. 26).

This idiomatic use of the phrase “this day” occurs forty-two times in Deuteronomy, and the forty-two passages are given in “The Companion Bible” at Deut. iv. 26. What the Lord said therefore, was indeed a reply to the dying man’s request:

“Lord, remember me, WHEN THOU COMEST IN THY KINGDOM.”
“Verily I say unto thee today, THOU SHALT BE WITH ME IN PARADISE.”

We have yet to consider the way in which the apostle Paul has used the word *sustauroo* “to crucify with”, but we must defer that study until the next article of this series.

No.3. The First Reckoning, “Crucified with Christ”. pp. 104 - 107

In the preceding article of this series, we noted the occurrence in the Gospels and in the epistles of *sustauroo* “to crucify with”, but paused to examine the Lord’s promise to the dying malefactor. We discovered that this man who was “crucified with” the Saviour was directed to the goal that was before Him, the Paradise of God, when the kingdom should indeed be the Lord’s. This dying man is the first great pledge and type of all who shall thus reach the crown by means of the cross, whether in the kingdom or the church.

No other books in the N.T. outside of the Gospels make use of the word “to crucify with” than Paul’s epistles to the Galatians and Romans. The words *stauros* “cross” and *stauroo* “crucify” are not found in the epistles of the circumcision, but are found only in the epistles of Paul. In Paul’s epistles *stauros* occurs eleven times and *stauroo* eight times. For this there must be a reason. Peter speaks of Christ being slain and “hanged on a tree”, as does Paul (Acts v. 30; x. 39; Gal. iii. 13); and in his epistles Peter tells us that Christ bare our sins in His own body on the tree (I Pet. ii. 24), but he never once speaks of “The Cross” neither does he ever use the word “crucify” except in his charge against the people of Israel (Acts ii. 36; iv. 10) repeating the historical fact already made known in the Gospels but never using the term when speaking doctrinally or of redemption.

It appears from this, that when either of the apostles are speaking of the death of Christ to those who were or who had been under the law, they used the word “tree”, referring back to the law of Moses, as Paul actually does in Galatians and in Acts xiii. 29 saying: “For it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. iii. 13). Not only is this difference observable, but another most important doctrine emerges; “the curse” which is so intimately associated with “the tree” and “the law” is never spoken of by the apostle Paul when dealing with the Gentiles as such. Only by putting themselves “under the law” can a Gentile come “under the curse” (Gal. iii. 10). In the O.T. from Genesis to Malachi we meet with the possibility of coming under a curse, and so widespread is this imprecatory teaching, that we find, even when limiting ourselves to the A.V., that the O.T. contains seventy references to cursing, and that nine Hebrew words are employed to express it. Of these seventy references, sixty-five belong to Israel, and five only occur before the call of Abraham. These are the primeval curse upon the ground because of the sin of Adam and of Cain, and the curse pronounced by Noah upon Canaan.

From these facts we are led to see the reason why Paul in his peculiar ministry, was inspired to adopt the Gentile words “crucify” and “cross” in place of the Hebrew words “hang” and “tree”. Once only in the LXX does the Greek word *stauroo* occur, namely in Esther vii. 9, where we read “and the king said, let him be *hanged* thereon”. In this particular passage the writer is reporting the saying of a Gentile king, and so puts into his mouth the word “crucify”. The Hebrew word thus translated is *talah*, and occurs in

Esther ii. 23; v. 14; vi. 4; vii. 9, 10; viii. 7; ix. 13, 14, 25, but in none of these passages is *stauroo* employed. In every passage in the book of Esther where the word “gallows” is found, that word is the translation of the Hebrew *etz* “tree”. He therefore, according to the testimony of Esther, who was “hanged on a tree” was “crucified”, the one form of speech being Hebrew, the other Gentile. Crucifixion was unknown among the Hebrews until they came into contact with Persia. The Greek and the Roman borrowed this form of punishment from the Phoenicians, and it was in force during the time of Constantine.

The fact that crucifixion was essentially a Gentile form of punishment and is employed alone by Paul among the apostles, makes any reference that he may make of supreme importance to ourselves. The first thing that we must do is to collect together the references found in the epistles of the words *stauros* and *stauroo*.

“THE CROSS” IN PAUL’S EPISTLES.

- “Lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect” (I Cor. i. 17).
- “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness” (I Cor. i. 18).
- “Then is the offence of the cross ceased” (Gal. v. 11).
- “Lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ” (Gal. vi. 12).
- “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Gal. vi. 14).
- “That He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross” (Eph. ii. 16).
- “Even the death of the cross” (Phil. ii. 8).
- “The enemies of the cross of Christ” (Phil. iii. 18).
- “Peace through the blood of His cross” (Col. i. 20).
- “Nailing it to His cross” (Col. ii. 14).
- “He endured the cross despising the shame” (Heb. xii. 2).

“TO CRUCIFY” IN PAUL’S EPISTLES.

- “Was Paul crucified for you?” (I Cor. i. 13).
- “But we preach Christ crucified” (I Cor. i. 23).
- “Save Jesus Christ and Him crucified” (I Cor. ii. 2).
- “They would not have crucified the Lord of glory” (I Cor. ii. 8).
- “He was crucified through weakness” (II Cor. xiii. 4).
- “Evidently set forth crucified among you” (Gal. iii. 1).
- “They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh” (Gal. v. 24).
- “By whom the world is crucified unto me” (Gal. vi. 14).

An examination of the context, the purpose, and the people to whom these words were addressed, reveal that the preaching of the cross has a much larger place in the ministry to those already saved, than it has in the initial preaching of the gospel to the unsaved, and this is markedly true of the two occurrences of *sustauroo* “to crucify with”. The first passage is Gal. ii. 20, where Paul makes his own point clear to Peter and the Church. The point at issue was the doctrine of Justification by faith without the works of the law, and Paul breaks off his expostulation with Peter to give his own personal testimony.

“For I through law, to law died, that I might live to God. With Christ I have been crucified; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, Who loved me, and gave Himself for me” (Gal. ii. 19, 20).

It is a pity that the translators did not respect the way in which the apostle differentiated between “the law” that is the law of Moses, and “law” of any kind whatever.

The following references are separated into two categories by the presence or the absence of the article in the original.

“THE LAW” IN GALATIANS.

“The book of the law” (iii. 10). “The law is not of faith” (iii. 12). “The curse of the law” (iii. 13). “The law which was four hundred and thirty years after” (iii. 17). “Wherefore then serveth the law?” (iii. 19). “Is the law then against the promises?” (iii. 21). “The law was our schoolmaster” (iii. 24). “Do ye not hear the law?” (iv. 21). “A debtor to do the whole law” (v. 3). “All the law is fulfilled” (v. 14). “And so fulfil the law of Christ” (vi. 2).

Here, every reference is to the law of Moses, except the last which is to the law of Christ.

“LAW” IN GALATIANS.

“Works of law” (ii. 16). “I through law am dead to law” (ii. 19). “If righteousness come by law” (ii. 21). “Received ye the Spirit by works of law?” (iii. 2). “Works of law” (iii. 5, 10). “No man is justified by law” (iii. 11). “If the inheritance be of law” (iii. 18). “Righteousness should have been by law” (iii. 21). “We were kept under law” (iii. 23). “Made under law” (iv. 4). “To redeem them that were under law” (iv. 5). “Ye that desire to be under law” (iv. 21). “Justified by law” (v. 4). “Ye are not under law” (v. 18). “Keep law” (vi. 13).

Here, the law of Moses is not particularly in mind, but rather law and legalism of any and every kind.

Here is Paul’s first great reckoning. When Christ died on the cross He died by law and to law. For the Jew under the curse of the law of Moses, that cross is “the Tree”, and the One Who died upon it became “a curse” and He is said to have been “hanged” that the curse of the law might be removed from those who were under it. To the Gentile who had never been under the law of Moses, redemption of this sort was not necessary. But all sin presupposes a law, for where there is no law there can be no transgression. Yet sin was in the world long before Moses, and because of this the apostle, in the selfsame epistle, speaks of the Redeemer hanging on a tree and of being crucified on a cross, according as he has the curse of the law of Moses, or the transgression of law as such, in view.

The second and last reference to *sustauroo* is found in the inner section of Romans (Rom. v. 12 - viii.). Although there are many references to the law of Moses in Rom. vii., they refer rather to the apostle’s past experience, than to the experience of the Roman Christians. Rom. v. 12 - viii. is concerned more with “sin” than with “sins”,

with “the law of sin and death”, the law in our members, the law of our mind, rather than the law of Sinai.

Consequently we find Paul speaking of the “old man” the inner seat of sin, the radiating point for the law of sin and death, and here it is that he speaks once again of being “crucified with Christ”.

“Knowing this that our old man is crucified with Him” (Rom. vi. 6).

The believer is never told to crucify the old man himself, he is told to look at the cross of Christ and see that there the blessed “reckoning” operates. We may have “put off concerning the former conversation the old man” (Eph. iv. 22), and we may have “put off the old man with his deeds” (Col. iii. 9), we can deal with the “conversation” and “the deeds” of the old man, but we cannot deal with the old man itself. Neither will all our “putting off” be of any avail unless based squarely on the great initial reckoning with Christ when the old man was crucified with Him. What the crucifying of the old man involves is immediately explained in Rom. vi. 6.

- (1) “That the body of sin might be destroyed” (A.V.)
“In order that our sinful nature might be deprived of its power” (Weymouth).
“That the body of sin might be annulled” (Darby).
- (2) “That henceforth we should not serve sin” (A.V.)
“So that we should no longer be slaves of sin” (Weymouth).
“And free us from further slavery to sin” (Moffatt).

The emphasis is placed here upon being freed from a dominion, and that because of the intervention of death. This death was not our own, but Another’s, and we are graciously reckoned to have been crucified with Christ, and our old man reckoned to have been crucified with Him, so that we may make the first step up the sevenfold ladder of life that leads from Reckoning to Reality.

Here for the time we must stay. That Cross and the Crucifixion terminated in death; it is not “The Cross” but “the Death of the Cross” that is stressed. It is not the “Cross” but “the blood of the Cross”, “the shame” of crucifixion, the complete rejection and abandonment that such an execution implied, that is brought to bear upon our old and sinful nature. We might have thought that this was enough; that no one could ever think of attempting to be saved by his own works, or by putting himself under law again. The Lord however knew otherwise, and so we are to go on with Him and learn that “dying with Him” and being “buried with Him” must be considered before we at last turn our back upon self completely and enter into newness of life.

“He was numbered with the transgressors.”
“I have been crucified with Christ.”

No.4. The Second Reckoning, “To have died with Christ”. pp. 125 - 129

The Scripture teaches that “the wages of sin is death”, and this is the testimony not only of the epistles of Paul, but of the early chapters of Genesis. For our salvation Christ was born, was attested to be without spot, suffered the contradiction of sinners, manifested the Father, was numbered with transgressors, was crucified; yet had He not gone to the end and become “obedient unto *death*, even the death of the cross” we should still be without a Saviour. “Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.” “In due time Christ died for the ungodly”; such is the testimony of the apostle Paul. We have pondered the grace that is made manifest in the fact that He the Righteous One, should be “reckoned with the transgressors” and how this self-same reckoning enables the believer, though sinful and condemned, to be reckoned among the righteous, but this supposes that what was commenced on the cross, was taken to its end in death and the grave, and still on to the glorious sequel of Resurrection. We must therefore consider this next great step in the upward movement from reckoning to reality, namely the identification of the believer with his Saviour in the death of the cross.

First let us observe what is actually written concerning that death and how it is associated with ourselves and our deliverance. “Christ died FOR the ungodly”; “while we were yet sinners, Christ died FOR us”. “Christ died FOR our sins”; “if One died FOR all, then all died” (Rom. v. 6, 8; I Cor. xv. 3; II Cor. v. 14). Into this aspect of the Saviour’s gracious work we cannot enter. When He bore our sins He bore them alone, and in the very nature of things, it could not be otherwise. He not only died “for” our sins as our Substitute however, He died TO sin as our Representative also, and it is in this aspect of His wondrous work that “reckoning” makes us one.

The compound word *sunapothnesko* occurs but once in the epistles of Paul in reference to the work of Christ, namely in II Tim. ii. 11, the other occurrence, namely II Cor. vii. 3 being personal to the apostle. It is interesting to note that the apostle waited until he was writing his last epistle before he actually used the full expression “to die with”. When he does employ the term it is not in order that he may introduce and explain the doctrine, but in order that he may make it a basis of appeal to Timothy that he should go on to perfection.

“It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him”
(II Tim. ii. 11).

We will not go into the question that awaits us in the context concerning “suffering” and “reigning”, “denying” and “being denied”, our business is with this initial reckoning that must without peradventure issue in life. Reigning and Crowning belong to another category. The death of Christ FOR us ensures our forgiveness, justification and peace; it also obtains for us the grant of newness of life, and this is received and entered by “reckoning” ourselves to have died with Him.

“Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. vi. 11).

This verse, however, is at the close of the revelation of a great truth, and so before we can appreciate at anything like its true worth what this reckoning involves, we must go back on our journey. Rom. v. 12-21 reveals that a principle is at work. By reason of one man’s disobedience, we read, many were made sinners, and so, by the obedience of One, shall many be made righteous. The one whose disobedience is in view, is Adam, the One Whose obedience more than counterbalances is Christ (Rom. v. 19). The verb “to make” is used both transitively and intransitively in the English language. Transitively it means “to cause to exist”; intransitively it means “to tend, to move in a direction”. These two definitions do not by any means exhaust the shades of meaning that this word assumes, but it indicates the categories under which they must be ranged. In Rom. v. 19 the word “make” is intransitive. Moreover, the Greek word that is translated “to make” more than anything else, is *poieo*. The word used in Rom. v. 19 however is *kathistemi*, which is composed of *kata* an intensive and *histemi* “to stand”. This is a prolific Greek root and occurs in sixty-nine different forms and combinations in the Greek N.T. From this root came *stauros* “the cross”, and *stauroo* “to crucify” and *anastasis* “resurrection”.

When therefore the apostle spoke of the consequences of the sin of Adam upon his children, he did not teach that his children were *made* sinners, or *made* to sin, he said they were “constituted” sinners, even as by grace they could be “constituted” righteous. No clearer mental picture can be made of the apostle’s meaning than that which comes from a literal translation:

“For as by one man’s disobedience many were made to stand sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made to stand righteous.”

“Standing” is in view, not actual participation. The two headships, Adam and Christ, are in view, not individual and personal sinners. Paul many times speaks of the “standing” of the believer. He stands “in grace”; “by faith”; “in the gospel”; and “perfect and complete” (Rom. v. 2; xi. 20; I Cor. xv. 1; II Cor. i. 24; Col. iv. 12).

This standing either in the position of a sinner, or of a saint, is primarily a matter of “reckoning” and Rom. v. introduces us to Rom. vi. Rom. vi. 1-14, which is a complete section, uses the word “dead” and “death” fourteen times, which of itself is an indication of its importance in the apostle’s argument. These fourteen occurrences are translations of four words, and it is essential that they should be distinguished in order that their relationship may be perceived.

<i>Thanatos</i>	“Death.”	Sentence and State (Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5, 9).
<i>Nekros</i>	“Dead.”	Used only of persons (Rom. vi. 4, 9, 11, 13).
<i>Apothnesko</i>	“To Die.”	Death consummated (Rom. vi. 2, 7, 8, 9, 10).
<i>Thnetos</i>	“Mortal.”	Liable to death (Rom. vi. 12).

The subject is so fundamental, that we cannot leave the examination of these words without a fuller acquaintance with their context and association. We must now set each occurrence before the reader.

Thanatos. This word indicates the state of death consequent upon the condemnation pronounced upon sin, whether it be the initial sin of Adam as federal head of the race, or of the individual sin of his children (Rom. v. 12, 14).

“Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His *death*” (Rom. vi. 3).

“Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into *death*” (Rom. vi. 4).

“Therefore if we have been planted together in the likeness of His *death*” (Rom. vi. 5).

“*Death* hath no more dominion over Him” (Rom. vi. 9).

Nekros. This word speaks of dead persons, those who have passed into the state of death (Rom. i. 4).

“Like as Christ was raised from *the dead* by the glory of the Father” (Rom. vi. 4).

“Knowing that Christ being raised from *the dead* dieth no more” (Rom. vi. 9).

“Likewise, reckon ye yourselves *to be dead* indeed unto sin” (Rom. vi. 11).

“Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from *the dead*” (Rom. vi. 13).

Apothnesko. This word is an intensive form of *thnesko* and refers to the consummation of the death sentence.

“How shall we that *are dead* to sin live any longer therein?” (Rom. vi. 2).

“For he that *is dead* is freed from sin” (Rom. vi. 7).

“Now if we *be dead* with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him” (Rom. vi. 8).

“Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead *dieth* no more” (Rom. vi. 9).

“For in that He *died*, He *died* unto sin once” (Rom. vi. 10).

Thnetos. This word is used to describe those who though still living are subject to death, as distinct from *nekros* which speaks of those actually dead.

“Let not sin therefore reign in your *mortal* body” (Rom. vi. 12).

We have yet further examination to make. First we must observe the order in which these words are introduced into the argument, and we will endeavour to make an unbroken explanation, passing from word to word as the argument develops. The argument is first of all not death as the punishment of sin, neither is it the death of Christ that opens this section of Rom. vi. It is the believer's death *to sin* that is introduced to show how impossible it is to deduce from the reign of grace an excuse for “continuing in sin”. The reader is deprived of the insistence of the words *te hamartia*, by the translations in Rom. vi. 1 “in sin” and in Rom. vi. 2 “to sin”. There is no actual word for “in” or “to” here, these are but two translations of the dative case. They are rightly translated “in sin” and “to sin” because of the demands of the context. The preposition “in” does not occur until we reach the words “live any longer therein”.

It is therefore the believer's death to sin that is in view at the opening of this section. But the question now presents itself, how can a believer “die to sin”? The answer follows

“we were baptized into His death”. We must leave the question as to what is intended by “baptism” here until we have completed the chain of argument that we are examining. The apostle continues with his reference to baptism, saying that “we were buried with Him by baptism into death”. This union with Christ he still further illustrated by speaking of the believer being “planted together in the likeness of His death”, and both the terms “planted together” and “likeness” demand attention. Just as baptism into His death is followed by “like as Christ was raised up from the dead, even so we”, so being planted together in the likeness of His death is followed by the assurance that we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. For the moment, the apostle looks back to the cross that preceded the death of Christ, and says that our old man was crucified with Him, thereby rendering the body of sin inoperative, and making slavery to sin no longer necessary. He then returns to the use of the word “dead” saying “he that is dead, is freed (*dedikaiotai* ‘justified’) from sin”. This freedom and justifying operates in new life, and the apostle reaffirms his argument by saying “now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him”, and the reason for this assurance is that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more, neither can death have any more dominion over Him. He died to sin once, He now lives to God.

We now come to the word that contains within itself the explanation of the terms “made sinners” and “made righteous”, “baptized” and “likeness”, namely, the word “reckon”. Earlier in this epistle the “reckoning” has been by God alone, the sinner having nothing to do or to say. For the first time this word is used as of the believer’s own volition, based as it is on all that has preceded in Rom. vi. 1-10.

“Likewise reckon ye also yourselves on the one hand (*men*) to be dead to sin, but on the other hand (*de*) to be alive to God in Christ Jesus.” The change of title “Jesus Christ our Lord” found in the A.V. is justified by the Revised Text. The translation “through” Jesus Christ our Lord, is not a true rendering of *en* “in” and as Alford remarks “in this chapter it is not Christ’s *Mediatorship*, but His *Headship* which is prominent”. This stand now being taken by the believer, certain consequences must follow. He is still in the mortal body, only by “reckoning” can he view himself as “alive from the dead”, but this is a very real standing. He can at last yield himself unto God as those that are alive from the dead, and just as death has no more dominion over the Saviour, so sin shall not have dominion over the believer.

We have made no reference yet to Col. ii. 20, where once again we meet the words “if ye be dead with Christ”, but this passage is linked with Rom. vi. by the fact that here also Paul speaks of the believer as having been “buried with Him by baptism” and consequently, as we must devote another article to these passages in Rom. vi., we must defer consideration of Col. ii. until this further study of Rom. vi. has been attempted.

**No.5. The Third Reckoning,
with special reference to the word “Baptism”.
pp. 152 - 156**

Unless we have very signally failed, the reader is by now fully aware that the *modus operandi* adopted by the God of grace, to bring about a union between the sinner and the Spotless Son of God, is by “reckoning”. We have seen that *He* was reckoned among the transgressors, and that *we* are reckoned to have been crucified with Him, and as a consequence, we can now be exhorted to put this reckoning into practical effect.

“Likewise RECKON ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. vi. 11).

This exhortation comes at the close of a series of links with the death of Christ introduced with the words “how shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?” We observe it is not dying because of sin, or dying as a sacrifice for sin, but dying TO sin that is in mind, and that neither forgiveness nor justification are before us. Instead of the word “reckon” the apostle employs one or two other expressions to indicate the union of the believer with the Lord, in this great matter of dying TO sin, and of living TO God. The sphere of this new activity is “newness of life”, life the other side of the grave, and consequently we have the words “baptized”, “buried”, “planted together” and “likeness” with a backward glance to what we already “know”, namely our old man is crucified with Him that the body of sin should be rendered inoperative, and that henceforth we should not serve sin. We can now link this passage on to Col. ii., where being dead with Christ is associated on the one hand with complete deliverance from “the rudiments of the world”, and with burial by baptism (Col. ii. 12, 13, 20).

It is evident that we have before us a doctrine of tremendous import, together with related features that demand most prayerful and careful attention. Instead of baptism being a simple subject, or at most a question of either “dipping” or “sprinkling”, it is used in a variety of ways and contexts, none of which can overlap or intrude into the domain of the other without confusion and damage.

First. The baptisms enjoined by the Levitical Law.

“Except they *wash* they eat not” (Mark vii. 4).

“The *washing* of cups and pots” (Mark vii. 4, 8).

“The doctrine of *baptisms*” (Heb. vi. 2).

“Meats, drinks and divers *washings*” (Heb. ix. 10).

The purport and character of these baptisms are summed up for us by the apostle in Heb. ix. 9, 10:

“Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the

conscience; which stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers *washings*, and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation.”

In order to appreciate the apostle’s teaching here, we must be prepared to give this passage something more than a passing examination. We can reduce the apostle’s argument to the following heads:

- (1) The Tabernacle and all its service was “a figure”.
- (2) This typical service was for a limited time “for the time then present”.
- (3) This typical service was imperfect: “it did not touch the conscience.”
- (4) This typical service was “imposed until the time of reformation”.

For our present purpose we must assume that the reader has no need of a description of the Tabernacle, or a detailed proof of its typical character. We must come to the case in point “the washings” or baptisms. The word *baptizo* occurs twice in the LXX, once it translates the Hebrew word *baath* “to make afraid” (Isa. xxi. 4), the figure using the word “to baptize” in the sense of plunging into trouble, being overwhelmed, being greatly perturbed. The other occurrence is II Kings v. 14, which reads in the A.V.:

“Then he went down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan.”

What the prophet told Naaman to do was “go and wash in Jordan seven times” (II Kings v. 10), and in the pleading of Naaman’s servant, come the words “wash and be clean”. There can be no possible doubt but that the translators of the LXX equated “washing” with “baptizing” here. The Hebrew word translated “wash” in these passages is *rachats*, and this word is used many times of the ceremonial “washings” referred to in Heb. ix. 9, 10. There are twenty-one such “washings” recorded in Leviticus, and these include the washing of the parts of the sacrifice (Lev. viii. 21), the washing of the leper (Lev. xiv. 8), and the washing of the priest (Lev. xvi. 4). See also Exod. xxix. 4, 17; xxx. 19, 21 and xl. 12, 31.

It will be seen therefore that the A.V. is right when it translated *baptismos* “washings”. These “baptisms” are defined as “carnal ordinances” that were “imposed” as something in the nature of a burden, a part of the yoke which neither the apostles nor the fathers could bear (Acts xv. 10). This imposition was for a limited season, “until the time of reformation”, when the needs of the “conscience” would be met.

Just as many believers assume that the dispensation of the Church begins with Matthew’s Gospel, so it is assumed that baptism is a distinctly Christian and church ordinance. This is far from being the truth. The Pharisees, when they questioned John concerning the *purpose* of his baptism, never questioned baptism itself. Here are a few extracts from *Maimonedes* in his great register of Jewish customs.

“By three things Israel entered into covenant: by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice.”

“A stranger that is circumcised, and not baptized, or that is baptized and not circumcised, is not a proselyte.”

The reader will probably anticipate our next remark, namely that Paul closely associates “circumcision” and “baptism” in Col. ii. 11, 12 and that both baptism as well

as circumcision can only be interpreted now in a spiritual sense. They must both stand together.

Before the institution of the Levitical law, there had been a more comprehensive “baptism” concerning Israel, which is mentioned by the apostle in I Cor. x. 1, 2:

“Moreover brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.”

This “baptism unto Moses” in the cloud and in the sea is referred to in Psa. cvi., and by Isaiah:

“He rebuked the Red Sea also and it was dried up; so He led them through the depths, as through the wilderness” (Psa. cvi. 9).

“That led them by the right hand of Moses with His glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make Himself an everlasting name? That led them through the deep, as an horse in the wilderness, that they should not stumble?” (Isa. lxiii. 12, 13).

