

# 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 XXXIX.

1957 - 1958

The Berean Publishing Trust,  
52a, Wilson Street, London EC2A 2ER  
England

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

It is with sincere gratitude that we write this Foreword, as it completes the forty-ninth year of the *Berean Expositor*.

While the actual subject matter is still the work of the Editor, it has become increasingly evident that the expansion of our witness called for helpers in many departments.

In addition to the most valuable work done by our Honorary Secretary, Mr. George T. Foster, by our Publication Secretary, Mr. Leonard A. Canning, and by our Assistant Editor, Mr. Stuart Allen, willing helpers have come forward to check MSS, to read proofs, to type the MSS ready for print, to address envelopes, to keep stock and to do the numberless jobs that must be done behind the scenes without recognition, except in the knowledge that in so doing such are serving the Lord Christ.

As fellow-members “In the measure of every part”, every one according to “The measure of the gift of Christ” play their role as “Joints of supply” (Eph. iv. 1-16), and for this practical outworking of our high calling, all who value the testimony of the *Berean Expositor* must be thankful.

My fellow-Trustees commend this volume of Expository Truth both to the Lord and to His people.

Yours by grace,

CHARLES H. WELCH,  
STUART ALLEN

# INDEX

## EPHESIANS—

|  |    |
|--|----|
| The Fullness (i. 23)                           | 6  |
| Dead IN, or Dead TO (ii. 1)                    | 11 |
| “What is the depth?” (ii. 2, 3)                | 16 |
| “But God” (ii. 4)                              | 19 |
| “Quickened together”                           | 22 |
| Roused together (suneguei) and seated together | 25 |
| An exhibition of kindness in the ages to come  | 29 |
| The oblation of God (ii. 8-10)                 | 32 |
| “Not of works . . . unto good works”           | 35 |

## FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF GOD--

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Man formed of the dust, breathes the breath of life         | 40 |
| Genesis Three (1) The Serpent                               | 45 |
| Genesis Three (2) The Cherubim                              | 48 |
| Genesis Three (3) The Temptation                            | 51 |
| “He shall see His seed”                                     | 57 |
| Light on the purpose from Heb. ii.                          | 61 |
| The evident importance of the Seed in the unfolding purpose | 64 |

## FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--

|  |    |
|--|----|
| GALATIANS: The curse of the law (iii. 13)                          | 68 |
| The Galatian will (iii. 15, 16)                                    | 71 |
| The argument from the Galatian will applied (iii. 17-20)           | 74 |
| The super-added law (iii. 13-20)                                   | 77 |
| “Shut up unto the faith” (iii. 21-23)                              | 81 |
| Redemption and Adoption (iii. 24 - iv. 7)                          | 85 |
| The inexplicable return to “weak and beggarly elements” (iv. 8-12) | 90 |
| The travail of an apostle (iv. 12-20)                              | 93 |

## “GO YE AND LEARN WHAT THAT MEANETH” (Matt. ix. 13)--

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Revelation                                    | 97  |
| Translation                                   | 100 |
| Interpretation                                | 102 |
| What do we mean by “interpret”?               | 104 |
| Various systems of Interpretation examined    | 108 |
| Rule No.1. “Rightly Divide the Word of truth” | 111 |

## HEBREWS--

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| The Express Image        | 115 |
| The Word of His Power    | 118 |
| The Purification of sins | 121 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| IN GLORY--   |     |
| Col. iii. 4  | 125 |
| JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST, THE--                           |     |
| Preliminary Enquiry                                      | 128 |
| Chastening v. Condemnation                               | 130 |
| MEDITATIONS ON PSALM LI.--                               |     |
| The Prophetic character of the Psalmist's Experiences    | 134 |
| MILLENNIAL STUDIES--                                     |     |
| The Bottomless Pit and The Little Season                 | 136 |
| The Rest of the Dead                                     | 140 |
| The Nations and the Camp of the Saints                   | 146 |
| White, its usage in the Apocalypse                       | 151 |
| The Heavenly Jerusalem                                   | 155 |
| The Eve of the Millennium                                | 158 |
| The Lake of Fire, and the Millennium                     | 161 |
| The Converging Lines of Prophetic Truth (with diagram)   | 170 |
| The Thousand Generations                                 | 178 |
| RECKONING AND REALITY--                                  |     |
| The Fifth reckoning—"Raised with Christ"                 | 181 |
| The Sixth reckoning—"Made to sit together"               | 184 |
| The Seventh Step—Reality. "Manifested with Him in glory" | 189 |
| SPECIAL ARTICLES--                                       |     |
| Acts Thirteen or Acts Twenty-eight?                      | 193 |
| Egypt  | 214 |
| The Prophetic Earth                                      | 233 |

**p.180**

How shall we sing the Love that sought?  
Its breadth and length, its depth and height.  
Its fullness passes all our thought,  
As mid-day sun surpasses night.

What shall for us its length define?  
No measure can to this extend:  
The Love that died to make us thine  
Has no beginning and no end.

Its height no angel wing can soar,  
Far, far above all power and might;  
Yet such His grace, for us in store,  
To share the Holiest in the light.

## EPHESIANS.

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

### No.38. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).

#### The Fullness (i. 23).

pp. 1 - 6

The church which is the Body is also called “the fullness of Him that filleth all in all”. This title taken by itself is evidently one of supreme importance and dignity, but when taken in relation with the outworking of the purpose of the ages, it will be seen to have a deeper significance. The student who is acquainted with Dispensational Truth is also aware of the presence of “gaps” in the outworking of the Divine purpose. The Saviour’s recognition of this “gap” in Isa. lxi. is made evident when we read Luke iv. 16-21 and Luke xxi. 22. So when we read I Pet. i. 11 or the quotation of Joel ii. 28-32 in Acts ii., the presence of a gap or interval is made evident. The word translated “fullness” is the Greek *pleroma*, and its first occurrence in the N.T. places it in contrast with a “rent” or a “gap”:

“No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse” (Matt. ix. 16).

“No man also seweth a piece of new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse” (Mark ii. 21).

“No man putteth a piece of new cloth on an old; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was taken out of the new agreeth not with the old” (Luke v. 36).

The words that call for attention are: “that which is put in to fill up”; this is the translation of the Greek *pleroma* “fullness”. In contrast with this “fullness” is the word “rent” which in the Greek is *schisma*. Two words translated “new” are used: in Matt. ix. 16, and in Mark ii. 21 *agnaphos*, not yet filled, or dressed, from *gnapheus*, a fuller, and *kainos*, which is used in Luke v. 36, which means newly made. In place of “put into” or “put upon” used in Matt. ix. 16 and Luke v. 36, we find the word “to sew on” *epirrhapto* employed in Mark ii. 21. One other word is suggestive, the word translated “agree” in Luke v. 36. It is the Greek *symphoneo*. Now, as these terms will be referred to in the course of the following exposition, we will take the present opportunity of enlarging a little on their meaning and relationship here, and so prepare the way.

*Pleroma*. This word, derived from *pleroo* “to fill”, occurs seventeen times in the N.T. Two of these occurrences occur in Matthew, Mark as we have seen; the remaining fifteen occurrences are found in John’s Gospel and in Paul’s epistles. It is noteworthy that the word *pleroma* “fullness” is never used in the epistles of the Circumcision. When Peter referred to the problem that the “gap” suggested by the words “where is the

promise of His coming?" he referred his readers to the epistles of Paul, who, said he, deals with this matter of longsuffering and apparent postponement and speaks of these things (II Pet. iii. 15, 16). The word *pleroma* is used in the Septuagint some fifteen times. These we will record for the benefit of the reader who may not have access to that ancient translation. I Chron. xvi. 32: "let the sea roar and the fullness thereof." So, Psa. xcvi. 11; xcvi. 7; xxiv. 1 "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof", and with slight variations, Psa. l. 12; lxxxix. 11.

In several passages, the fullness, or "all that is therein" is set over against flood or famine, as Jer. viii. 16; xlii. 3; Ezek. xii. 19; xix. 7; and xxx. 12. Some of the words used in the context of these Septuagint references are too suggestive to be passed over without comment. Instead of "time of healing" we find "anxiety", the land "quaking", "deadly serpents" and a "distressed heart" (Jer. viii. 15-18). Again, in Jer. xlvii. 2 (xxix. 2 in the LXX) we have such words of prophetic and age time importance as "an overflowing flood" Greek *katakluzomai*, *kataklusmos* and variants, a word used with dispensational significance in II Pet. ii. 5 and iii. 6, and preserved in the English cataclysm, a word of similar import to that which we have translated "the overthrow" of the world. The bearing of II Pet. iii. on this "gap" in the outworking of the purpose of the ages, will be given an examination in this series.

In the context of the word "fullness" found in Ezek. xii. 19, we have such words as "scatter" *diaspero*, a word used in James i. 1 and in I Pet. i. 1 of the "dispersed" and "scattered" tribes of Israel, also the word "waste" which calls up such passages of prophetic import as Isa. xxxiv. 10, 11 and Jer. iv. 23-27 where the actual words employed in Gen. i. 2 are repeated. The *pleroma* or "fullness" is placed in direct contrast with desolation, waste, flood, fire and a condition that is without form and void. *Schisma*, the word translated "rent" in Matt. ix. 16, is from *schizo* which is used of the veil of the temple and of the rocks that were "rent" at the time of the Saviour's death and resurrection. Two words translated "new" have been mentioned. One *agnaphos* refers to the work of a "fuller", who smoothes a cloth by carding. The work of a fuller also includes the washing and scouring process in which fuller's earth or fuller's soap (Mal. iii. 2; Mark ix. 3) is employed. A piece of cloth thus treated loses its original harshness, and more readily yields to the cloth that has been more often washed. The whole purpose of the ages is set forth under the symbol of the work of a fuller, who by beating and by bleaching at length produces a material which is the acme of human attainment, for when the Scriptures would describe the excellent glory of the Lord, His garments are said to have been "exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth could white them" (Mark ix. 3).