In the song of Moses, sung by him and the children of Israel on the banks of the Red Sea, we read:

“And with the blast of Thy nostrils the waters were gathered together, the floods stood upright as an heap, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea” (Exod. xv. 8).

Here is the initial baptism of the Bible. This baptism took place before the institution of the Levitical ceremonials, and is entirely disconnected with them. Everything is said to ensure that the reader shall be aware that at the baptism of Israel unto Moses, *water was miraculously absent!* Israel were led through the deep as a horse is led through a wilderness, the floods stood in an heap, the depths were congealed.

“He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through; and He made the waters to stand as an heap” (Psa. lxxviii. 13).

At the crossing of the Jordan under Joshua, once again the waters are said “to stand upon a heap” as far back as the city of Adam, while the Israelites passed over *on dry ground* (Josh. iii. 13-17). Although the figure is not actually stated, this crossing of the Jordan was as much a baptism, as was the crossing of the Red Sea.

“The sea saw it and fled. Jordan was driven back” (Psa. cxiv. 3).

If we read the opening of this Psalm, we shall see that the sea that fled must refer to the Red Sea, thus linking together the two crossings, one under Moses at the beginning, and the other under Joshua after the long interval of temptation and wandering. “The depths” and “the deep” through which Israel were led are described by the same word as is employed in Gen. i. 2 “the deep”, whose fountains were broken up at the flood (Gen. vii. 11). This baptism at the Red Sea has no discernible connexion with the subsequent “baptisms” practiced by Israel up to and including the days of Christ and the apostles. The law had come in, and had relegated the earlier and fuller baptism into the

background. As the dispensation drew to its close, so the earlier and richer baptism demanded its antitype, and that we discover in Rom. vi. and Col. ii.

The baptism of all Israel “by the cloud and by the sea” (the preposition *en* here referring to the instrument, for we are distinctly prevented from translating “in the sea”) was not a “washing” but a symbol of union. It was “unto Moses”. The baptism of the Epistles is “unto Christ” and whoever confuses the ceremonial cleansings with this great initiation, does so at his own peril, and the imperiling of precious truth.

The baptism of repentance, the ceremonial cleansings of pots, cups and beds, the baptism that was associated with the washing away of sins, the baptism that was for the remission of sins, the baptism that led to salvation and was followed by signs and miracles, this doctrine of baptisms, has been left behind as among the rudiments and elements that belong to spiritual childhood, as Heb. vi. 1, 2 show. It is impossible to “go on unto perfection” where alone the “conscience” is touched (Heb. ix. 9, 10; x. 1, 2) and retain these obsolete ordinances that were only imposed until the time of reformation.

With this somewhat lengthy preamble, we can now return to Rom. vi. and see that the baptism spoken of by the apostle cannot possibly refer to ceremonial baptisms and washings, but to the antitype of that baptism “unto Moses” that took place at the Red Sea. The apostle assumes that his reader had been “baptized *unto* Jesus Christ” which no baptism in water ever accomplished or was intended to accomplish. What his readers did not fully appreciate was that such baptism baptized them “unto His death”. Baptism therefore of this sort, is another form of “reckoning”. The apostle takes the question further; he declares that such were “buried” with Him by baptism “unto death” that like as Christ was “raised up” from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. In order to enforce his teaching, the apostle uses another figure, he speaks of being “planted together”. Alford says: “planted together is inadmissible, *phutos* being not from *phuteuo* but from *phuo* intimately and progressively united.”

Thayer’s note reads: “born together with, of joint origin, i.e. ‘Connate, congenital, innate, implanted by birth or nature’ and comments on Rom. vi. 5: *If we have become united with the likeness of His death* (which likeness consists in the fact that in the death of Christ our former corruption and wickedness has been slain and buried in Christ’s tomb), i.e. it is part and parcel of the very nature of a genuine Christian to be utterly dead to sin, *we shall be united also with the likeness of His resurrection*, i.e. our intimate fellowship with His return to life will show itself in a new consecration to God”. Alford further adds: “Christians, it is true, partake of the *likeness* not only of Christ’s *death*, but of His actual resurrection itself as the change of construction shows.”

Passing to Col. ii., we observe that “the rudiments of the world” are in opposition to the completeness of the believer’s standing in Christ (Col. ii. 8, 14, 16, 17, 20). To all such the believer “died with Christ”. So complete is this severance from the dominion of the handwriting of ordinances, that the apostle uses the double figure “circumcision” and

“baptism”, and it is admitted that the circumcision here in view is the spiritual reality of which circumcision made by hands was but a poor type.

The burial with Him in baptism, is further expanded as being “dead in (‘to’) your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh”. It is not possible in the space available to attempt an exposition of Col. ii., but we believe sufficient has been shown from the Scriptures to show that the baptism “unto Christ”, and so unto His death, looks back, not to the ceremonials of the Tabernacle service, but to the crossing of the Red Sea and again the crossing of the Jordan where Israel were baptized “unto Moses” and where the waters stood on a heap as far back as “Adam”, a symbolism that awaited the exposition of the secret that had been silenced (Rom. xvi. 25, 26). It was the glory of Paul’s ministry to make this known, as he does in this inner section of the epistle to the Romans (Rom. v. 12 - viii.) where Adam and his one offense is first spoken of as having a place in the great scheme of Redeeming Love.

No.6. The Third Reckoning (cont.).
The first and last “Baptism” of all Scripture.
pp. 195 - 200

We dealt with various aspects of baptism in the preceding articles of this series, but the subject is of such importance that we have reserved the present study for one particular baptism that has a bearing upon the use of the terms in Rom. vi. and Col. ii.; we refer to the baptism of all Israel unto Moses at the Red Sea, and the repetition of this baptism with similar miraculous accompaniments under Joshua at the River Jordan.

First it will be necessary to establish the typical connexion of these two events. In Psa. cxiv., we have these two great events linked together. “The sea saw it, and fled: Jordan was driven back”; “What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest? thou Jordan that thou wast driven back?” (Psa. cxiv. 3, 5). The Psalm opens with the words: “When Israel went out of Egypt”, and leaves us without doubt as to what “sea” is intended. These two men, Moses and Joshua, together provide a type of the twofold work of the Lord Jesus Christ, Who both died and rose again.

“Moses My servant *is dead*; now therefore *arise*, go over this Jordan, thou and all this people” (Josh. i. 2).

The types of the O.T. set forth not only the death of the Saviour, His spotlessness, His innocence, and the substitutionary nature of His offering, they also set forth His resurrection. This could have been accomplished in one of the three following ways:

- (1) The person (Moses), or the offering (the Lamb) could have been literally raised from the dead.
- (2) The person or the offering need not to have died.
- (3) Two persons, or two offerings could be used in foreshadowing the death and resurrection of Christ to the believer, the one dying, the other being free to live.

The strong objection to the first suggestion would be the multiplication of the miracle of resurrection so that it rendered the unique character of this mighty event void by reason of familiarity. Moreover, a type ceases to be a type if it actually accomplishes that which it is supposed only to foreshadow. The objection to the second suggestion must be, that without actual death and shedding of blood, the supreme importance and nature of the one offering of Christ, would not have received sufficient emphasis. The third alternative is that which has been adopted by Divine Wisdom in setting forth this twofold work.

Abel dies, but Seth is appointed "in the stead" (Gen. iv. 25). Two goats were appointed for the day of atonement, one which was offered for a sin offering, the other "the scapegoat" presented "alive" before the Lord, and "let go" into the wilderness (Lev. xvi.). Two birds were used at the cleansing of the Leper. The one was killed, the other "the living bird" was dipped into the blood of the dead bird, and then let loose into the open field (Lev. xiv. 1-7).

As to typical persons, while no proof is necessary to demonstrate the fact that David was a type of the Lord's true Anointed, it may be forgotten that Solomon was "the King's Son" (Psa. lxxii.) and the king whose reign is associated with such peace and prosperity as was never again enjoyed by Israel, he also is required to complete the Scriptural type of the great reign of the Son of God.

"The death of Moses and the succession of Joshua prefigured the continuance of the law till Jesus came (Acts xiii. 37; Luke xvi. 16).

Moses must die, that Joshua may succeed."

"Joshua begins his office at the banks of Jordan; and there Jesus was baptized and entered upon the public exercises of His prophetic office. Joshua chose there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; Jesus thence began to choose His twelve apostles, those foundations in the Heavenly Jerusalem" (Bishop Pearson).

"Joshua brought the people into Canaan, after they had been lying, as it were, helpless under the Law in the wilderness for *thirty-eight* years after their sin and exclusion at Kadesh-barnea. Jesus came to the impotent man who had been thirty-eight years in his infirmity, and lay beneath the shade of Bethesda with its *five porches*, and bade him rise and walk" (Chr. Wordsworth, D.D.).

Let us examine these two typical events in order that the light they give may illuminate our understanding as we ponder the meaning of baptism in Rom. vi. and Col. ii.

The baptism of Rom. vi. and Col. ii. is not only a burial into death, but in both cases leads on to fellowship with Christ in His resurrection. The burial into death is that of Moses at the Red Sea, the rising again is with Joshua at the Jordan. The interval between these two events is occasioned by Israel's failure and by the interposition of the law. A further check is administered by the imposition of carnal ordinances that could only be done away by Christ Himself, and so it was not possible for Moses to fulfil the complete

type, the supplemental action of Joshua at the Jordan being necessary to round off the whole foreshadowing.

Not only are there two movements symbolized in this great baptism, but two phases of Redemption are also associated, the one with Moses and the other with Joshua. The sixth chapter of Exodus shows that this twofold deliverance was always in the mind of the Lord. This is the redemption effected under Moses.

“I am the Lord, and I will bring you OUT I will rid you OUT” (Exod. vi. 6).

This is the further redemption accomplished under Joshua.

“I will bring you IN I will GIVE it you” (Exod. vi. 8).

In the first deliverance, a mighty foe is destroyed at the moment of Israel’s baptism; in the second, the walls of Jericho fall flat after the second baptism at Jordan. Following the first baptism unto Moses, the Manna was given (Exod. xvi. 35), and immediately after the crossing of the Jordan “the manna ceased” (Josh. v. 11, 12). The baptism unto Moses followed the first Passover (Exod. xii.-xiv.), the baptism at the Jordan is followed by the observance of the Passover (Josh. v. 10). As a prelude to the mission of Moses, a burning bush is used to teach a lesson, “and when Moses drew near to see this great sight, God said to him, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground” (Exod. iii. 1-5). So, in the case of Joshua, immediately after the manna ceased, he saw a man standing with drawn sword and when he went forward to question him, this “Captain of the Lord’s host” said “Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground” (Josh. v. 13-15).

The powers of the enemy were shaken by the news of the crossing of the Red Sea and at the destruction of Pharaoh and his host.

“The people shall hear and be afraid; sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestine all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away” (Exod. xv. 14-16).

The powers of the enemy were further shaken by the crossing of the Jordan by the children of Israel:

“When all the kings of the Amorites all the kings of the Canaanites heard that the Lord had dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel that their hearts melted” (Josh. v. 1).

This “melting” effect upon the two sets of enemy, is associated in both Exod. xv. 16 and in Josh. v. 1 with their “passing over”: “till Thy people *pass over*”; “until we were *passed over*”.

The baptism of Israel “unto Moses” was that of the entire nation. “Not a hoof” was left behind in Egypt (Exod. x. 26). “I would not have you ignorant, how ALL our fathers were under the cloud, and ALL passed through the sea; and were ALL baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea” (I Cor. x. 1, 2). It was the baptism of the whole

nation. As a solemn background to this baptism was the Passover, and the fact that gave the Passover such significance “there was not a house where there was not one dead” (Exod. xii. 30), either a firstborn in the houses of Egypt or a Lamb instead in the houses of Israel. The baptism unto Moses was a symbolic setting forth of this great fact.

“Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized INTO Jesus Christ were baptized INTO His death buried with Him by baptism unto death” (Rom. vi. 4).

We must now turn our attention to the baptism of Israel at the Jordan under Joshua.

“Moses is dead: now therefore ARISE” (Josh. i. 2).

Here the Hebrew word *kum* is translated “arise”, the word used by the Saviour when He said *Talitha cumi* (Mark v. 41). “Within THREE DAYS” (Josh. i. 11). Here, resurrection is set forth in type. “Thou and ALL this people” (Josh. i. 2), here is the same emphasis upon “All” that we found to be true at the Red Sea.

The crossing of the Jordan is described in Josh. iii. 1 to v. 12, and by eliminating every reference but the barest minimum, we find the following items standing out as of first importance.

The Magnifying of Joshua. “This day will I begin to magnify thee” (iii. 7). “On that day the Lord magnified Joshua” (iv. 14).

The Command to the Priests. “Stand still” (iii. 8) “come up” (iv. 15-17).

The Twelve Stones. “What mean ye?” (iv. 1-10, 19-23).

The Magnifying of Joshua anticipates the exaltation of the Saviour at the resurrection. The LXX uses the Greek word *hupsoo* to translate the Hebrew word for “magnify” here, and this word is found in Isa lii. 13 “He shall be exalted and extolled and be very high”, and is used by Peter when he said “Him hath God exalted with His right hand” (Acts v. 31, also ii. 33).

The twofold command to the Priests stresses two great doctrinal facts:

- (1) “Stand still”; “stood firm”; “until everything was finished”; “When all the people were clean passed over” (iii. 8, 17; iv. 10, 11). Here we have the finished work of Christ set forth as the basis of all that follows.
- (2) “Come up out of Jordan.”

“When the soles of the priests’ feet were lifted up unto the dry land, the waters of Jordan returned unto their place” (iv. 16-18).

It may be that the reader mentally questioned our right to use the word “baptism” in connexion with the crossing of Jordan. Our justification is that the LXX translators have used the verb *bapto* in translating Josh. iii. 15:

“And as they that bare the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests were dipped *bapto* (LXX) in the brim of the water that the waters which came down from above stood and rose up upon an heap very far off, at the city called Adam (Massoretic marginal reading), and those that came down toward the sea of the plain, even the salt sea, failed, and were cut off” (Josh. iii. 15, 16).

Waters cut off “from Adam to the Dead Sea”. Who that knows the teaching of Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 can deny the prescience of inspired Scripture, or the fullness of the O.T. types? *The testimony of the twelve stones*. Twelve is the number of Israel.

“Now therefore, take you twelve men out of the tribes of Israel, out of every tribe a man” (Josh. iii. 12, so also iv. 2).

Each of these twelve representative men who passed over before the ark and from the midst of Jordan took up a stone “according to the number of the children of Israel” (Josh. iv. 4, 5, 8). These stones were taken “out of the place where the priests’ feet stood firm” (Josh. iv. 3). But the place of these stones was to be occupied by “other twelve stones” (LXX) in the midst of Jordan where the feet of the priests stood. These were set up by Joshua himself, and the record says: “they are there unto this day” (Josh. iv. 9).

It is illuminating to observe that what the twelve representative men did, is said to have been done by “the children of Israel” (Josh. iv. 8). This principle has already met us in the Passover that preceded the baptism unto Moses “The *whole assembly* of the congregation of Israel shall kill IT in the evening” (Exod. xii. 6).

The two sets of twelve stones provide us with an instance of the use of a double type where death and resurrection have to be indicated. As it is not possible for these twelve stones to be in two places at the same time, the transfer from the river bed to the dry land, and the transfer from the dry land to the river bed, does bring before the mind the truth that they who are “raised with Christ” are also those who were “buried with Him by baptism”.

These stones are said to have been “pitched” in Gilgal (Josh. iv. 20). This word “pitch” must not be confused with the words that indicate the pitching a camp, for which *chanah* and *natah* are used, the Hebrew word translated “pitch” here is *kum* “to stand up”, “to arise” which we have already noted in Josh. i. 2. That these twelve stones had an important symbolic teaching is evident by the fact that provision is made for the time when the children should ask “what mean ye be these stones?” Just as Col. ii. links spiritual circumcision with spiritual baptism, so here at the Jordan, circumcision immediately follows the crossing of the Jordan, and this in connexion with the teaching that we are seeking to establish, namely, that the baptism unto Moses and the baptism at Jordan are intentionally linked together, the interval of human frailty and law being as it were cancelled. This truth is expressed in the words of Josh. v. 2 “The second time”. By reading Josh. v. 4-7 we learn that this circumcision “the second time” referred to the children that had been born in the wilderness “by the way as they came forth out of Egypt”. This typical resumption is the more enforced by the words of verse seven “their children, whom He raised up in their stead”. The “breach of promise” (Numb. xiv. 34) being healed, Joshua fulfils that which was commenced but never finished by Moses.

Lest any reader should feel that all this reference to O.T. types is contrary to the exclusive character of the Mystery, we would remind ourselves that the Mystery does not consist of the basis doctrines of redemption and justification, nor even of the doctrine of identification as taught in Rom. v. and vi. These are fundamental to the Mystery, but are not the Mystery itself.

We can bring to bear upon this O.T. teaching concerning baptism the argument of Gal. iii. 17-19, changing the terms from that which deals with the promise made to Abraham 430 years before the law, to that which deals with the one great initial baptism at the Red Sea.

“And this I say, that the baptism of all Israel unto Moses at the Red Sea, temporarily suspended, and resumed by the baptism of all Israel at the crossing of the Jordan, this initial baptism which was 430 years from the call of Abraham, and two years before the setting up of the tabernacle with its ‘baptisms and carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation’ which, as Gal. iii. 19 reveals were ‘superseded’ (*prosetethe*), these baptisms cannot displace the initial baptism at the Red Sea, which will be most gloriously fulfilled when every ordinance has passed away.”

We must never omit from our consideration *that* baptism which the Lord spoke of, long after He had been baptized in the waters of Jordan. That too is beyond the fluctuation of dispensational changes, and gives meaning even to the carnal and passing ordinance. Yet one more note. The reader may have met at times some such question as the following:

Consider this group of names: Shakespeare, Browning, Gladstone and Byron. Which name is an intruder? Naturally, Gladstone, for he was a politician, the other being poets. So also can we propound a question.

Crucifixion, Death, Baptism, Quickening, Raising, Seating, Manifesting with Christ. Which word is an intruder? Again the answer is obvious. To put an *ordinance* into this series is to intrude. It must be substituted by the word Burial, and all is harmony. Here then is light upon “baptism” wherein the believer is “buried” and reckoned “with Christ” both in death and in resurrection.

The baptisms of water, whether the carnal ordinances of the law imposed on Israel until the time of reformation, the baptism of repentance of John the Baptist, or the baptism as practiced by the Pentecostal Church, have been allowed by orthodoxy to eclipse *the only baptism that matters*, namely that baptism toward which the Lord Himself looked, long after His baptism at Jordan (Luke xii. 50).

This is the baptism of the Spirit, the baptism that is associated with the One Body (Eph. iv. 5), the baptism that fulfils all that the baptism unto Moses and Joshua foreshadowed and more. To introduce the rite of baptism in water into such a passage as Rom. vi. or Col. ii. is not only an anachronism, it is an intrusion, dispensationally untrue and consequently dangerous. Let us try the things that differ, and hold fast that which is good.

No.7. The Fourth Reckoning.
“Quickened together with Christ.”
pp. 235 - 238

It is a common mistake, when enumerating the steps that link the cross with the future manifestation in glory, to step from union in death with Christ, to being raised with Him, “Crucified with Him, dead with Him, buried with Him, and raised with Him”, but by so doing, we omit the first great anticipatory “reality”. The next rung in this ladder of life is given in Eph. ii. It is “quickened with Him”, and this precedes being raised with Him, and is experience here and now.

“Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ” (Eph. ii. 5).

The word translated “quicken together” is *suzoopoieo*, and occurs only in Eph. ii. 5 and Col. ii. 13, its composition being obvious. The word *zoopoieo* to make alive, or to quicken, occurs twelve times in the Greek N.T., three of which occurrences are found in John’s Gospel, one in Peter’s first epistle, and eight in the epistles of Paul, of which seven occurrences are found in the epistles written before Acts xxviii., and one only afterwards.

Zoopoieo is used six times in the LXX, where it is set forth as the prerogative of God (Neh. ix. 6); and withheld from “the wicked” (Job xxxvi. 6).

The way in which this word is employed by the Apostle Paul, will prepare our minds for its application in Eph. ii. 5 and Col. ii. 13.

- (1) It is of the very nature of God as the God of our salvation, that He be believed on as “God Who quickeneth the dead” (Rom. iv. 17). It was *this* faith that justified Abraham.
- (2) It is of the very nature of the Law and the Old Covenant, that they could neither justify nor “give life” (Gal. iii. 21; II Cor. iii. 6).
- (3) It is of the very nature of this “quickening” that it be associated with the resurrection brought in by Christ as the second Man and the last Adam (I Cor. xv. 22, 36 and 45).
- (4) It is of the very nature of the life we “now live in the flesh” after having believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, that this life should be an anticipation of the future resurrection here and now, “but if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall *quicken* your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom. viii. 11).

In the two epistles Ephesians and Colossians, the word *zoe* “life” occurs but three times.

- (1) “Alienated from the life of God” (Eph. iv. 18); the condition of all men by nature.
- (2) “Your life”, “our life” (Col. iii. 3, 4). Here Christ is revealed as our life, this life is hid with Christ in God, and our manifestation with Him in glory will not take place until He Himself is manifested.

So far we have attempted to catch the outstanding characteristics of this word, we must now come closer to its contexts in Ephesians and Colossians.

The translation of Eph. ii. 1-5 found in the A.V. and the R.V. robs the believer both of the intended association of this passage with Rom. vi., and of the fact that Paul here is not speaking of the sinner's state by nature, but of the believer's standing in grace. He is not speaking of death IN sins, but of death TO sins. This we must examine and establish before we can proceed.

First, let us set out the Greek original so that it can be referred to by the English reader:

Kai humas ontas nekrous tois paraptomasi kai tais hamartiais.

Secondly, let us give a word for word literal rendering:

“And you being dead ones to the trespasses and to the sins.”

The words that demand particular attention are (1) *ontas* “being” and (2) *tois tais* “to”.

There is no reticence noticeable on the part of the Apostle in his employment of the preposition *en* “in”. Wherever its use is needed the preposition is employed, and that repeatedly. It occurs twenty-eight times in the first chapter of Ephesians and is translated “at”, “with”, “in”, and “wherein”; and twenty-eight times in the second chapter, where it is translated “wherein”, “in”, “among”, “through”, “at”, “by” and “thereby”. The fact that Paul employs the preposition so frequently in these passages, when set over against the other fact that he does not use the preposition in Eph. ii. 1 and 5, should at least make us pause. When the Lord desired to speak of the state of “being dead IN sins” the preposition *en* is used (John viii. 21, 24) and when the Apostle uses the hypothetical argument of I Cor. xv. 17 he uses the preposition *en*. The reader may ask, what warrant is there in Eph. ii. 1 to use the word “in” in the translation? The answer is, that the dative case, indicated by *tois tais* can be so translated where the subject demands it, but in the majority of cases, the dative is better expressed by such words as “to” or “at”.

It may be that not every reader of these lines will be clear as to what is meant by the “dative case”, and we are sure that those who do know, will be the first to join us in our desire to make this feature as plain as our limited space will permit.

First, as to the word “case”. This word is not to be confused with a word of the same spelling which is derived from the Latin *capio* “to hold” and so a case, as in the word “suit-case”; it is derived from the Latin *casus* “a chance”, from *cado* “to fall”. When we use the term “dative case”, we must remember that the nominative, or the subject of the sentence was conceived as being upright and that other relations indicated by the genitive, the accusative and the dative, were thought of as deflections from the upright and hence called “cases”. It will be perceived that to speak of the nominative *case* is rather like saying “the upright deflection”. The word “dative” from the Latin word *datives* means “giving”, is so named, because when we say, for example “give me the

book”, we actually mean “give TO me the book”. “The fundamental conception of the dative is juxtaposition hence the dative is diametrically opposed to the genitive” (Farrar). So, the dative is employed with *en* “in” whereas the genitive would be used with *ek* “out”.

When Paul wanted to say “to the saints” he wrote *tois hagiois* (Eph. i. 1) and when he wanted to say “in the saints” he wrote *en tois hagiois* (Eph. i. 18). We therefore believe that the omission of *en* from Eph. ii. 1 and 5 is intentional, that the Apostle did not speak of the unbeliever’s dreadful condition of being “dead IN trespasses and sins” but rather of the believer’s blessed liberation “being dead TO trespasses and sins”. This however is by no means proof, so we continue.

In I Pet. ii. 24 we read “that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness”. Here the Greek reads *tais hamartiais*, which the reader can compare with the last two words of the Greek of Eph. ii. 1 set out on page 236. It would be monstrous to translate this blessed passage in Peter “that you being dead IN sins, should live unto righteousness”. This is not all. The same grammatical form meets us in Rom. vi. with the one difference that the word is in the singular “sin” and not in the plural “sins”.

“We that are dead TO sin” *te hamartia* (Rom. vi. 2).

“He died UNTO sin once” *te hamartia* (Rom. vi. 10).

“Dead indeed UNTO sin” *te hamartia* (Rom. vi. 11).

It is absolutely impossible to use the words “IN sin” in these passages; to attempt it in verse two would be nonsense, and in verse 10 blasphemy.