So too, the effect upon Israel of the Second Coming is likened to "a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap" (Mal. iii. 2). It is this "fulled" cloth that makes the "fullness", although there is no etymological connexion between the *fuller* and the *fullness*. The other word translated "new" is *kainos*, and has the meaning of "fresh, as opposed to old", "new, different from the former" and as a compound the meaning "to renew". It is this word that is used when speaking of the new covenant, the new creation, the new man, and the new heaven and earth. We shall have to take this into account when we are

developing the meaning and purpose of the fullness. The only reason for lifting out the words translated “to sew” is the significant use of the word in the Septuagint version of Job xiv. 12 “till the heavens are unsewn”. The bearing of this upon the argument of II Pet. iii., the present firmament and the fullness will appear when we call to mind the passages which speak of the heavens as “curtains” or a “tent” as Isa. xl. 22. Finally, we have the word *sumphoneo* “to agree”. *Sumphonia* is translated “musick” in Luke xv. 25, and of course is the Greek original of our word “symphony”. In Eccles. vii. 15 the word is used with a rather different meaning from “agreement”. The Church of the One Body is the great outstanding anticipation of the goal of the ages. It is associated with Him, under Whose feet are *all things*, it is associated with a dispensation of the fullness of the seasons, when *all things* are to be summed up in Him, and it is itself called:

“The fullness of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23).

How are we to try to understand this statement? It falls into line with the last occurrence of *pleroma* in Colossians, and for that matter, in the N.T.:

“For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. ii. 9).

The first occurrence of *pleroma* in Ephesians, stands by itself (Eph. i. 10) the remainder form a group that expand the theme, thus:

- A | Eph. i. 22, 23. “The Church which is His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.”
- B | Eph. iii. 14-19. “The whole family in heaven and in earth . . . . that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith . . . . filled unto all the fullness of God.”
- C | Eph. iv. 8-13. “He ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things . . . . unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of the Christ.”
- B | Col. i. 16-20. “For by Him were all things created . . . . all things were created by Him and for Him . . . . He is the Head of the Body the church . . . . for it pleased the Father that in Him should all the fullness dwell . . . . to reconcile all things . . . . in earth and things in heaven.”
- A | 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.”

Here is a very complete conspectus of this mighty theme, point answering point with such precision, that no approach to one corresponding member can be undertaken without due consideration of the other. This, the reader will perceive, is fraught with immediate consequences. It forces a comparison between Eph. i. 22, 23 and Col. ii. 9, 10. The passage in Col. ii. 9 has been taken as one of the proof texts of the Deity of Christ. The doctrine of the Deity of Christ constitutes one of the four tenets of the trust of the Berean Forward Movement, yet we believe it to be a mistake to use Col. ii. 9 as a proof of that wondrous doctrine. The church of the One Body is “the fullness of Him that filleth all in all” but such a revelation does not justify the thought that the church is Divine. The

prayer of Eph. iii. is that the believer may be filled with all the fullness of God and if to be filled with all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, proves the Deity of Christ in Col. ii. 9, what does Eph. iii. 19 teach of the believer? Identical language, *pan to pleroma* “all the fullness”, is found in Eph. iii. 19, Col. i. 19 and ii. 9, and these passages cannot be separated and interpreted independently of each other. The “fullness” of Christ dwells “bodily” in the church, even as the “fullness” of the Godhead dwells “bodily” in Him. Philippians does not contain the word “fullness”, but it reveals the blessed condescension of the Lord that alone made the “fullness” possible, for the word is always used with a redemptive meaning. The words of Phil. ii. 7 “He made Himself of no reputation” are literally “*He emptied Himself*”. As our Mediator, He emptied Himself, so that as our Mediator He might become our fullness. The same thought underlies the words of Heb. i. and ii. “He was made a *little lower* than the angels”, and as a result He was “made so much *better* than the angels” (Heb. ii. 7; i. 4, 5).

There are moreover many contextual links that bind these references together as one whole. In Eph. i. 21-23 the stress is upon the Headship of Christ as the risen and ascended One, with all things under His feet, the Church which is His Body, being the fullness of Him Who in His turn filleth all in all. In Col. i. 15-20 the two creations are brought together, with Christ as “Firstborn” in each (Col. i. 15, 18), with Christ as pre-eminent in each (Col. i. 17, 18). Things in heaven and earth were His creation (Col. i. 16) and they are the objects of reconciliation (Col. i. 20). When we come to Col. ii. 4-23, we have left the positive revelation of truth, and have entered into the sphere of conflict with error. The complete structure of this passage has been set out on page 84 of Volume XXIII, but for our present purpose we will give the opening and closing members of this great correspondence.

R | a | 4-8-. Plausible speech. Philosophy (*philosophia*).  
     b | -8-. Traditions of men.  
     c | -8-. Rudiments of the world.  
 CORRECTIVE. | -8. Not after Christ. Fullness *pleroma*  
                   9, 10. Ye are filled full in Him. *pleroo*  
                   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*  
 R |       c | 20-22. Rudiments of the world.  
     b | 22. Teaching of men.  
     a | 23-. Wordy show of wisdom (*sophia*).  
 CORRECTIVE. | -23-. Not in any honour.  
                   -23. Filling of the flesh. *plesmone*

Whatever is intended by Col. ii. 9 “all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” is closely and intimately carried forward into verse ten, for the word translated “complete” is *pepleromenoi*, even as conversely, the title of the church as “the fullness” is carried upward to Christ, as the One Who is filling (*pleroumenon*) the all things in all. Col. ii. 4-23 combats the invasion of a vain and deceitful philosophy, supported by tradition and the rudiments of the world, but “not after Christ”, and later in the same argument, not only philosophies and traditions, but even Divinely appointed “new moons and sabbath days” are alike set aside as “shadow of things to come” because “the Body is

of Christ". The whole fullness, toward which every age and dispensation has pointed since the overthrow of the world, is at last seen to be Christ Himself. All types and shadows that once filled the gap caused by sin, are now seen to be but transient, or of value only as they point the way to Him, and then disappear.

He is Head, He is Pre-eminent, He is Creator and Redeemer, He is the Firstborn of all creation, and the Firstborn from the dead. He is the Beginning of the creation of God (Rev. iii. 14; Col. i. 18) the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, in deed and in fact "Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11) in the church of the One Body, as He will yet be in the whole redeemed universe. No more glorious position for the redeemed is conceivable than that revealed in Eph. i. 23. To be one of a kingdom of priests on the earth is a dignity so great, that O.T. prophets have piled imagery upon imagery in setting it forth. Yet when we come to the Bride of the Lamb, or the description of the heavenly Jerusalem, we realize how much more glorious is that calling than the highest calling on earth. What shall be said then of that company of the redeemed, blessed neither on earth nor in the New Jerusalem, blessed neither as a kingdom nor as a bride, but blessed "with Christ" where He now sits "far above all", blessed not only as the members of His Body which is dignity indeed, but actually destined to be "the fullness of Him", in Whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily!

It is evident from what we have discovered in the Word, that the term "fullness" is vital to the accomplishment of the Divine purpose, and there is one point more that must be considered before we close this article. Head and members, or Head and Body, are relative terms. The one cannot exist or function without the other. This we all recognize must be true of the members, but is it not also necessarily true of the Head? Christ, as HEAD, needs the complement of His Body, just as surely as the Church His Body needs the complement of the Head. In the words "the fullness of Him that filleth all in all" the words thus translated *to pleroma tou* "the fullness of Him" are cast in the form known as "the genitive of relation". Words ending in *ma* often have a passive significance. Chrysostom, in his commentary says:

"The fullness of the head is the body, and the fullness of the body is the head . . . . that is just as the head is filled (or fulfilled) by the body."

Beza says something very similar:

"However complete He is in Himself, yet *as Head* He is not complete without His Body."  
*Pleromenou* "that filleth" is not passive but middle . . . . to fill up or complete for Himself."

The very fact that God has a goal, and is moving toward that goal, implies that this relationship of the redeemed with the Redeemer is essential to the glorious achievement of the ages. God is moving from the status of God Who is Creator, to God Who is the Father, and the title Father is itself relative, it necessitates a family. While therefore the redeemed are nothing in themselves, they are precious by reason of His gracious purpose, and their place through grace in it.

For an extended exposition of this subject the reader is referred to the Alphabetical Analysis, article, THE PLEROMA, which has a specially designed chart to illustrate the exposition.

### **No.39. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).**

#### **Dead IN, or Dead TO? (ii. 1).**

**pp. 21 - 26**

The first half of this section is taken up with the exceeding exaltation of Christ seated at the right hand of God, seated in the heavenlies and seated far above every conceivable authority. We do well to pause with worshipping wonder as we glory in the fact that “He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high” (Isa. lii. 13). We shall lose the real import of this passage, however, even as we shall miss the import of Isa. lii. 13 if we leave the Lord in isolated exaltation. Isa. liii. provides the sequel “Therefore will I divide Him a portion with the great, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong” (Isa. liii. 12). “He shall divide the spoil.” Some of the redeemed therefore are to share this high glory, and that is exactly the reason for the revelation of Eph. i. 20-23. The whole section is an exposition of “His power to usward who believe”. The Saviour’s glory now at the right hand of God, is the glory of the Mediator and Redeemer. He had a glory that antedates time, and He Himself distinguishes between that glory which is His intrinsically and which *cannot be shared*, with that glory which He has received as Mediator and Head, which He intends most certainly to share with the redeemed:

“And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was” (John xvii. 5).