The Apostle in Eph. ii. 1 and 5 is building upon the great teaching of Rom. vi. There “sin” and “the old man” are in view, whereas in Ephesians “trespasses and sins” are in view. The “old man” together with his “former conversation” as Eph. iv. 22 puts it, thereby carrying the teaching one stage further from the doctrinal, into the practical realm along the path of complete emancipation. Before we leave Eph. ii., we must notice the verb that is translated “were” in verses one and five. There is no possibility of a difference of opinion here. The word *ontas* is the present participle of the verb *eimi*, and in English reads “being”. One error is productive of others. When once the translation has been adopted “dead IN sins” it was manifestly impossible to put into the epistle of Paul “And you BEING dead IN sins” without complicating the argument and distorting the doctrine, consequently the present participle is translated “were”, yet two wrongs do not make a right, and the only translation that abides by the language of inspiration is that offered “and you being dead to” indicating the *present* condition of the believer by grace.

We must now turn to the parallel passage in Col. ii. In the Received Text the preposition *en* “in” is found in verse thirteen which justifies the translation “dead IN your sins”. Lightfoot’s comment is: “the *en* of the received text, though highly supported, is doubtless an interpolation for the sake of grammatical clearness.” *En* is not found in either the Vatican or the Sinaitic manuscripts, and the Numeric New Testament omits it.

The whole of the context is against the idea that the believer's state by nature "dead in sins" is in view; rather it is his standing in grace; he had died to these things.

"And you, being dead (here the A.V. translates *ontas* correctly) to trespasses and to the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses" (Col. ii. 13).

To appreciate in any measure of fullness this passage in Col. ii., necessitates an acquaintance with the structure of Col. ii. 4-23, some knowledge of the incipient agnosticism that was at work, and the place that philosophy, religion and the rudiments occupied in the Colossian conception of the faith, but such vast themes are entirely beyond the range of the present series. To all such the believer died with Christ, and the life that he now lives "with" Him, is for ever free from bondage of all such rudimentary religion that can only operate in the realm of the flesh, but can never intrude into that newness of life into which the believer even now enters by faith in glad anticipation of the day of reality, when He Who is our LIFE shall be manifested, and we be manifested with Him in glory.

The SECOND EPISTLE to TIMOTHY.

No.44. Paul and the heavenly kingdom (iv. 19). pp. 11 - 15

The “exigencies of time and space”, to use a journalistic *cliché*, prevented us from doing more than quote the apostle’s closing doxology, as he reviewed the past, rose triumphant over the present, and confidently looked forward to the future.

The circumstances are too solemn to permit us to discuss his last words so unceremoniously, and we therefore take up our study where we left it in the preceding article.

“And the Lord shall deliver me.”

Paul’s earlier testimony to the Lord’s deliverance was threefold (II Cor. i. 10), and his closing testimony was threefold (II Tim. iii. 11; iv. 17, 18).

“We were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life; but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead; Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in Whom we trust that He will yet deliver” (II Cor. i. 8-10).

Here is deliverance, past, present and future. It was a deliverance from “so great a death”, from a pressure that was “out of measure” and “above strength”, and although the two words translated “sentence” (“answer” in the margin of II Cor. i.) and “answer” in II Cor. i. and II Tim. iv. are not the same, they both breathe the atmosphere of the law court with its grim possibilities. This early threefold deliverance took place “in Asia”. Its memory encouraged the apostle when he was “in Rome”. The threefold deliverance of II Timothy takes a wider sweep. It goes back to the beginning of Paul’s ministry, and it appears at the end.

- A Past Deliverance. “Persecutions, afflictions, which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium and Lystra; what persecutions I endured; but out of them all the Lord delivered me” (II Tim. iii. 11).
- A Present Deliverance. “I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion” (II Tim. iv. 17).
- A Future Deliverance. “The Lord shall delivered me from every evil work” (II Tim. iv. 18).

What did the apostle mean by “every evil work”? Such an expression hardly fits such a deliverance as “out of the mouth of the lion”, “work” rather looks to the deeds of the individual himself. It cannot mean the attack of evil men, or the course of his trial before Nero, for he was not “delivered” from these. Paul’s concern was not so much with the attacks of evil men upon himself, but with his own faithfulness, even unto death. He had previously written:

“If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He also will deny us”
(II Tim. ii. 12).

He looked forward to that “crown”, and the deliverance he prayed for was not from the hands of men, but from the slightest denial that he might be tempted to make of his Lord. Those of our readers who have ever stood before an earthly tribunal, who have had the well bring of self and loved ones in their hands, need no reminder of the strength of that temptation that presents itself to temporize, to compromise, in other words “to deny” one’s Lord or calling. And if by grace one has emerged from such an ordeal, with the veriest rags of decency left, no one who knows his own heart, could ever adopt boastful language, but would rather see in one’s “stand”, a “deliverance” from oneself, a “deliverance” from an “evil work” indeed.

Paul makes it clear that “profession” “works” and “denial” go together, for writing to Titus he said:

“They profess that they know God, but in *works* they *deny* Him.”

Moreover, the passage in Titus adds the words:

“and unto every work *reprobate*” (Titus i. 16),

which is the very opposite of the word rendered “*approved*” in II Tim. ii. 15, and is translated “castaway” in connexion with being “disqualified” for the crown in the Greek races (I Cor. ix. 24-27). In view of “that day” Paul saw the whole of Christian service as “work”, and that:

“Every man’s work shall be made manifest every man’s work of *what sort it is*”
(I Cor. iii. 13).

The “works” that occupy the apostle in his last epistle are:

- (1) The works of the flesh which are entirely set aside in the scheme of gospel grace (II Tim. i. 9).
- (2) “Good works” which sum up acceptable service and for which the Scriptures equip (II Tim. ii. 21; iii. 17).
- (3) “The work of an evangelist”, the “full proof” or goal of Timothy’s ministry (II Tim. iv. 5).
- (4) The “works” of Alexander the coppersmith which will come up for “reward” either of gain or loss in “that day” and,
- (5) “Every evil work” that would militate against the apostle’s own perseverance and loyalty to the end (II Tim. iv. 18).

The apostle had the choice of several words to express the “evil” character of the works from which he trusted for deliverance: *kakos*, *poneros*, *adikos*, *phaulos*.

These four words have slightly different meanings which should be observed when translating or interpreting any given passage. *Kakos* indicates something useless,

unsuitable, bad, whereas *poneros* is positive and means something dangerous, injurious or evil. *Poneros* ascribes quality as regards effects, *kakos* looks rather to quality as regards nature. *Kakos* differs from *adikos* “as state differs from conduct” (Cremer). *Phaulos* (Titus ii. 8) means “light”, “worthless”. The word used in II Tim. iv. 14 is *kakos*, but in II Tim. iv. 18 it is *poneros*.

“In a moral sense—bad, evil, answering somewhat to the German *unnütz*, useless, what is good for nothing. It is therefore in Greek, in the first place, the opposite of *chrestos*, as applied to persons who diligently follow their calling, and thus support themselves, e.g. of a clever housewife, good parents, good citizens” (Cremer).

Paul dreaded those things which would spoil his position as a vessel “*meet* for the master’s use” *euchrestos* (II Tim. ii. 21), or render him unprofitable for the ministry *achrestos* (iv. 11). He had waned against the “striving about words to no profit”, in contrast with showing oneself “approved” (ii. 14, 15), and “profit” here is *cherismos*.

It is evident therefore that when the apostle speaks of “evil work”, he has in mind own perseverance and loyalty to the Lord and His word, unshaken by desertion, betrayal or death. This “deliverance” is followed by another step along the road to glory:

“And will preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom” (II Tim. iv. 18).

The word translated “preserve” is *sozo* the simple verb “to save”. Salvation not only deals with the initial act of grace whereby sinners are saved (I Tim. i. 15), it covers the whole redeeming process from the deliverance from bondage of sin to the final deliverance from the bondage of corruption. Moreover, there is never absent from *sozo* its primary meaning of “health” and “soundness”. When Peter said to Israel “Neither is there *salvation* in any other” (Acts iv. 12) he referred to the type of their salvation that was immediately before them, using the verb *sozo* in the sentence “By what means he is *made whole*” (Acts iv. 9).

The three opening references to *sozo* in the N.T. as we possess it are Matt. i. 21, viii. 25, and ix. 21, and they give us in turn salvation “from sin”, salvation “from peril” and salvation “from bodily disease”. Paul therefore, knowing the full meaning of the verb “to save”, uses it of the end of his course as he does for its beginning (I Tim. i. 15).

A believer can be “saved, yet so as by fire” (I Cor. iii. 15), he could also obtain *that* salvation which is accompanied with “eternal glory” (II Tim. ii. 10). The apostle endured what he did so that this blessed result may be the lot of those who believed, and he desired that he might also endure to the end so that after heralding to others, he himself should not be disqualified (I Cor. ix. 27). Here, in II Tim. iv., there are no doubts. The Lord *did* deliver. He *will* “save to the uttermost”, save right to the full end, as *panteles* “uttermost” literally means, save so that Paul shall be able to say I have finished (*teleo*), I shall be numbered among those that are “perfect” (Phil. iii. 12, *teleioo*).

The full sentence in which *sozo* appears is:

“And will preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom” (II Tim. iv. 18).

Let us not lose “things” by endeavouring to preserve “words”. In order to differentiate between that body of truth which deals with Israel and the kingdom, and that body of truth which deals with the Church, it has been found convenient to use two terms “Kingdom truth” and “Church truth”. Now these terms are good servants but bad masters.

While the kingdom of Israel differs exceedingly from the Church of the Mystery, we must not blind our eyes to the fact that the whole of the nation of Israel was a “church” in the sense, that “ecclesia” means a company of people “called out” and separated for a special purpose. So, Israel is called “the church in the wilderness” by Stephen (Acts vii. 38), and in the Gospel of the Kingdom, with Peter receiving the keys of the “*kingdom*” of heaven, Christ speaks about His “*church*”. Again, while the Church of the mystery is completely separated by calling, sphere and constitution, from the kingdom of Israel, yet the apostle does not hesitate to speak of the kingdom in these epistles of the mystery.

The Colossian saints had been translated “into the kingdom of God’s dear Son” (Col. i. 13), and the Ephesian believer had been warned against possible forfeiture of the “inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God” (Eph. v. 5). Paul charges Timothy to faithfulness, in view of the Lord’s “appearing” and “kingdom”, at that appearing Paul himself expected a “crown”, and those who endured expected “to reign”, and having finished his course he was looking forward to his place in the “heavenly kingdom”. Every department of God’s administration is within His kingdom. Israel on the earth, the seed of Abraham in the Heavenly City, the Church of the One Body “in heavenly places” all are departments in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Paul did not merely say “kingdom” in II Tim. iv. 18. He said “heavenly” kingdom, even as he had linked the “kingdom” in the first verse with the “appearing”.

And so, with a doxology, the weary but happy warrior sheathes his sword: “To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

We are sure that no one would have intruded at this glorious climax an argument as to whether the word *aion* means “an age”, whether there is an end suggested to the glory that is here ascribed—such things would be an impertinence. This age, this present evil age (II Tim. iv. 10) which had ensnared Demas, was soon to pass. Another age was coming in which sin, death and curse should be for ever removed. “That day” and “the ages of the ages” might differ, but they were united in the one glorious sense that they stood for complete emancipation, glorious triumph, blessed and eternal fellowship, and reward outweighing the heaviest of earthly trials.

Here again we must pause. The apostle stoops down yet once again to things of earth before he comes to a finish, and we will defer our conclusion, so that we may bide with him to “the last hour of act”.

**No.45. Demas, Titus, Luke, Mark. Those who leave,
those who abide and those who arrive (iv. 9 - 22).
The Closing hours of a devoted life.
pp. 26 - 29**

The reader will remember that the very fact that Paul said nothing about Demas in Col. iv., was an indication that he could not say anything *good*.

We *are told* why Demas forsook Paul, he “loved this present world”. Why he went to Thessalonica we can only conjecture. The apostle tells us that he had *sent* Tychicus to Ephesus (II Tim. iv. 12) and that he had *left* Trophimus at Miletus sick. These are therefore accounted for. We have a sinking at heart however when we read straight on from the betrayal of Demas, without comment or qualification. “Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia” (II Tim. iv. 10). The verb that one naturally supplies is the word used of Demas who “departed” to Thessalonica.

Demas “departed” to Thessalonica,
Crescens “departed” to Galatia,
Titus “departed” to Dalmatia.

We know nothing of Crescens, but Titus we do know. He had, the years before, been summoned from Crete to join the apostle at Nicopolis (Titus iii. 12). Dalmatia lies North of Nicopolis, and it may have been that Paul’s determination to winter at Nicopolis was cut short by the Roman authorities, and that Titus had continued on from Nicopolis to Dalmatia, to complete the work in Illyricum which the apostle then knew that he himself would never finish. Possibly Paul linked Demas and Titus together, not because they had both forsaken him, but that for whatever reason, good or bad, he was deprived of their fellowship and presence.

Demas had gone, so had Crescens, so had Titus. One after another had been called upon to leave him. Sickness had claimed Trophimus, and for some unexplained reason Erasmus abode at Corinth, where he had been Chamberlain (Rom. xvi. 23).

“Only Luke is with me.”

Paul was not only in deadly peril, but so also would all be who sought him out and associated with him.

“Christianity had been pronounced a crime against the State, and an ‘outrage against humanity’.” (Tac. Ann.).

No longer did Paul enjoy the fellowship of friends as he had in the previous imprisonment at Rome. He now suffered as a “malefactor”. One by one his friends

forsook him. “All in Asia have left me.” First Phygellus and Hermogenes, then Demas, and Luke alone left—loyal, faithful, unobtrusive Luke!

Luke’s appearance in the Acts of the Apostles is indicated by the presence of the pronoun “we”, he joined the apostle at Troas after he had seen the vision of the man of Macedonia (xvi. 10). Luke apparently continued with Paul until he left Philippi (xvii. 1). He rejoined the apostle at Philippi (xx. 5) and continued with him until he arrived at Jerusalem (xxi. 18). He again enters the narrative at Acts xxvii. 1, continuing with the apostle right through to Rome and remained with him there while he wrote the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, and is found with him at the end*. (* See “The Apostle of the Reconciliation”, p.6, the “We” sections.)

Timothy alone of all Paul’s fellow-workers appears to have been dearest to Paul. Luke was his physician, Luke was his biographer, and Luke was his cheer. Whether his eyes ever again beheld the face of his beloved son in the faith—whether winter or death intervened before Timothy could reach Rome—we know not, but we are particularly sure that among the last of human faces upon which Paul’s eyes rested before they closed in glorious martyrdom, was the face of Luke the beloved, Luke the loyal, Luke the unobtrusive. That Luke was a physician, is proved beyond question by his choice of words, words found in the medical works of Hippocrates, Aretaeus, Galen and Dioscorides, covering a period from B.C.460 to 100-200A.D.

A very full examination of Luke’s medical language will be found in the book of Hobart on the medical terms used by Luke, and in our own book “The Apostle of the Reconciliation”, pages 11 and 12 we have given seventeen examples.

It is not proper or possible to write here concerning our own selves and our witness over these forty years, but those few who really know the inner history of this testimony*, and the Lord Himself Who has watched over it all this time, they know that history has repeated itself, and that if there have been those like Phygellus, Hermogenes and Demas who have, for various reasons, failed us, and if there have been those like Alexander the coppersmith who have opposed us, there have been those who most certainly have filled the role of Luke the beloved physician, Tychicus a beloved brother, faithful minister and fellow servant, Timothy the son in the faith, the homely fellowship of Priscilla and Aquila and others of Paul’s stalwart friends.

[* - Some idea may be obtained by reading the series “Less Than the Least”, Volume XXXV.]

“Take Mark and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry” (II Tim. iv. 11).

In direct contrast with Demas, is Mark, and it is noteworthy that Demas is never mentioned without Mark’s name being associated with him (Col. iv. 14; Philemon 24 and II Tim. iv. 10, 11).

Demas is an example of one who did run well but who failed to finish the course. Mark is an encouragement to those timid souls who make a poor show at the start, yet

who grow in grace and come out into clear light and testimony at the end. Mark had already been commended to the church by the apostle:

“Marcus sister’s son to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you receive him)” (Col. iv. 10).

The inclusion of Barnabas here, plainly refers back to the incident recorded in Acts xv. 36-39. There, Mark had turned back when he learned the project to enter Pamphylia, now he stood boldly by the side of the imprisoned apostle. The incident illumines the character of more than that of Mark. Peter, with whom Mark had laboured, had evidently helped the younger man and had certainly not prejudiced him against Paul. It throws light, too, upon the nature of Paul, who did not hesitate to commend and accept the services of the selfsame man on account of whose departure, at Perga, he had sacrificed the friendship of Barnabas. Tradition is unanimous that Mark was the companion and interpreter of Peter. Peter was in the habit of visiting the house of Mark’s mother (Acts xii. 12), and there the young disciple would learn most of the facts which he was afterwards inspired to place in the “Gospel” that bears his name. Jerome wrote concerning the office that Titus filled in service to Paul as compared with that of Mark:

“Therefore he had Titus for a secretary, and the blessed Peter had Mark, whose Gospel was composed by him after the dictation of Peter.”

Thus, in the prison cell at Rome there gathered with the apostle of the Gentiles, Luke who wrote his gospel to a Gentile “Theophilus”, and had the Gentiles in mind all the time, as a comparison with Matthew will reveal, and Mark, who wrote his gospel, presumably for those Gentiles who had become attached to the kingdom ministry of Peter, as a comparison of his gospel with that of Matthew will show. Who can estimate the worth or the fruit of the written testimony of these three men who at the time were despised, ill-treated and reckoned of no possible account.

“But Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.” The “but” suggests a contrast between those mentioned before, who were absent, and Tychicus who had definitely been sent by the apostle. There is every reason to believe that Timothy was at Ephesus when this second epistle was written to him.

In II Tim. i. 16-18 and iv. 19 the reference to the household of Onesiphorus and his ministry at Ephesus, certainly suggests that that city was his home. In ii. 17 Hymenæus, the teacher, and in iv. 14 Alexander the coppersmith, are mentioned separately, but in I Tim. i. 20 they are mentioned together, and Alexander figures in the riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33). Timothy, at the time of writing, was evidently not far from Troas (II Tim. iv. 13) and would have to pass through this city if he were journeying from Ephesus to Rome.

The last notice of Mark was a recommendation of him to the church at Colosse (Col. iv. 10), and Paul assumes in his second epistle, that Timothy would find Mark near at hand. With all the anxiety which his own personal affairs brought, Paul is seen here still mindful of the stewardship with which he had been entrusted and while not hesitating to call Timothy to his side, did not omit to provide another faithful minister in his place.

There was still an amount of important matter to be considered as the apostle drew near to the conclusion of his life's work. The next to be mentioned by name is Alexander, who did Paul much evil. But let us leave the apostle with his beloved friend Luke to solace and cheer, eagerly expecting the coming of his son Timothy and of Mark, with Tychicus already on his way to Ephesus to fill the breach.

The sands of time are sinking, but the last word has not yet been said, let us therefore devote one more article at least to these precious moments, before we say "Hail and farewell" to one of the noblest servants that ever followed Christ.

**No.46. Hail and Farewell (iv. 19 - 22).
pp. 74 - 78**

It is fitting that the dispensation which opened so far as its inspired literature is concerned, with the words "Blessed be God" (Eph. i. 3), should end with the doxology with which preceding study closed (II Tim. iv. 18).

This epistle, however, is not the only one where the heart of the apostle as it were overflows and compels him to add to his "last" word. The reader will remember that in Philippians the apostle said "finally" twice, and that in Romans, there is a doxology in chapters i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, and that he appears to come to a conclusion twice before actually doing so (Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20 and 27). Ephesians pronounces a doxology in the middle of the epistle (iii. 21), and Philippians ends in much the same way as does II Timothy, for after the doxology of Phil. iv. 20, the apostle sends his salutations and benedictions to every saint in Christ Jesus (iv. 21-22). Paul was a man of thanksgiving, every epistle except that to the Galatians contain the words *eucharisteo*, *echo charin*, *eucharistos*, *eucharistia* or *charis*, 45 references in all. Paul had "endured to the end", and a thankful spirit was no small contribution to his success. Even on the lower plane of life, it is true that:

"A merry heart goes all the day,
Your sad tires in a mile-a."

Not only was Paul a man who gave thanks on every possible occasion, he was a man who loved those who had been given into his charge, so that they were in his mind and heart, night and day. For some of us it would have been impossible to step down from the heights of II Tim. iv. 18, to think of sending greetings to a few believers, but it is the very essence of the apostle's conception of grace that he could and did mingle the sublime with the homely. It would, we believe, have been a cause of great grief to him, had he forgotten the simple salutation to "Prisca and Aquila". They had come into his life when he first set foot in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2) and their home had provided not only a shelter for the apostle himself, but an opportunity to earn a meager livelihood "with his own hands", and so maintain that independence which he perceived was essential in his

ministry at Corinth (II Cor. xi. 7-11). In the hour of his own peril, he would remember that to this devoted pair both he and the Church of the Gentiles owed much, for, sending them greetings at the close of the epistle to the Romans, he said:

“Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus; who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles” (Rom. xvi. 3, 4).

How blessedly unconscious of an “halo” was the apostle! For in this hour of death, forsaken by most and in extreme distress, his irrepressible spirit bubbled over, and he used the familiar pet name “Prisca” for the “proper” name Priscilla! What volumes might be filled at the writing of such a name at such a moment! Who, but the simply great, would combine martyrdom and pet names, without some sense of the unseemly! Yet so complete is the Apostle’s trust, so victorious his hope, he can slip from the doxology to endearment without the slightest self consciousness, and God has preserved the record for all time among His sacred Scriptures. The fact that Paul salutes “the household of Onesiphorus” suggests that Onesiphorus was either deceased or away from home. After Onesiphorus, the apostle speaks of Erastus and of his abiding at Corinth. We know nothing of the motives that moved Erastus, we can only ponder the statement and leave it there. This reference to Erastus however will prove to be an important item when we endeavour to arrive at a conclusion of the vexed question concerning Paul’s imprisonment. Some contend that Paul’s imprisonment at Rome, as narrated in the twenty-eighth of Acts, ended in his martyrdom. Some contend that Paul was liberated, and that during that interval he wrote the first epistle to Timothy and the epistle to Titus, and that he was subsequently apprehended, taken back to Rome, imprisoned as an evil-doer, condemned and executed.

We hope to take up these epistles (I Timothy and Titus) as a sequel to the study now drawing to a close and we may then give all the available arguments that are at our disposal in settling this important matter.

The fact that Trophimus had been left at Miletum, sick, coupled with the fact that Epaphroditus had been sick nigh unto death (Phil. ii. 27), and that Timothy suffered “often infirmities” (I Tim. v. 23), is an indication that a change of dispensation had occurred since the miracles of healing were wrought in Melita (Acts xxviii. 1-10), after the setting aside of Israel and their hope (xxviii. 20, 25), and the sending of salvation to the Gentiles subsequent to this crisis (xxviii. 28).

The recognition of the dispensational boundary of Acts xxviii. and the vital association of Paul’s imprisonment with the new dispensation of the mystery, has been the warp and woof of our ministry since the first line of *The Berean Expositor* was penned. We have given Acts xxviii. a detailed examination in the series devoted to the Acts of the Apostles, to which we refer the interested reader. Paul not only sends greetings himself but he mentions by name a number of believers at Rome who join with him in saluting the saints. Before he mentions this however, he reverts to the overwhelming desire that he had to see Timothy, saying:

“Do thy diligence to come before winter” (II Tim. iv. 21).

Then come salutations from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus and Claudia, besides all the brethren. Of Eubulus nothing is known, except that he was a fellow-worker with Paul, and honoured by having his name included in the epistle. Linus was the name of the first bishop of Rome, and Irenæus says that Linus was succeeded by Anacletus, and in the third place from the apostles Clement received the Episcopate of the city, a person who had beheld the blessed apostles, and had enjoyed intercourse with them, and had their preaching still sounding in his ears (Irenæus 3:3).

“Who was Claudia who is here connected with Pudens and Linus? Was she the daughter of Cogidunus king of the Regni, now Surrey and Sussex? or was she the daughter of Caractacus, the renowned British chieftain?” (Lewin).

“The Companion Bible” has the following note:

“Pudens and Claudia are supposed by some to be husband and wife, and have been identified with Titus Claudius and Claudius Quinctilia, whose inscription over a child they lost has been discovered near Rome.”

At Chichester has been found an inscription which speaks of one Pudens, in conjunction with King Cogidunus, dated when Nero was Consul for the fourth time, namely 60-68A.D. Claudia of II Tim. iv. is identified by some with a British Princess whom Pudens married, daughter of either the British king Cogidunus or Caractacus. There is a good deal of conjecture in this identification and we can only look upon the two names in II Tim. iv. with interest, in that it may have been, that the apostle Paul while at Rome made the acquaintance of a Princess from our own shores, and that the Church in Rome met at times under the roof that sheltered one of our own race. In ancient British tradition Linus is said to be the Llin of Welsh Hagiography, the son of Caractacus, and so the brother of Claudia. These traditions and suggestions are interesting, but they do not form part of our faith. The Lord knows the individuals which Paul has here named, and there will be no mistaken identities in “that day”.