That is one aspect of the subject. Here is the other:

“The glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one” (John xvii. 22).

The wondrous goal “that they may be one” is reflected in the title of the church “the fullness of Him”.

We return then from the contemplation of the high glory of Eph. i. 22, 23 to realize with reverence and awe, that after all this, glory is a part of our high calling by grace, and we can perhaps the better appreciate the translation favoured by many, of Eph. ii. 1 “Even you”. Reading the A.V., the grace and glory of this relationship between the Head and the members of the Body, between the Redeemer and the redeemed, is interrupted by the statement “who were dead in trespasses and sins”, but we must never allow ourselves to “prefer” a reading simply because it accords with our creed. Most readers of the *Berean Expositor* believe that “all have sinned and come short of the glory of God” and the epistle to the Romans leaves us in no doubt on that dread score.

We do not need to hold on to the A.V. translation here in the fear that a proof text for universal sinfulness will be lost. We desire the truth, and we are sure that truth is one, and no disagreement is possible between its parts or statements. When we read the epistle to the Romans we are reading an epistle that specifically sets out to deal with the question of sin. Trespass, offence, sin and sins meet us in that epistle continually, occurring all told forty-nine times. In Ephesians we meet with “sins” once (Eph. i. 7) and trespasses twice (Eph. ii. 1 and 5). Romans is the foundation, Ephesians the temple erected on it, and things that are essential to a foundation, may be intruders in the finished building. We believe instead of harking back to our condition before salvation Paul is revealing our state by grace, when he penned Eph. ii. 1. Here is a transcription of the words of the original:

*Kai humas ontas nekrous tois paraptomasin kai tais hamartiais.*

First let us observe that there is no word “in” (*en*) in the original, that is supplied by the translators because of the presence of the dative case. There is no reticence noticeable elsewhere 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 “in”, “among”, “through”, “at”, “by”, “whereas” and “thereby”. The fact that Paul uses this preposition so frequently, when set over against its absence from Eph. ii. 1 and 5 is important. When the doctrine, being dead IN sins is being stated in Scripture the preposition *en* is used (John viii. 21, 24 and I Cor. xv. 17). The only warrant for supplying a preposition where it is not actually used is the presence of the dative case, and this is often done by adding “to” or “at” and in some cases by “in”. The dative case is the “giving” case, for when we say “give me the book” we really mean “give TO me the book”. This is the one employed in Eph. ii. 1. We are, however, not left to our own devices here, there is complete evidence in the Apostle’s own writing to show that he was telling the Ephesian believers that they were dead TO trespasses and sins, not dead IN them. Here are some examples of the usage of the dative case in connection with death and sin:

“We that are dead TO sin” (Rom. vi. 2).  
“He died UNTO sin” (Rom. vi. 10).  
“Dead indeed UNTO sin” (Rom. vi. 11).  
“Dead TO the law” (Gal. ii. 19).  
“Dead TO sins” (I Pet. ii. 24).

To the list we add Eph. ii. 1, reading:

“Dead TO trespasses and sins.”

Let us, for the sake of the truth, endure the horror that the following translations must inspire in any grace-taught heart. If the A.V. of Eph. ii. 1 be accepted as the truth, then let us read:

“How shall we that are DEAD IN SIN, live any longer therein.”

Is there sense, let alone doctrinal truth, in such a rendering? NO. Again shall we read:

“For in that He died, He died IN SIN once.”

We cannot conceive of anything more shocking than such a statement, and we are sure every reader repudiates with horror.

“Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed IN SIN.”

Alas, we have no need for such reckoning, our natural condition is most evident but *how* can the believer, looking at His Lord, say “likewise I will reckon myself to be dead IN SIN”. Surely the only translation that is true is as the A.V. gives it. The context of Peter’s reference to “being dead to sins” illuminates the expression. He tells us that Christ’s sufferings leave us a “copy” (*hupogrammos*, a copy set for a pupil) with the object that he may “follow His steps”, “that we being dead TO sins, should live unto righteousness” (I Pet. ii. 21-24). When “example” is introduced into the Scripture we are not dealing with “sin” but “sins”. We are never exhorted to put off *the old man*, what the Scripture says is put off the old man *with his deeds* or as regards our *former conversation*. So we return to Eph. ii. 1 not only convinced that the Apostle is emphasizing the most gracious fact that the members of the church of the One Body, *died to sin*, but died to sins, “trespasses and sins” to be exact. Trespass (*paraptoma*), “a falling when one should have stood upright, a mishap; hence a falling from right and duty, the particular and special act of sin from ignorance, inadvertence or negligence; sin rashly committed by one unwilling to do an injury” (Dr. Bullinger, *Lexicon*).

How few of us can say that we have never sinned rashly even thou “unwilling to do an injury”? Well, to all this, in Christ we have died. The A.V. reads “who *were* dead”, the Greek reads *humas ontas* “you being”, using the present participle. The Apostle had the choice of four terms to express “being dead”. He could have used the verb *thnesko* as in Acts xxv. 19, or *apothnesko* as in Col. ii. 20 and Heb. xi. 4, or *nekroo* as in Rom. iv. 19. He uses none of these but the present participle “being” and the word *nekros*, “a dead person”, you being dead is the literal and true rendering of Eph. ii. 1. Eph. ii. 1 reads in the A.V. “were” dead, which of course is the past tense of the verb. The original reads *ontas*, the present participle of the verb *eimi*, and should be translated “being”. Now obviously the Apostle could not be represented as saying “And you BEING dead IN sins” when addressing saints, so we see that the one error, namely the addition of the preposition “in” led to another, the substitution of “were” for “being”. Two wrongs, however, do not make a right, and nothing can justify robbing the believer of his present position by grace.

A parallel passage is Col. ii. 13. 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. The whole context is against the idea that the state by nature is in view; it is his state by grace.

“And you being dead (here the A.V. translates *ontas* correctly) to trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses” (Col. ii. 13).

At a Bible study held some years ago, the name of the Editor of *The Berean Expositor* was being severely condemned for advocating this translation, when one reader rose and said, "I believe a number of those present possess and use 'Newbury's Bible'. Would anyone kindly read the note appended to Eph. ii. 1 in that valuable edition?" The note in Newbury reads "being-dead" and "*or to-the*" and the sign of the present participle an inverted T is affixed to the words "being-dead". We add this note for the benefit of any who are fearful of what may prove to be a private interpretation.

To resume, instead of Paul turning from the heights of heavenly places, and the glorious calling of the church, to remind his readers that they were once dead in sins like the rest of the human race, he reminds them of the miracle of grace that has happened, that in Christ they were at the moment of writing not only dead TO sin as a root (this is the foundation doctrine of Rom. vi.), but TO sins as the every day fruit, a line of teaching to which he returns in Eph. iv. 22-25 where he speaks of the putting off concerning the former conversation, the old man, and the putting on of the new man.

Shorn of all explanatory additions, Eph. ii. 1-5 reads "Even you . . . . hath He quickened together with Christ", but the necessary parenthesis holds up the actual statement, so that we may perceive what a need there was for this quickening, and how it fulfilled the reference to the power to usward who believe, for we are now to read of a mighty spiritual power in direct antagonism to the working of grace. The Apostle's primary intention is to place in correspondence with the raising and seating of Christ, the raising and seating together of the believer, but as in Eph. iii. 1 and 14 the main argument is held up while a most enlightening parenthesis explains the nature of the dispensation of the Mystery, so here, in Eph. ii. 1-4, room must be provided in our examination for a digression full of teaching.

Taking the hint from verse 1 as compared with verse 5 where the theme is resumed, we see that the section before us falls into the following pattern:

- A | 1. Dead ones to sins.
- B | 2, 3. What was involved:
  - A walk . . . this world.
  - An energy . . . the prince of the power of the air.
  - A conversation . . . the wills of the flesh.
- C | 4. Rich.
- A | 5. Dead ones to sins.
- B | 5, 6. What is involved:
  - A quickening together.
  - A raising together.
  - A seating together.
- C | 7. Exceeding riches.

Before these believers died to trespasses and sins, they had walked according to the course of this world. "Walk" is a term which belongs to practical truth. It is the outward

expression of inward life, as Shakespeare says, “the apparel oft proclaims the man”, and in the practical section the words “put off” and “put on” literally refer to clothing. Eph. ii. 2 and 10 contrast the walk of the old and of the new, but it is left to chapters iv.-vi. to develop this practical aspect, as it does in iv. 1, 17; v. 2, 8 and 15. Here, in Eph. ii. the walk that characterized the believer’s past was “according to the course of this world”. The word translated “course” here is *aion*, literally an age, but not to be limited merely to lapse of time, the word carries with it something of character, even as we say today “the golden age”, “the age of innocence”. This meaning the A.V. has attempted to give by the rendering “course”. Weymouth translates the passage freely thus:

“Your offences and sins which were once habitual to you while you walked in the ways of the world.”