Whether Timothy ever reached Rome in time, we do not know, whether Paul found physical comfort in the cloke, and spiritual comfort from the parchments is hidden from us. Whether he made a confession of the faith at his last trial, whether he went to his triumphant death alone or with the faithful few, we have no knowledge.

Tradition has left some account, and while tradition must always be submitted to examination and received with reserve, it is not necessarily false.

Tradition tells us that Paul was led out through the gate which now bears his name. Three miles further on, not far from the Ostian Road, is a place anciently known as *Aquæ Salviæ*, and now as *Tre Fontane*, and there the execution is said to have taken place. Thus without pomp or show, but rather in ignominy and desertion the great apostle yielded up his life for the truth which had been more dear to him than life itself.

Tradition tells us moreover that those of the guard, Longinus, Acestor, and Megistus, were converted on the way, and that they afterwards suffered martyrdom for the name of Christ.

We have no words with which, adequately to express our own appreciation of this man of God. We cannot trust our pen at this point, lest in the eyes of some, we appear too fond. We cannot however say farewell to this lonely child of grace, this champion of truth, this herald of light and liberty, without some tribute, and so we quote the words of another, who, though viewing much of the Scriptures from a different angle from that held by ourselves, was an unreserved lover of Paul the apostle.

“Here was one to whom no single man that has ever lived, before or since, can furnish a perfect parallel. If we look at him only as a writer, how immensely does he surpass, in his most casual Epistles, the greatest authors, whether Pagan or Christian, of his own and succeeding epochs. The younger Pliny was famous as a letter-writer, yet the younger Pliny never produced any letter so exquisite as that to Philemon. Seneca, as a moralist, stood almost unrivalled, yet not only is clay largely mixed with his gold, but even his finest moral aphorisms are inferior in breadth and intensity to the most casual of St. Paul’s. Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius furnish us with the purest and noblest specimens of Stoic loftiness and thought, yet St. Paul’s chapter on charity is worth more than all they ever wrote. If we look at the Christian world, the very greatest worker in each realm of Christian service does but present an inferior aspect of one phase only of Paul’s many-sided pre-eminence. As a theologian, as one who formulated the doctrines of Christianity, we may compare him with St. Augustine or St. Thomas of Aquinum; yet how should we be shocked to find in him the fanciful rhetoric and dogmatic bitterness of the one, or the scholastic aridity of the other! If we look at him as a moral reformer, we may compare him with Savonarola; but in his practical control of even the most thrilling spiritual impulses—in making the spirit of the prophet subject to the prophet—how grand an exemplar might he not have furnished to the impassioned Florentine! If we consider him as a preacher we may compare him with St. Bernard; yet St. Paul would have been incapable of the unnatural asceticism and heresy-hunting hardness of the great Abbot of Clairvaux. As a reformer who altered the entire course of human history, Luther alone resembles him; yet how incomparably is the Apostle superior to Luther in insight, in courtesy, in humility, in dignity, in self-control! As a missionary we might compare him to Xavier, as a practical organizer to St. Gregory, as a fervent lover of souls to Whitefield, and to many other saints of God in many other of his endowments; but no saint of God has ever attained the same heights in so many capacities, or received the gifts of the Spirit in so rich an outpouring, or borne in his mortal body such evident landmarks of the Lord. In his lifetime he was no whit behind the very chiefest of the Apostles, and he towers above the very greatest of all the saints who have since striven to follow the example of his devotion to his Lord” (Farrar).

Faithful to the end, the apostle did not forget his promise to the church in the beginning.

The Thessalonians had been deceived by a letter purporting to come from the apostle (II Thess. ii. 2), and to safeguard them and us he said:

“The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle; so I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen” (II Thess. iii. 17, 18).

Paul never failed of this promise. Every epistle that he wrote concludes with a salutation that contains the word “grace be with you”. This salutation is found at the close of Hebrews, but is not found at the close of the epistles of either James, Peter, Jude or John.

Inspiration does not make a man like Paul write meaningless platitudes. Those words “the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you” are characteristic of the apostle and his own personal desires. He can wish nothing better to either a church, a minister or a fellow believer, and so on this note:

“Grace be with you. Amen,”

the apostle of grace lays down both his pen, his sword and his life, to await that day when grace shall give place to glory, and he and we shall be for ever with the Lord.

Tools for the Unashamed Workman.

No.6. Commentaries with Greek Text.

pp. 98 - 100

Our survey of the many translations of the Scriptures that are of service to the workman in the Word, would not be at all complete without a reference to those larger works that not only give a translation, but provide a commentary at the same time. We draw the reader's attention to the following, which are not however placed in order of merit.

He Kaine Diatheke, The New Testament with English Notes, Philological and Explanatory. By E. Valpy.

The fourth edition, published in 1836, is enriched by a fairly full contribution on the Greek Article contributed by Bishop Middleton, Dr. Tilloch and Mr. Granville Sharp. While we do not say that this commentary has anything exceptional about it, the reader would be well advised should he see it second hand for a few shillings to secure it. Here and there its philological notes and explanatory passages are suggestive.

A work of much greater value and authority is that entitled:

“The Greek Testament with English Notes, Critical, Philological and Exegetical, especially adapted for the use of theological students, and ministers.”

By the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D. The ninth edition of this work was published in 1858.

His own note which we extract from the preface, very aptly introduces the words “cautious”, “candour”, “charity”, which we would ourselves use in characterizing this work.

“To revert in a general way to the two departments of his present labours—the critical and exegetical. As to the former, the Author trusts that his recent very extensive researches have enabled him materially to improve the Text which he had long ago framed; at any rate he has been guided by a spirit alike remote on the one hand from the reckless innovation, and, on the other, from a slavish adherence to what had been indeed received As to the *latter* and more important department, he is not aware that aught has been left undone to serve every necessary purpose of the Student in Theology, the Minister and Preacher, and the general Reader of Divinity. Accordingly he trusts that the work will be found to present a constant *Handbook* supplying an ever ready *Aid*, and, as far as is needed (though the materials for judgment are always placed before the reader), a *Guide*. In regard to such portions as concern *Systems of Theology*—nay even *points of doctrine* whereon professing Christians, however sober and conscientious, have differed and do differ, he has been anxious to lay down the course of *Exegesis* (on the adjustment of which the decision of such points turns), in the most cautious manner ever endeavouring to open out the mind of the Spirit in the spirit of love, candour, and Christian charity; at any rate studiously avoiding to treat such passages polemically or controversially.”

In the same year that Bloomfield's ninth edition was published, there appeared:

The Greek Testament, with notes grammatical and exegetical
by William Webster, M.A.. and William Francis Wilkinson, M.A.

In explanation of their work, the authors say:

“Our intention of undertaking this task was conceived more than twenty years ago, when Dr. Valpy's was the only annotated edition in the hands of students at our universities. Though since that period the labours of Bloomfield, Burton and Trollope have supplied to some extent the defect which then existed, we cannot regard the amount of attention which the New Testament in the Original has received from English annotators, as at all commensurate with the theological or classical literature of our day Six years ago, this volume was in a state of considerable forwardness, when the announcement of a similar publication by Mr. Alford caused us to pause, till we saw how far the reception of his labours might render the prosecution of our own unnecessary.”

As a result, Webster and Wilkinson, still believing that there was room for an annotated Greek Testament along the lines they had planned, published their labours, deviating largely from the path of their predecessors in that, (1) They omit altogether the department dealing with Textual Criticism; (2) They modify or decline as superfluous to their purpose much that is common to preceding annotators; and in lieu thereof, (3) dwell upon points which have hitherto received but partial attention.

Both Bloomfield and Webster & Wilkinson refer to Alford's monumental work the third edition of which was published in 1856. It was entitled:

“The Greek Testament, with a critically revised text: a digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage: prolegomena: and a critical and exegetical commentary.” By Henry Alford, B.D.

Each section of this work is prefaced by Prolegomena which treat of Authorship, Origin, Readers, Time, Place and Language, Genuineness and Authenticity, Style and Character.

While Alford supplied the reader with the names of the MSS that are both for and against certain readings, the reader would do well to follow his leading with caution as in the last report Alford gave too great a prominence to “internal probability”. He adopted that reading “which on the whole *seemed most likely* to have stood in the original Text”.

In the notes that accompany the Greek Text, the student will find not only a suggestive translation, but the reasons for and against the rendering adopted together with arguments for rejecting or accepting the translations of such commentators as Calvin, Bengel and Meyer, &c., beside a copious reference of the “Fathers”.

One other commentary of this same kind we must mention, and that is:

“The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the original Greek, with notes and introductions.” By Chas. Wordsworth, D.D.

While there are other similar Greek New Testament commentaries available, we feel that sufficient has been said for our purpose, their multiplication but encumbers. The reader must be prepared, in practically all his researches, to find that “Dispensational Truth” is scarcely recognized, and that most commentators hold opinions concerning hell, baptism, the Lord’s Supper, &c., that are contrary to the teaching for which *The Berean Expositor* stands. With all this however, those works mentioned above if used with discretion can become tools in the hands of the workman of God, especially in the elucidation of the finer points of grammar and translation, leaving the reader himself the privilege and responsibility of arriving at the true interpretation and application of the truth thus illuminated.

NO No.7, (No.5 also).

No.8. Works that show by undersigned coincidences the accuracy of Acts and the Epistles, by William Paley, D.D. and T. R. Birks, M.A. pp. 119, 120

The two books that come before us for examination are most helpful and stimulating. The first is entitled:

Horae Paulinae or The Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced by a comparison of the epistle which bear his name with the Acts of the Apostles and with one another.

He Kaine Diatheke, The New Testament with English Notes, Philological and Explanatory. By E. Valpy.

The fourth edition, published in 1836, is enriched by a fairly full contribution on the Greek Article contributed by Bishop Middleton, Dr. Tilloch and Mr. Granville Sharp. While we do not say that this commentary has anything exceptional about it, the reader would be well advised should he see it second hand for a few shillings to secure it. Here and there its philological notes and explanatory passages are suggestive.

He Kaine Diatheke, The New Testament with English a high and deserved reputation, not only as a decisive argument for the genuineness of St. Paul’s epistles, and the fidelity

of St. Luke's narrative, but as a pattern of sagacious and discriminating historical criticism No candid reader, after a perusal of the work, can escape the full conviction that the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistles of St. Paul, forming together nearly one half of the New Testament, could neither be the result of fraud on the part of contemporary authors, nor have an artificial origin in later times, but are certainly what they bear upon their face, a genuine history, and authentic letters of the great apostle of the Gentiles."

Birks carried Paley's method further. He gleaned many coincidences that Paley had overlooked, and applied the same argument to the four gospels. Birks included the epistle to the Hebrews in his survey, and his contribution is greater in bulk than the original work of Paley, but just as interesting. We would suggest that these works be consulted whenever any serious examination of the N.T. is intended, they are worthy "tools for the unashamed workman".

No.9. Some Valuable Books on the Septuagint. pp. 139, 140

The reader of *The Berean Expositor* who has been acquainted with its method of exposition for any length of time, will be aware that the testimony of the Septuagint, especially for the light that it sheds upon the meaning of N.T. words, is held in high esteem. In our Index of Volumes I-XX of *The Berean Expositor*, we devoted two pages to a special Index of references to the Septuagint Version of the O.T.

A book which we recommend every student to obtain if possible is the work by E. W. Grinfield, M.A., published in London by William Pickering in 1850, and now only obtainable at second-hand. He entitled his book:

"An Apology for the Septuagint, in which its claim to Biblical and Canonical Authority are briefly stated and vindicated."

While we may not follow this writer to the full length of his argument and believe as he does that the LXX is of equal inspiration and canonicity as the Hebrew originals, we do certainly value the testimony that he gives to the extreme value and importance of this great Version. An apology is a justification rather than an excuse, and an apologetic is a formal defence of a person, doctrine, course, etc., and is first found in use in 1605. An apologist is a defender, as Lord Broughton wrote "Mr. Hume, the staunch apologist of all Stuarts".

The reader will find no "apology" in the weak and secondary sense of the word in Grinfield's work. The following extracts will give some idea of the nature of this "apology".

"This Greek version was received by the immediate successors of the apostles, on authority which they could not hesitate to acknowledge. They had heard it preached and

quoted by the apostles; they found it more or less in every chapter of the New Testament.”

“The terms repentance, faith, righteousness, justification, redemption, sanctification, etc., together with the titles Lord, Christ, Saviour, Holy Spirit, etc., are the very same in the Alexandrian version (the LXX) as in the New Testament, and they are used precisely in the same meaning. It is this identity of doctrinal terms and expressions which constitutes the unity, and which secures the continuity of faith and doctrine, in the Old and the New Testament.”

“*Dikaios*, in the LXX and in the New Testament, is one, whom the Judge pronounces innocent, i.e. who He absolves or pardons, whereas *dikaios*, in Classic Greek, signifies one, who is *just in himself*, and on his own account, who therefore needs no pardon.”