In other contexts, the Apostle speaks of “the rudiments of the world” in much the same way. It is the most natural thing “to walk according to the course of the world” for otherwise, there would be a mad scramble, a traffic jam, and progress would be impossible. Yet in spite of this “sweet reasonableness”, the fact remains that this world is at present in a state of enmity with God, and to walk in harmony with its ends and aims is contrary to the will of God and to the design of His great salvation. After having said so far, the Apostle draws aside a veil, and shows that what on the surface appear to be the free actions of free agents, are many times the result of a spiritual power that is using the desires of men to accomplish his own ends. This spiritual power is named “The prince of the power of the air”. We have already noted the fact that the “principalities” of Eph. i. 21 is the translation of the Greek *arche*. We now note that the word “prince” translates the Greek word *archon*. This is a verbal noun, derived from *archo*, translated usually “to begin” but on two occasions “to reign over” or “to rule over” (Rom. xv. 12; Mark x. 42).

The English word “prince” is from the Latin *princeps* “taking the first place”, and only in a secondary sense it is used of the son of a sovereign. The word *archon* is used of the rulers of the Jews (Matt. ix. 18), the prince of the devils (Matt. ix. 34), and the princes of the Gentiles (Matt. xx. 25) in one Gospel. In John’s Gospel, the title “the prince of this world” is found three times, and “the prince of the power of the air” is not removed from “this world” as a reference to Eph. vi. 12 will show. The word translated “power” in this title is not *dunamis*, but *exousia*, a word already found in Eph. i. 21. The fact that *arche* and *exousia* (principalities and powers) have a prince (*archon*) who exercised power (*exousia*) shows that there is a definite link between the evil powers that work their way in this world, with the principalities and powers beneath the feet of the ascended Lord. This prince is said to be “the prince of the power, or authority, of the air”. Why “the air”? Today, our first thought when we speak of the “air” is that gaseous compound of nitrogen, oxygen and carbon that lies next to the surface of the earth, usually styled the atmosphere. The Ancients, however, had no such knowledge. To them the “air” was the lower, even as the “ether” was the upper portion of the atmosphere, and the air often became synonymous with mist, gloom and darkness. The LXX uses the word *aer* but twice, namely in II Sam. xxii. 12 and in the parallel passage in Psa. xviii.:

“He made darkness pavilions round about Him, dark waters, and thick cloud of the skies.”

The A.V. uses the English word “air” twenty-one times to translate the Hebrew *shamayim* “heaven” when that word is associated with “fowls” or “birds”, showing that the heavens extended from the very surface of the earth to the heights above. When we remember the association which the Greek word had with the lower regions of the atmosphere, and so with gloom and darkness, the fact that this Prince exercises his authority in the air, and that his spiritual servants are called “the rulers of the darkness of this world” show something of the nature of his rule. Moreover, in the Revelation when the seventh angel poured out his vial, he poured it “into the air”, and so important is this, that we read “and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, it is done” (Rev. xvi. 17).

Finally, when the Lord descends from heaven with a shout and with the voice of the archangel, His redeemed people meet Him “in the air”, a term evidently conveying far more than may at first sight have been believed. They meet their Lord in that region, that once was ruled and invested by the powers of darkness, and as the enemy of truth is dislodged and comes down to earth, so the believer is translated to the vacated sphere in triumph. We must reserve consideration as to the way in which this prince of darkness works his will among the children of men, for our next study.

#### **No.40. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).**

**“What is the depth?” (ii. 2, 3).**

**pp. 61 - 63**

In our last study we learned that those who were called and chosen to the high glory of the church which is the fullness of Him that filleth all in all, were dead TO trespasses and sins, not, as the A.V. puts it, dead IN trespasses and sins. Although this new rendering makes Eph. ii. 1 speak of a blessed state by grace rather than a wretched state by nature, it is obvious that no unfallen being would ever be under the necessity to die TO sins. Consequently we learn in the succeeding verses, that two great forces were at work, combining together to enthrall and condemn the children of men. The first is that “the prince of the power of the air” energizes such, and the second is that this energizing runs not contrary, but parallel with their own desires and intentions. All such are so clearly responsible, that they are described as “sons of disobedience” and “children of wrath”.

We have already examined the title “the prince of the power of the air” and must now turn our attention to the way he works, and the ground that the natural man gives him. He is called “the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience”. There is an evident correspondence intended by the Holy Spirit. The word “worketh in” is the Greek *energeo*, a word we have already met both as verb and noun in Eph. i. 19, 20 “working” and “which He wrought in”. Two spiritual activities are here revealed. The one “to usward” who believe, the other in the children of disobedience. In Eph. v. 6 the

A.V. puts in the margin against the word “disobedience” the word “unbelief” and in Rom. xv. 31 “do not believe” in the text is altered to “are disobedient” in the margin. There is only one occasion where a word is translated “disobedient” which in the original actually means insubordinate or refractory, namely I Tim. i. 9; in every other case the words disobedience and disobedient translate either *apeitheo* and its derivatives, “unwilling to be persuaded”, “refusing to believe” or *parakoe* “to hear aside, amiss”. Those who were thus energized by the prince of the power of the air, must therefore have had some relation in the first place with faith, and by their reaction, and refusal, laid themselves open to his wiles and deceits.

II Thess. ii. 10-12 has a terrible thing to say about those who “received not the love of the truth”; they become the subject of a strong delusion, and believe “the lie”. The A.V. says that those thus energized were “children of disobedience”. The truer translation reads “sons of disobedience” and employs a Hebraism that is well known. The same figure is found at the close of a list of dreadful immoralities in Eph. v. 6 where once again “wrath” is said to come upon them. We read elsewhere of “sons of this world” Luke xvi. 8; “sons of light” xvi. 8; and “sons of day” in I Thess. v. 5.

“Ye walked . . . . we all had our conversation.” The Apostle and those who were with him, were no different from, nor better than those just mentioned. They were “children of wrath” as the rest. The keys upon which the devil plays are said to be “the lusts of the flesh” and the response made by the individual concerned “fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind”. Without “desire” man would remain inactive and apathetic. Eph. ii. 3 is the only passage in the A.V. where the Greek word *thelema* is translated “desire”, usually *thelema* is translated “will” as in Eph. i. 1, 5, 9, 11; v. 17; vi. 6. The word however does not convey the idea of determination so much as desire or wish. The words translated “lust” *epithumia* and the word translated “desire” *thelema* are in themselves colourless. While “the lusts of the flesh” are practically always evil, the words *epithumia* and *epithumeo* are used in a good sense in several places. For examples, in Matt. xiii. 17 the Lord told His disciples that many prophets and righteous men “desired” to see the things which they saw. It is used of the Lord Himself in His great desire to eat the Passover with His disciples (Luke xxii. 15), and of Paul’s “desire” to depart (Phil. i. 23). It was because “the flesh” had become the instrument of sin in which no good thing lived, that to follow its desires was but to put oneself at the mercy of the Prince of the power of the air. Such, said the Apostle, were “by nature children of wrath, as the rest”.

The use of this word “nature” has caused a great deal of heart searching on the part of teachers and preachers. *Phusis*, the word so translated, occurs in the N.T. thirteen times, and apart from Eph. ii. 3 it is innocuous. When Paul said that certain practices were “against nature” (Rom. i. 26), and when he said to the Corinthians “doth not even nature itself teach you?” (I Cor. xi. 14), the word is used of something that is right and proper. The selfsame word is used of the “Divine nature” (II Pet. i. 4). We must not confuse this with the word *psuchikos* (I Cor. xv. 44, 46), which refers to the “soul” as contrasted with the “spirit”. Those who were “Jews by nature” (Gal. ii. 15), or those who were “uncircumcision by nature” (Rom. ii. 27), were not esteemed to be wrong because they

were thus Jews and Gentiles. Yet here in Eph. ii. 3 “those who were by nature children of wrath even as others, or the rest”, will not fit into this category. To discover, as some have, an answer to the problem by saying the “ye” of verse two refers to the Gentiles and the “we” of verse three to the Jews, does not alter the fact that the Jews as well as the Gentiles were “by nature” children of wrath. Josephus in his *Antiquities*, says of David “but David fell into a very grievous sin, though he was otherwise *naturally* a righteous and religious man” (Ant. 7:7,1). The laboured comment of Barnes in his commentary, is a testimony both to his extreme sensitiveness to the thorny points of the problem, his great reluctance to admit what is known as the depravity of our nature, yet his conviction at the close, seems worth repeating here:

“*And were by nature.*” By birth, or before we were converted. By conversion and adoption they became the children of God; before that, they were all the children of wrath. This is, I think, the fair meaning of this important declaration. It does not affirm *when* they became to be such, or that they were such as soon as they were born, or that they were such before they became moral agents, or that they became such in virtue of their connexion with Adam—whatever may be the truth on these points; but it affirms that before they were renewed, they were the children of wrath. So far as *this* text is concerned, this might have been true at their very birth; but it does not directly and certainly prove that. It proves that at no time before their conversion were they the children of God, but that their whole condition before that was one of exposure to wrath. Comp. Rom.2:14,27; 1Cor.11:14; Gal.2:15. Some men are born Jews, and some heathen; some free, and some slaves; some white, and some black; some are born to poverty, and some to wealth; some are the children of kings, and some of beggars; but, whatever their rank or condition, they are born exposed to wrath, or in a situation that would render them liable to wrath. But *why* this is the Apostle does not say. Whether for their own sins, or for the sins of another; whether by a corrupted soul, or by imputed guilt; whether they act as moral agents as soon as born, or at a certain period of childhood, Paul does not say. *The children of wrath*, exposed to wrath, or liable to wrath. They did not by nature inherit holiness; they inherited that which would subject them to wrath. The meaning has been well expressed by Doddridge, who refers it “to the original apostasy and corruption, in consequence of which men do, according to the course of nature, fall early into personal guilt, and so become obnoxious to the Divine displeasure. Many modern expositors have supposed that this has no reference to any original tendency of our fallen nature to sin, or to native corruption, but that it refers to the *habit* of sin, or to the fact of their having been the slaves of appetite and passion. I admit that the direct and immediate sense of the passage is, that they were, when without the gospel, and before they were renewed, the children of wrath; but still the fair interpretation is, that they were born to that state, and that that condition was the regular result of their native depravity; and I do not know a more strong or positive declaration that can be made to show that men are by nature destitute of holiness, and exposed to perdition.

The term “by nature” here, must therefore refer to what man had become. Sin and death had so invaded his nature as to distort his reason, give the reins over to the flesh, and make him a slave to his own desires, so that he became an easy prey to the great deceiver. Any other explanation of “by nature” here has the appearance of special pleading, and goes against the obvious meaning of the Apostle. All this however but leads us to the great thought of this section, the fact that the believer is associated with Christ in His high exaltation. To look back to the depths from which we have been called, is salutary. We will walk humbly, for all here is of grace. The change is introduced in Eph. iii. 4 with the words “But God”, a triumphant interference of Omnipotent Love. To this we must devote our attention in the articles that follow.

**No.41. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).**

**“But God” (ii. 4).**

**pp. 101 - 103**

Although we may have made an advance, and learned an essential truth by recognizing that Eph. ii. 1 does not refer to our state “by nature” dead *in* sins, but our state by grace “dead *to* sins”, we shall seriously miss our way both in Eph. ii. and Rom. vi. which provides the doctrinal basis, if we stress this death to sin as an end in itself. The goal is life, “that we might live unto God”.

“What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? Let it not be so. How shall we that are dead to sin, LIVE ANY LONGER THEREIN? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we also should WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also IN THE LIKENESS OF HIS RESURRECTION . . . . Now if we died with Christ, we believe that WE SHALL ALSO LIVE WITH HIM . . . . For in that He died, He died unto sin once: BUT IN THAT HE LIVETH, HE LIVETH UNTO GOD. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, BUT ALIVE UNTO GOD THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD” (Rom. vi. 1-11).

In Gal. ii. 20 Paul not only said that he had been crucified with Christ, but he added “nevertheless I live”. And so we come to Eph. ii. 4, 5 where the word wrongly supplied in verse one, is at length recorded “quickenened”. Eph. ii. is subdivided by the notes of time indicated by the word “in time past” and “at that time” (Eph. ii. 2, 11, 12). The relationship of these time periods can be seen by the following set-out of the subject matter:

- A | DOCTRINE |
  - a | 1-3. Once. Walk. World. Flesh.
  - b | 4. But God. Mercy. Love.
  - c | 5-10. Made Alive together.
    - Raised together.
    - Seated together.
- A | DISPENSATION |
  - a | 11, 12. Once. Gentiles. In flesh. In world.
  - b | 13-18. But now. Nigh. One.
  - c | 19-22. Citizens together.
    - Framed together.
    - Builded together.

“But God.” At times the interposition of grammatical and exegetical features may appear to be an intrusion where worship seems called for rather than exposition. However, the truth has been channeled to us through words and sentences, and their

humble ministry is of first importance to us all. "But" is a word that should not be lightly passed over. It is "a disjunctive conjunction" which at first sounds like a contradiction in terms. "It is a conjunction in which the second sentence or clause is in opposition to the one preceding it, and arrests an inference which that first sentence or clause would else have suggested" (Bain). The close of the last sentence was "children of wrath, even as others". The word "but" does indeed most blessedly "arrest an inference", for without God and His grace, the only inference that we could draw from this state of things would be gloomy in the extreme. An adversative conjunction, however, is of itself of little value, and of no point. The glory of the change that is here manifested is only to be discovered when we say "But God". The structure already given, shows that in verse thirteen the same break is made with the words "but now". In the one it is the intervention of God, Who is rich in mercy, in the other it is the intervention of the person and work of Christ. The original instead of saying "God Who is rich" says *ho de theos plousios on*, using a participial clause "God being rich". This gives the ground of all that follows.

Instead of looking upon us in our sinful state with loathing, He looked upon us in compassion and mercy. Mercy looks upon wretchedness, grace upon unworthiness. Here mercy is to the fore, rather than guilt is evidently uppermost in Eph. ii. 2, 3. *Eleos* mercy, gives us *eleinos* "miserable" (I Cor. xv. 19; Rev. iii. 17) and must be distinguished from the word used by the Publican when he cried "God *be merciful* to me a sinner" for there the word is *hilaskomai*, a word implying atonement. If we take the epistle to the Romans as the repository of fundamental doctrine, we shall discover that the word "mercy" does not enter into the teaching of Rom. i.-viii. It is found in Rom. ix., xi., xii. and xv., and especially in connexion with the dispensational position.

So we discover that even though the first part of Eph. ii. is largely doctrinal (sins, death, wrath, salvation, grace, faith, works), and the second half largely dispensational (uncircumcision, distance, aliens, strangers, made nigh, access), yet the whole of the doctrine of Ephesians is an instrument which leads to the supernal glory of heavenly places, and so the dispensational word "mercy" comes early in the record here. God has riches of *grace* where redemption is in view (Eph. i. 7), and riches of *glory* where the inheritance is in view (Eph. i. 18), and exceeding riches of *grace*, when the ages to come are in view (Eph. ii. 7) but here, in the riches of His *mercy*, He stoops to lift the wretched sons of disobedience and children of wrath to the highest place that glory affords! This rich mercy originates not in *our* misery, neither does it arise out of any covenant with our "fathers", it is "For His great love wherewith He loved us". The word *agape* "love" occurs ten times in Ephesians, six of these references being used of the believer's love manifested to the saints (Eph. i. 15; iv. 2, 15, 16; v. 2; vi. 23). The phrase "in love" occurs six times also, being used of God (Eph. i. 4) and of the believer (Eph. iii. 17; iv. 2, 15, 16 and v. 2).

Reverting to Romans again for a comparison, we discover that the Apostle could traverse the whole story of redemption in Rom. i.-iv., without mentioning the love of God once, this being reserved for Rom. v. 1, where he can say:

"Therefore being justified by faith . . . . the love of God is shed abroad."

Again, we read right through the gospel of Matthew, without reading once that God loved the sinner or the saint. The same is true of Mark and Luke, unless we include the words of Mark x. 21 “Jesus beholding him loved him”. We must traverse the four gospels up to John iii. 16 before we come to the first reference to the love of God to man. The fact therefore that so early in Ephesians, i. 4, we read of the love of God is all the more remarkable, and further to realize that that love was in operation ages before we came into existence makes it even more wonderful. The love of God operating “before the foundation of the world” (Eph. i. 4) prompted His choice of us in Christ, this same love, in time, moves Him in great mercy to quicken us (Eph. ii. 5), and sets before us an endless yet ravishing quest, namely “to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge” (Eph. iii. 19). If Paul, writing his triumphant conclusion to Rom. viii., could say:

“I am persuaded . . . . nor principalities nor powers . . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom. viii. 38, 39),

how much more we, whose destined sphere of glory is “far above all principality and power”, can rejoice in this unchanging everlasting love.

We come back again to Eph. ii. 4. Because of the love that God had towards us, manifesting itself in His choice before the foundation of the world, persisting in spite of the advent of sin and death, enduring even though the destined heirs of glory had become “children of wrath” even as others, loving so much as to go to the extreme of the death of the cross on their account, this love and rich mercy are seen in this passage to issue in life, life from the dead, “He hath quickened us . . . . raised us”. Eph. ii. 5 resumes after the parenthesis, but with one slight difference *kai humas* “And you”: *kai hemas* “And we”. It is a false interpretation that makes the pronoun “you” refer exclusively to the Gentile and the “we” exclusively to the Jewish member of the body. When the Apostle says “we” he speaks of both Jew and Gentile together, one in common need, one in a common salvation, one in glory. If this should be doubted the experiment should be made by the reader, segregating all that is said of “us” and “we” from all that is said of “you”. It will be found to yield no intelligible result and is artificial in the extreme. What is true of “you” (Eph. ii. 1) is true of “us” (Eph. ii. 5) for “the both” and “the twain” of later verses are already in view.

## No.42. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).

### “Quickened together.”

pp. 121 - 124

The introduction of the italicized words “*hath He quickened*” into Eph. ii. 1 may at first seem harmless enough, but when we arrive at verse five and read “hath quickened us together with Christ”, we perceive that the omission of the words “together with Christ” is serious—indeed fatal to the understanding of the teaching awaiting us. The quickening, the raising and the seating, now to be described, find their power and their glory in the fact that they are “together with Christ”, and we must school ourselves so that we do not slip into speaking of them apart from this great fellowship and gracious oneness “with Christ”.

*Suzoopoieo* is of rare occurrence, being found only in Eph. ii. 5 and Col. ii. 13. *It is exclusive to the teaching of the Mystery.* Elsewhere we read *zooipoieo* “to quicken, or make alive” but without the preposition *sun* “together with”. This great doctrine is built upon the foundation already laid in Paul’s earlier ministry, where the word translated “quicken” is found seven times in the epistles written before Acts xxviii., and once after. Abraham, when he believed the promise recorded in Gen. xv., did not simply believe “God”, he believed “God that quickeneth the dead” (Rom. iv. 17). This is the faith that justifies.