“If you attempt to attire the language of the Scriptures in a classic form, you are in danger of substituting heathen ethics for Christian morals, by bringing down the doctrines of the Bible to the level of human speculation.”

“The eloquence of Paul, a Valckenaer has remarked, is quite another kind from that of the Greek orators. His vocabulary is chiefly confined to the LXX, and those who would comprehend his arguments or appreciate his excellence, must give their days and nights to the study of the Septuagint.”

In his introduction Grinfield says:

“This ‘apology’ may be regarded as a natural sequel to my Hellenistic Edition of the Greek Testament.”

This indicates that Grinfield had worked for some time in the study of the Greek of the O.T., and another work by this same writer is of extreme value, in the matter of comparing passages of the Greek O.T. and the Greek Fathers, with the Greek of the N.T. Its title is rather forbidding, it is *Scholia Hellenistica in Novum Testamentum*, but the reader needs no Latin to use the work.

No.10. Some Valuable Books on the Septuagint (contd). pp. 241, 242

In association with the works of Grinfield referred to in the preceding article, we would mention *The New Testament Quotations*, by Henry Gough, because he gives the original Hebrews, the corresponding Septuagint Greek, and the N.T. quotations, together with English translations that enable the reader to compare and check every quotation made from the LXX in the N.T.

“Large as this collection is, it must not for a moment be supposed that it comprehends all the verbal similarities to the Old Testament, and especially to the Septuagint version of it.”

“Had not such a translations (i.e. the LXX) been published and received a proper time before our Saviour’s advent, the composition of the New Testament in Greek would, humanly speaking, have been impossible.”

Henry Gough’s book was published in 1855, and in his preface he pays a tribute to the learned and valuable works of the Rev. E. W. Grinfield.

We must include a more modern work among our books of reference to the LXX and that is:

An introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., published in 1900 by the Cambridge University Press.

In this work of over 590 pages almost every phase of the subject is dealt with. The book is divided into three parts:

- I. The History of the Greek Old Testament and of its transmission. This is subdivided into six chapters and occupies pages 1-194.
- II. The contents of the Alexandrian Old Testament. This is subdivided into six chapters and occupies pages 197-366.
- III. Literary use, value, and textual condition of the Greek Old Testament. This is subdivided into six chapters and occupies pages 369-497. There is an Appendix and two Indexes.

It must be clearly understood that in recommending books as tools in this series, we expect the student to be discreet, that he has no hesitancy regarding the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and where a modernistic tendency is observable, he will nevertheless be able to use what is good and true without endorsing everything that is put forward and without accepting every conclusion.

One other book must be mentioned under this heading, it is:

Essays in Biblical Greek by Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D., published in 1889.

The work consists largely of the lectures delivered by the author as Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint. The contents are in the form of seven essays, and are very comprehensive in their scope and full of detailed examples. The seven essays are:

- I. On the value and use of the Septuagint.
- II. Short studies of the meaning of words in Biblical Greek.
- III. On psychological terms in Biblical Greek.
- IV. On early quotations from the Septuagint.
- V. On composite quotations from the Septuagint.
- VI. On Origen's revision of the LXX text of Job.
- VII. On the text of Ecclesiasticus.

The book does not permit of extracts. It is a valuable acquisition. With these works and a good concordance to the LXX, the earnest student has not only a mine in which Treasure lies, but real tools with which to work it out.

For the benefit of any who may have been perturbed by a recent misleading reference, take note, the phrase *en tois epouraniois* "in heavenly places", does not occur in the LXX.

Truth in the Balance.

No.13. Prophecy and its Fulfillment. pp. 35 - 38

Among the subjects that demand the “balance” for their interpretation and the appreciation of their value, must be numbered Prophecy and its fulfillment.

The following paragraphs written by Horne, in his “Introduction” are worth reproducing:

“The knowledge of future events is that object, which man, with the greatest desire, has the least ability to attain. By tracing cause and effect in their usual operations, by observing human characters, and by marking present tendencies, he may form some plausible conjectures about the future; and an experienced politician, who is thoroughly acquainted with the circumstances, interests, and tempers both of his own community and of those who are his neighbours, will frequently anticipate events with a sagacity and success which bear some resemblance to direct prescience, and excites the astonishment of less penetrating minds. Still, however, he is limited to a kind of contact with present circumstances. That which he foresees must have some connexion with what he actually beholds, or some dependence on it; otherwise his inquiries are vain, and his conjectures idle and delusive; and even within those narrow limits, how often is his penetration baffled, and his wisdom deceived. The slightest intrusion of uncommon circumstances, the smallest possible deviation from rules, which cannot by any means be rendered exact, destroys the visionary chain which he has constructed, and exposes his ignorance to himself and others. The prescience of the most experienced politician, in short, bears a close resemblance to that of an experienced general or a skilful chess player.”

Prophecy in the sense of an unfulfilled prediction, has little or no meaning or weight apart from its fulfillment, and the demonstration that any prophecy has been fulfilled is an evidence that God is at work, for:

“To foresee and foretell future events is a miracle of which the testimony remains in itself. It is a miracle, because to foresee and foretell future events, to which no change of circumstances leads, no train of probabilities points, is as much beyond the ability of human agents, as to cure diseases with a word, or even to raise the dead, which may properly be termed miracles of power. That actions of the latter kind were ever performed can be proved, at a distant period, only by witnesses, against whose testimony cavils may be raised, or causes for doubt advanced: but the man, who reads a prophecy and perceives the corresponding event, is himself the witness of the miracle; he sees that thus it is, and that thus by human means it could not possibly have been. A prophecy yet unfulfilled is a miracle at present incomplete; and these, if numerous, may be considered as the seeds of future conviction, ready to grow up and bear their fruit, whenever the corresponding facts shall be exhibited in the theatre of the world. So admirably has this sort of evidence been contrived by the wisdom of God, that in proportion as the lapse of ages might seem to weaken the argument derived from miracles long since performed, that very lapse serves only to strengthen the argument derived from the completion of prophecy.”

The Prophecies of the Scripture are reducible to four heads:

- (1) Prophecies relating to Israel in particular.
- (2) Prophecies relating to the neighbouring nations.
- (3) Prophecies relating to the Messiah.
- (4) Prophecies given by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and His apostles.

Prophetic utterances concerning Israel begin with the call of Abraham, and are continued to Isaac and Jacob. These prophecies foretell that the posterity of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, shall possess the land of Canaan, and that though they should lose the enjoyment of this land for a time, owing to their sinfulness, yet their title to the land should never be alienated, but that in God's good time they should be gathered back and given possession of their land, there to continue in peaceful enjoyment to the end of time. The passages of Scriptures that contain these prophetic utterances are Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 14, 15, 15; xv. 18-21; xvii. 7, 8; Exod. iii. 8, 17; Deut. xxx. 1-5; Jer. xxx. 3. When the original prophecy was uttered, Abraham was an old man, without children, and had just left the land of his nativity to become a pilgrim in the land beyond the Euphrates unto which the Lord has led him. That land moreover was held by a number of warlike tribes, some of them being giants with "cities walled up to heaven", yet the book of Numbers (chapter xxi.), Deut. ii. and Josh. iii. onwards, reveal how exactly these prophecies began to be fulfilled, while the remainder of the O.T. reveals the fulfillment of the threat to scatter the children of Israel from their land. We now confidently await the fulfillment of the third feature—Israel's gathering, restoration and blessing. What has been fulfilled encourages us to believe that all will be fulfilled in God's own time.

When the days drew near for the prophecy of the captivity of the Jews to take place, the prophet Jeremiah foretold Nebuchadnezzar by name (Jer. xxvii. 3-7). For a composite prophecy, so written before the event as to produce the feeling of contradiction, one is referred to the double prophecy of Jeremiah and Ezekiel concerning the fate of Zedekiah. If we compare Jer. xxxiv. 2-7 with Ezek. xii. 13 we find that Zedekiah should "see the king of Babylon", yet he should "not see Babylon", that he should be "carried to Babylon", yet should die in peace and be buried after the manner of his ancestors, yet that he should die, nevertheless, at Babylon. The history of Zedekiah reveals a faithful fulfillment of all that was prophesied. He did see the king of Babylon, who ordered his eyes to be put out, he was brought to Babylon without seeing it, and that he died there (Jer. xxxiv. 4, 7; II Kings xxv. 6, 7). The only feature that is left unrecorded is that after his death Zedekiah was given an honourable burial, but in the absence of any word to the contrary this can be safely assumed.

Prophecies concerning the Nations, occupy a large portion of the prophetic scriptures. Tyre, Egypt, Babylon, Nineveh, Ethiopia, the successors of Nebuchadnezzar, namely, the Medes and Persians and the Greeks are named. To give details of these embracing prophecies is beyond our present scope. To mention them is for the moment sufficient for our purpose. So marvelously did the fulfillment agree with the prophecy, "that the celebrated infidel Porphyry, in the second century, could only evade the force of them by asserting, contrary to all evidence, that they were written long after the event".

Prophecies concerning the Messiah, however, cannot be treated in this fashion. They lie so near to the heart of truth, so close to the basis of all our hopes, that if they could be explained away we should be of all men most miserable. Let us tabulate some that are outstanding.

The place where Messiah was to be born, namely, Bethlehem, a little village among the thousands of Judah, was predicted by Micah the prophet (v. 2) 700 years before the event, which is as though someone in 1066 foretold the birth of an individual in some obscure village in England in the reign of George the Third!

The extraordinary character of this birth, namely, that the Messiah should be born of a virgin, was foretold by the prophet Isaiah (vii. 14; ix. 6, 7).

The extraordinary marvelous character of His death, is foretold by Isaiah, in that wonderful chapter, the fifty-third. Isaiah even goes so far as to foretell such details as:

“He made His grave with the wicked ones (plural), and with the rich one (singular) in His death” (liii. 9).

The death and resurrection of the Messiah were foretold with extraordinary exactness. The Psalms reveal that He would not see corruption (xvi. 10), that the instrument of His death should be crucifixion (xxii. 16) a mode of punishment unused among the Jews in David’s time; that He should sit on the right hand of God waiting until His foes be made His footstool (cx. 1), and that He should come again, His feet standing in the last day upon the Mount of Olives, the spot from which the N.T. records that He actually ascended (Zech. xiv.; Acts i.). Finally, for the present section, Daniel predicted the number of years that should intervene from the time indicated in Dan. ix. 25 to the coming of the Messiah the Prince Who should “be cut off and have nothing”, a prophecy which is a never-ending source of wonder to all who take the trouble to compute and examine chronology and history. Christ was born “in the fullness of time”.

The prophecies of the N.T. fall into two great groups. Those which were uttered by Christ concerning His own death and resurrection and which were immediately fulfilled, and those uttered by Christ and His apostles concerning the close of the age and the second coming of Christ, which prophecies necessarily await fulfillment, although the signs of the times, as predicted in I Tim. iv. and II Tim. iii., iv. are most certainly making themselves evident. The Saviour foretold His death, where it should take place, who would be instrumental in bringing it about, and what would precede it. He would be “killed” at “Jerusalem”, and suffer many things of “the elders, and chief priests and scribes” (Matt. xvi. 21). He specified what these “many things” would be. He would be delivered to the “Gentiles to mock, scourge and crucify” Him (Matt. xx. 18, 19). He also foretold His betrayal, indicated the traitor, and moreover, knew that all His disciples would forsake Him in the hour of His extremity (Matt. xx. 18; xxvi. 23, 31); and He even foretold that Peter would deny Him thrice before the cock crew twice (Mark xiv. 30). *In every case the prophecy was fulfilled to the letter.*

The Saviour just as explicitly foretold His resurrection. He would rise again “the third day” (Matt. xvi. 21), and that after He was risen He would go before the disciples into Galilee (Matt. xxvi. 32; xxviii. 16). The Lord foretold the descent of the Spirit and the enduement of the day of Pentecost (Luke xxiv. 49; Mark xvi. 17, 18), the destruction of Jerusalem with its temple (Mark xiii. 2; Luke xxi. 20-24). It would be a profitable exercise to trace out and tabulate the various expressions, such as: “That it might be fulfilled”, “That the Scripture might be fulfilled”, which are found in the four gospels, so that the close association of “promise and fulfillment” which characterizes the connexion between the Old Testament and the New might be appreciated for its true worth. There are twenty-eight such references where *pleroo* is used, beside other references and allusions. When all is placed in the balance that can be brought forth from the Scriptures concerning Prophecy and its fulfillment, the reader will possess an evidence for God and His Word, for Christ and His Redemption, that is overwhelming. Let us take courage. The prophecy that has been fulfilled is sufficient pledge to the believer of the prophecy which awaits fulfillment. “None shall want her mate” (Isa. xxxiv. 16).