This “quicken” is also related to actual and physical resurrection as I Cor. xv. 22, 36 and 45 will show. While literal and future resurrection will be indeed “a making alive”, the believer is able by grace to anticipate that day, for He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His spirit that dwelleth in you (Rom. viii. 11). This great blessing belongs to gospel grace, the law could neither provide righteousness nor life (Gal. iii. 21; II Cor. iii. 6). If a number of believers were asked to complete the series which commences with “crucified with Christ”, “dying with Christ”, “buried with Christ”, the majority would continue “raised with Christ”, omitting the intervening and present blessing “quickened with Christ”. The seven associations of the believer with his Lord are as follows:

- A | The Cross. Crucified with Christ.
- B | The Death. Dead with Christ. The past reckoned.
- C | The Burial. Buried with Christ.
- D | *The present experience, quickened with Christ.*
- C | The Resurrection. Raised with Christ.
- B | The Ascension. Seated with Christ. The future anticipation.
- A | The Glory. Manifested with Christ.

If now we turn to the passages that supply these “texts” we shall find that in most of them “life”, “living unto God” or “living in the flesh”, is in the context. “I am crucified with Christ” wrote the Apostle to the Galatians, but these words are immediately

followed by “nevertheless I live” (Gal. ii. 20). “If we be dead with Christ” found in Rom. vi. 8 is immediately followed by “we believe that we shall also live with Him”. The statements of Rom. vi. 3-5 “ye . . . . were baptized into His death”, “buried with Him by baptism into death”, “the likeness of His death”, are followed at once by “the likeness of His resurrection”.

Not only so, but if we retrace our steps and return again to Gal. ii., we shall find the present “quickenings” there too. Paul does not say “I have been crucified with Christ, nevertheless I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the latter days I shall live again in resurrection”, he says “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”. So, in Rom. vi., future and literal resurrection is anticipated by a “walk in newness of life” and “the likeness of His resurrection”, and we are enjoined to reckon ourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but ALIVE UNTO GOD through Jesus Christ our Lord. This present “quickenings” enables us to shake off the dominion of sin (Rom. vi. 14); the power of the “old man” (Rom. vi. 6), and also enables us not only to rise and walk in newness of life, but to serve in newness of spirit (Rom. vii. 6).

Let us tarry a little while we ponder some of these present anticipations of resurrection life. We have already referred to Gal. ii. 20, we must refer to it again. The Apostle there says that even though he had been “crucified with Christ” nevertheless he lived. It will be evident to every reader that Paul was not literally and physically crucified with Christ, but he was “reckoned” to have died with Him, and enjoined the believer to take his stand also: “likewise reckon ye also yourselves . . . . dead . . . . alive” (Rom. vi. 11). Paul lived by “reckoning” as God reckoned, standing where grace had placed him, realizing that in this position and in this position only was life and victory.

“Yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.” How are we to understand this? If we take the passage to extremes, it will mean that Paul as Paul had been obliterated, that he was indeed non-existent. If that be the teaching, then Paul was not saved; he had been destroyed. Paul could not look forward to receiving a crown of righteousness, for he had not kept the faith, or finished the course; Christ had taken his place and Paul no longer counted as an individual. The use of the word *ego* “not I” finds illustration and explanation in Rom. vii.:

“I was alive without the law once . . . . sin revived, and I died . . . . it slew me . . . . I am carnal, sold under sin; for that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I . . . . now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me . . . . so then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin” (Rom. vii. 9-25).

Here is a complicated argument, and a double use of the *ego*. The *ego* evidently can be dominated by sin, having its seat of operation in the flesh, which term embraces both “the members” and “the mind” (Rom. vii. 23 and viii. 7). Paul however has been redeemed, and he now sees the war that is going on in his members is waged against the law of his mind, and that with the mind he can now serve God. He now, as it were sides with God, and speaks of the new man as “I myself”. What Paul teaches in Gal. ii. 20 is

not that his body was tenantless, or that he had become a nonentity, but that he had a new master, Christ, now taking the place previously occupied by sin, “the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death” (Rom. viii. 2). “We have the mind of Christ” (I Cor. ii. 16). Later in Rom. xii., the Apostle returns to the theme and says that we are “transformed by the renewing of the mind” which is expressed in Eph. iv. 23 as the renewing of the spirit of the mind.

The *dominion* of sin and death has been broken. Christ now has “dominion”, “dominion” being the Greek verb *kurieuo*, and “Lord” being the Greek word *kurios*. We acknowledge the *Lordship* of Christ now, and in so doing make it gloriously possible for the life we now live in the flesh to manifest and anticipate this resurrection power and glorious victory that are resident in the concept “Lord”. Gal. ii. 20 says that this life now lived in the flesh is by “the faith of the Son of God”. Rom. viii. 9-11, which immediately follows the statement concerning the mind of the flesh (the carnal mind) attributes the quickening of the mortal body here and now to the indwelling of the spirit of Christ. “If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness”, and if this resurrection spirit dwell in us, He that raised our Saviour will also quicken these mortal bodies by that same indwelling spirit. In Col. ii. the Apostle not only repeats the teaching of Eph. ii. (Col. ii. 13), but applies it with the trenchant question:

“Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, AS THOUGH LIVING in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?” (Col. ii. 20).

We can perhaps appreciate the reason why the Apostle broke the thread of his argument in Eph. ii. 5, 6 by interposing the words that are placed in parenthesis (by grace ye are saved). The word here translated “ye are saved” is the perfect passive participle “ye have been saved”. Sometimes salvation is introduced as a process “ye are being saved” as in I Cor. i. 18; here it is a work done in the past which has continued and present effect. The words that are interjected come again in verse eight, where they introduce the great plan of salvation by grace through faith. It is important however to remember that before the Apostle has said “raised together” and “made to sit together” which seem to include nearly all that salvation has wrought, he says, immediately after the quickening has been mentioned, “ye have been saved by grace”, for quickening means life, and life however feeble, if it be life after death, is marked with immortality. Moreover, this life is not isolated, it is “with Christ”. Those who have passed from death unto life, those in whom the minutest germ of incorruptible life is at work, these are they who “have been saved”. True, salvation is still spoken of as a “hope” (Rom. viii. 24), and as yet unseen; nevertheless the word used in Rom. viii. 24 is *esothemen* “ye were saved”, saved from the beginning, even though salvation in some of its aspects is yet future.

**No.43. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).**  
**Roused together (*sunegeiro*) and seated together.**  
**pp. 141 - 144**

We have considered something of the teaching of Eph. ii. 5, and now give our attention to the next revelation of our union with Christ and His work, namely the opening words of verse 6:

“And hath raised us up together.”

Christ is set forth as both “raised” and “seated” (Eph. i. 20); the believer here is said to be “raised up together” and “made to sit together”, blessings that are most evidently intended as a sequel. Before we proceed, there is a great need for discrimination, as there are two words used in the original which are translated “raise”, but only one of them is compounded with the preposition “with”. The urgent need to discriminate will be seen when we remember that there were some who said in the Apostle’s day that “the resurrection is past already”. An article appeared some time ago in which the reader was informed that the Greek word for resurrection was *anastasia*, a word derived from *anistemi*, to raise, and the writer then went on to expound the wonder of being “raised with Christ”, without instructing the reader that *sun* “together with” is *never* used with the Greek words *anistemi* or *anastasis*. This even though innocently done, is nevertheless evil, for it provided a basis for an untrue inference. The uninstructed reader would naturally assume that just as there is the compound *exanastasis* “the out-resurrection”, so there must be *sunanastasis*, and this being assumed, provided the basis for the teaching that the believer is thus “raised together” with Christ, and as the writer referred to put it, “the believer had been ALREADY RAISED with Christ”, consequently *for such* the resurrection was past already! There is not one single occurrence of the words *sunanastasis* or *sunistemi* in the N.T. The word of Eph. ii. 6 employs another term, the word there being *sunegeiro*. This word we find in two passages in Colossians:

“Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are *risen with* Him through the faith of the operation of God, Who hath raised Him out from dead ones” (Col. ii. 12 *literally*).

“If ye then be *risen with* Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God” (Col. iii. 1).

*Egeiro* differs from *anistemi* in that it means “rouse” rather than “raise”, “to wake up” rather than “stand up”. The A.V. occasionally gives this primary translation “His disciples . . . . awoke Him” (Matt. viii. 25). “It is time to awake out of sleep” (Rom. xiii. 11). “Awake thou that sleepest” (Eph. v. 14). In this passage taken from Ephesians, we find both words occurring thus:

|   |  |   |                  |
|---|--|---|------------------|
| A | Awake ( <i>egeiro</i> )                | \ | subject “sleep”. |
| B | Thou that sleepest ( <i>katheudo</i> ) | / |                  |
| A | Arise ( <i>anistemi</i> )              | \ | subject “death”. |
| B | From the dead ( <i>nekros</i> )        | / |                  |

Here we see “arousing” where the subject is sleep, and “arising” or “standing up” when the subject is the dead. Even where the A.V. uses “arise” to translate *egeiro* it is evident that awaking out of sleep is intended as in Matt. ii. 13. *Diegeiro* is found in Matt. i. 24 “raised from sleep” and Luke viii. 24 “awoke Him”, and *gregoreo* is translated “watch”, “wake” or “be vigilant”. *Diagregoreo* occurs in Luke ix. 32 “when they were awake, they saw His glory”. It is the teaching of Scripture that the believer will be RAISED from the dead and *anistemi* and *anastasis* is rightly used in this connexion, but where we read “raised together with” it is always the compound of *egeiro*. Even though we are still here in mortal bodies, we have been “made alive with Christ” and have been ROUSED with Him, a blessed anticipation of the ultimate resurrection from the dead.

*Sunegeiro* “to raise (or rouse) together” occurs three times in the N.T.: Eph. ii. 6; Col. ii. 12 and iii. 1. A person awakened from sleep, usually is first roused and then stands up. This is the experimental order of faith. We are “roused” even here, in this life, we shall “stand up” in the day of resurrection. If we are “roused” it suggests that we are at least awake and aware, and we can be exhorted to watch. I Thess. iv. and v. clearly distinguishes between the full awakening of future resurrection, and the partial “arousing” even here and now. In I Thess. iv. 13, 14, 15, “sleep” and “asleep” translate the Greek word *koimaomai*; these are described as “the dead in Christ”.

In I Thess. v. 6, 7, 10 the word so translated is *katheudo*. Now *katheudo* means “to lie down to sleep”, a voluntary action, whereas *koimaomai* means rather “put to sleep” involuntarily, as in death. The one is voluntary and so can be used of a sleepy person who should be watching, the other means to fall asleep involuntarily, hence is used as a figure of death. The word to “wake” in I Thess. v. 10 is the Greek *gregoreo* “to watch” and is so translated in verse six. There it is associated with being drunk and being sober, not with physical death, whereas I Thess. iv. deals only with death, and not with moral sluggishness. When the Scriptures speak of the Saviour Himself, both words *egeiro* “to rouse” and *anistemi* “to cause to stand up, to raise” are employed, for in His case there was no interval as there is between the conversion and quickening of the believer, and his resurrection in glory. As we have before remarked, Eph. v. 14 differentiates the two terms:

AWAKE (*egeiro* to arouse) thou that SLEEPEST, and  
ARISE (*anistemi* to cause to stand up) from the DEAD.

We see that the words “and hath raised us up together” do not teach that for the believer “the resurrection is past already”, and in the same way, we must remember that the words that follow “and made us sit together in heavenly places” do not alter the fact that those originally addressed were living at Ephesus or some other city; they were still here upon earth surrounded by sin and temptation, called upon to walk worthy of their calling and to avoid complicity with the unfruitful works of darkness.

Even though made to sit together in heavenly places, where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, those so blessed still belong to that society in which there was husband and wife, parent and child, and in connexion with the obedient children there is even added the promise of long life “on the earth”. Further, complete armour is provided in view of a future “evil day”. The word translated “made to sit together” is *sunkathizo* and the only other occurrence in the N.T. is in Luke xxii. 55. There are comparatively few occasions when *kathizo* means simply “to sit” in the sense of resting, it is generally associated with authority. This idea of authority in connexion with being seated is found in the use of *kathedra* “a chair” in English.

A cathedral is so named because it contains “the Bishop’s throne” or “chair” so we use the expression “*ex cathedra*” of one who by reason of his office speaks with authority. Similarly we use the English word “chair” (which is itself derived through the Latin *cathedra* from the Greek). We speak of “taking the chair” or of “a chair” meaning a professorship at a university. So we find *kathizo* used:

- (1) For the authority of a teacher. “When He was set.” “The Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat.”
- (2) For the authority of a judge. “Pilate . . . . sat down in the judgment seat.”
- (3) For the authority of a king. “When the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory.”

It has special significance when it is associated with the right hand of God.

“He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God” (Mark xvi. 19).

The word *kathizo* has a special significance in the epistle to the Hebrews:

“When He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb. i. 3).

“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” (viii. 1).

“But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God” (x. 12).

“Looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of faith; Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (xii. 2).

It is entirely foreign to *the teaching of Hebrews*, to think of associating any believer with the seated Christ. The teaching of Hebrews is rather that as the high priest, He was there ALONE (Heb. ix. 7). If it came as a shock to Peter to be told “Rise, Peter; kill, and eat” (Acts x. 13), how much more would he have said “not so, Lord”, had anyone dared to associate the holiest believer of either Israel or the church with the seated Christ! One believer who has come to the conclusion that Hebrews presents to us the ultimate revelation of the Scriptures, was quite logical when he denounced us for teaching such a thing. Yet Eph. ii. 6 still stands written. The Hebrew believers were bidden “to draw near”, but none were ever told that they were made “to sit” together there. This but emphasizes the extraordinary nature of the calling of Ephesians. It is one of a series of unique blessings found in the epistle of the Mystery, but revealed nowhere else.

The words “with Christ” must be repeated mentally in Eph. ii. 6. We are quickened together “with Christ”. Eph. ii. 5 says so. We are raised together “with Christ”, for there is no point in stating that the believer today is raised together with other believers, for that takes place at the coming of the Lord. By all the laws of language and of sense the same must be true of the third association. This seating together is said to be “in heavenly places”. This looks back to the closing verses of Eph. i. where Christ is both “raised” and “seated”, in the same heavenly places, at the right hand of God. If this be not truth in excelsis, it approaches very nearly to blasphemy. This position is far above anything revealed elsewhere, and but emphasizes the distinctive character of the truth revealed in this epistle of the Mystery. The term “in Christ Jesus” embraces the three verbs:

|                    |   |                 |
|--------------------|---|-----------------|
| Quickened together | \ |                 |
| Raised together    | } | In Christ Jesus |
| Seated together    | / |                 |

The title, as we have shown elsewhere, is exclusive to the ministry to the Gentiles. It is never found in Hebrews. “In Christ Jesus” occurs seven times in Ephesians, thus:

- “To the faithful in Christ Jesus” (Eph. i. 1).
- “Quickened, raised, seated together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (i. 4).
- “In His kindness toward us through (lit. in) Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 7).
- “His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus” (ii. 10).
- “But now in Christ Jesus . . . . made nigh” (ii. 13).
- “The purpose of the ages . . . . in Christ Jesus” (iii. 11).
- “Unto Him be glory in the church in (lit.) Christ Jesus” (iii. 21).

There is, as it were a seven-runged ladder, reaching from earth to heaven, each one being a compound of *sun* “with”. Believers are reckoned to be “crucified with”; “dead with”; “buried with”; “quickened with”; “raised with”; “seated with” and finally be “manifested with” Christ. We have therefore reached in Eph. ii. 6 the sixth and last step of “reckoning” in grace that leads to the seventh step, the “realization” in glory. That step is found, not in Ephesians, but in the parallel epistle to the Colossians, namely in Col. iii. 1-4.

This seven-rung ladder is dealt with in the series “*Reckoning and Realization*”.

## No.44. The Throne Room (i. 19 - ii. 7).

### An exhibition of kindness in the ages to come.

pp. 161 - 164

We have mounted in faith the rungs of the ladder “with Christ” until we find ourselves potentially “there, where Christ sitteth”, the last and highest anticipation of the glory of the Mystery, until faith shall be exchanged for sight, and hope to realization. The final, the seventh rung of the ladder, is reserved for Col. iii. to make clear that when Christ, Who is our life, shall appear or be made manifest, we shall appear or be made manifest “with Him” in glory. The verse of Eph. ii., which concludes the present section, namely verse seven, takes us forward to that day of glory, but instead of dwelling on the one great moment of manifestation, it surveys the remainder of intervening time before the consummation is reached, and gives a glimpse of the nature of our *reception* and the kind of *treatment* we may expect when we are presented “without spot or wrinkle or any such thing” at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The first call to pause and consider is the purpose that is expressed in the word “that” with which verse seven opens.

*Hina*. Some words translated “that” focus attention on the manner and method adopted, as II Thess. i. 12 “so that the name . . . . may be glorified”, and in I Cor. i. 29 “so that no flesh may boast”; others on comparison, or to time, but *hina* focuses attention on purpose and result. In the generality of cases, *hina* is followed by the subjunctive “in order that He may, or that He might”. This is the condition of the sentence now before us in Eph. ii. 7. The “purpose” or “intention” of all that has gone before is now to be unfolded. This union with Christ in His death, resurrection and present session at the right hand of God, is “in order that” the way may be cleared for such an outpouring of kindness as to exhaust the possibility of language to describe. We give a new translation of verse seven:

“In order that He might exhibit in those ages which are coming, the surpassing riches of His grace in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 7).

“Exhibit” A.V. “shew”. “Shew” may mean “to make manifest” as in II Pet. i. 14, but here in Eph. ii. 7 the thought rather is to “exhibit”. The original word is derived from *deiknumi*, the word used in Rev. i. 1 and so gives “example” (Jude 7), and “make a shew” (Col. ii. 15). Paul uses this word when he speaks of himself “that in me first Jesus Christ *might show forth* all longsuffering, *for a pattern*” (I Tim. i. 16), or in Phil. i. 28 “an evident token”.

*Hupodeigma* is translated “example” (Heb. viii. 5), and “patterns” (Heb. ix. 23). Some, like Pharaoh, are exhibitions of wrath; some through mercy are exhibitions of grace, and Rom. ix. which speaks of the exhibition of wrath in Pharaoh, contrasts the vessels of wrath with other vessels of mercy which He had afore prepared unto glory. Let us never forget that all such vessels of mercy were “children of wrath” even as those that were left; consequently we can understand the interposition of the words “by grace

ye are saved” in Eph. ii. 5 and the succeeding emphasis upon grace apart from merit “lest any man should boast” (Eph. ii. 9). The word *hina* comes in verse nine as well as in verse seven. It is of the Divine purpose that in the ages to come He shows his kindness to us in Christ Jesus, and it is also the Divine purpose “that” no man should boast.

When at last the church of the Mystery is manifested in glory, it will be among other things “an exhibit” of what grace means to all the serried ranks of spirit beings. We do not do the passage justice however if we stay here at the word grace. We have “riches” of grace, but even that is not all. We have “exceeding riches” of grace to consider, to preach and to give thanks to God. Even that is not all, for these exceeding riches of grace are to be expressed in “kindness” toward us. “Riches” of grace, of glory, of Christ, and of full assurance, characterize the epistles Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians; and Romans speaks of the riches of His goodness, and glory, and contains the doxology that opens with “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God”, but there are only two passages in all Paul’s epistles which say that God was or is rich.

“Though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor” (II Cor. viii. 9).  
“God, Who is rich in mercy” (Eph. ii. 4).

No believer who rejoices in salvation by sacrifice will need a lengthy argument to prove that the one passage is linked to the other, as is cause and effect. *We* can only be the recipient of these riches of grace, because *He* Who was rich, became poor on our account. God Who is rich in mercy, provided the steps, “quickened with”, “raised with”, “seated with”, and He also provides the goal “manifested with”, or, as in the verse before us, kindness beyond dreams. The term “the ages to come”, could strike a note of fear were we not assured of this grace, but Paul includes the age to come in that which is placed in subjection beneath the feet of Christ, and we have already seen how this is accomplished.

His being raised is balanced by our being raised with Him  
His being seated is balanced by our being seated with Him

So now we can add a third correspondence:

The age to come is beneath His feet; the ages to come can contain nothing but grace and kindness for His believing people.

These riches are said to be “exceeding” *huperballo*, a word that occurs three times in Ephesians:

“The *exceeding* greatness of His power toward us” (Eph. i. 19).  
“The *exceeding* riches of His grace . . . . towards us” (ii. 7).  
“The love of Christ, which *passeth* knowledge” (iii. 19).

An *hyperbole* in language is a figure of exaggeration (to be distinguished from *hyperbole* the answering of an argument by anticipation), and generally indicates that the subject is so vast as to go beyond the powers of human language to describe. *Huperballo* is composed of *huper* “over” and *ballo* “to throw”. There are four derivatives from *ballo*

in Ephesians that seem to grow in richness when seen together. Two are used of the Lord in His grace, and two of the evil one in his attack. We were chosen in Him “before the overthrow (*katabole*) of the world” (Eph. i. 4). We look forward to the ages to come, to exceeding (*hyperbole*) riches of grace (Eph. ii. 7). There is an enemy, named the devil (*diabolos*) to whom we should give no place (Eph. iv. 27) and this enemy has fiery darts (*belos*) all of which are extinguished by the shield of faith.

Those who are blessed in the *huper* or *super*-heavens (Eph. i. 20, 21) are blessed *huper*, or exceedingly above the comprehension of the human mind. The exceeding riches of His grace that are to be exhibited to us in the ages to come will be manifested in a peculiarly gracious way. Grace, *charis*, has already been exhibited toward us in our salvation (Eph. ii. 8); and grace is the very denomination of the present dispensation (Eph. iii. 2). The glory of His grace and the riches of His grace are the moving causes of our acceptance and redemption (Eph. i. 6, 7), the very word “made accepted” being *charitoo*. Even the forgiveness of Eph. iv. 32 whether that of God extended to us, or of one believer to another, is *charizomai*. These are all references to what is past or present, but Eph. ii. 7 refers to the future. The grace that saved, that forgave, that accepted, is the grace that will prompt the Divine Kindness. This is one of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22), where the Greek word is used as a near synonym with goodness, and where in Titus iii. 4 it is a near synonym with “philanthropy” (see original).

*Chrestotes* “kindness” occurs fourteen times in the Septuagint version and consistently translates variants of the Hebrew *tob* meaning “good” or “goodness”, e.g. Psa. xxi. 3 and cvi. 5. Some of the translations of *chrestos* and *chrestotes* are suggestive: “easy” (Matt. xi. 30); “gracious” (I Pet. ii. 3); “goodness” (Rom. xi. 22) and “gentleness” (Gal. v. 22). The idea of future glory has been so coloured by magnificence and splendour, that the fact that the goal of the ages is expressed in terms of home and family is likely to be lost sight of, or relegated to the background. Here, the epistle of the Mystery brings into relation with the highest position of glory such lovely and homely things as “gentleness”, being “easy” and “kindness”.

Whenever it falls to our lot to interview or be interviewed by the great and the wealthy, there is, however hidden, an element of uneasiness and the sense of an ordeal. All this is absent from the believer’s mind as he contemplates this most high and holy introduction. “Made meet” for the inheritance of the saints in light; “accepted” in the Beloved, having not only access, but “boldness and access with confidence”, he looks to be presented faultless and with joy, and then when the presentation is over, not to feel strange among his celestial associates, not to be overawed by the presence of principalities and powers, but to be “easy”, to be treated with overwhelming kindness, all because we are viewed by the Father as being not “through” as the A.V. reads, but “*in* Christ Jesus”. Thus ends the section which visualizes a throne, a seated position in heavenly places, a glory far above all! Thus ends this amazing revelation of supernal glory, not on the note of overwhelming brilliance, but on the lovely and lowly note of kindness, a kindness that sets us at “ease”, a kindness greater in richness but not different in kind from that we are enjoined to show to one another here and now.

**No.45. The Almonry (ii. 8 - 10).**

**The oblation of God.**

**pp. 181 - 183**

The reader will remember that we have adopted the figure of a great house to set forth the literary structure of Ephesians, and should he have commenced to study with us since the opening articles were published in Volume XXXV, he will see the diagram of the Great House with an explanation of the chart, on pages 141 to 146.

The present section, Eph. ii. 8-10, we have called "The Almonry". This word comes to us through the French *aumonerie*, which is derived from the Greek word *eleemosune*, meaning "pity" or "mercy". This was a room in which alms were distributed, especially in monastic buildings. *Eleos* has already appeared in Eph. ii. 4 where we read of God Who is rich in "mercy", and this is its translation in every one of the twenty-eight occurrences of the word.

*Eleeo* means to have pity, have mercy, obtain mercy or have compassion and it is so translated in the A.V.

*Eleemosune* is limited to Matthew, Luke and the Acts, where it is translated alms and almsdeed. Those to whom alms are given, are generally those who have little or nothing of themselves. Where Luke xii. 33 reads "sell that ye have, and give alms", Matt. xix. 21 reads "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor", where "give to the poor" is an evident synonym for "give alms". We therefore have full justification for adopting the idea of an almonry in this series, where the rooms in a great building are used to symbolize the structural subdivisions of the epistle.

**Ephesians ii. 8 - 10**

A | For by grace are ye saved through faith  
B | a | Not of yourselves  
    b | The gift of God  
    a | Not of works lest (*hina*) any should boast   FAITH  
A | For we are His workmanship, created  
B | a | Unto good works  
    b | Foreordained of God  
    a | That (*hina*) we should walk in them       WORKS

Salvation is not *out* of works, but it is nevertheless *unto* works, for the same God that "predestined" us (*prohorizo*) from before the foundation of the world, as surely "foreordained" (*proetoimazo*) that there should be a gracious practice corresponding to our high calling. He Who elected us apart from any personal merit on our part, has declared that this unmerited election is demonstrated by our attitude to His Word and the

gospel (I Thess. i. 4, 5), while Peter speaks of those virtues which, when added to faith, make our calling and election sure (II Pet. i. 10). The fact that the Apostle introduces this testimony regarding salvation by “for”, shows that he related the past outpouring of grace in “salvation” with the future outpouring of “kindness”, seeing in the one the root, and the other the fruit of the all embracing grace of God; “for by grace are ye saved through faith”.

The emphasis here is placed upon “grace”; it is the *instrumental* cause of salvation; “faith”, which is added, being the *causa apprehendens*, as Hooker has said “the hand which putted on Christ to justification”. Grace is objective, *the cause*. As Rom. iv. 16 puts it “Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; that the promise might be sure”. Faith is subjective, *the medium*. The section before us is the shortest in the whole epistle, not because Paul held the gospel of salvation cheaply, but because he was writing to those already saved, seeking to lead them on. What he does say, however, is to the point, but for a full outline of salvation by grace through faith, and which is not of works, we must read his great epistle to the Romans. Here, in Eph. ii. 8-10, as in Phil. iii. 9, the doctrine of Romans is epitomized, and we are supposed to know it; it is the foundation upon which the superstructure of Ephesians is built. He who knows the epistle to the Romans, can never mix grace or faith, with works and wages (Rom. xi. 6). Grace *imparts*, faith *receives*. “Are ye saved” *este sesosmenoi* literally “ye are those having been saved”. This combination is very strong. It unites the past with the present. You have been, and still are, saved. The participle “having been saved” is almost a title—how the redeemed can be named.

“And THAT not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.” The fact that the word “faith” is followed immediately by “that” has led some to teach from this passage that “faith is the gift of God”. This has been adopted by hyper-Calvinism, in opposition to the teaching of Calvin himself (see Alford’s note) and has introduced the element of fatalism in the gospel of salvation. There is such a thing as “faith, the gift of God”, but it is a special gift *to one who is already a believer* (I Cor. xii. 9). George Müller had a “gift” of faith, and by that faith he built and maintained the orphanage that bears his name, but that gift of faith must not be confused with the faith whereby George Müller believed the gospel unto his salvation, neither must we teach that because we are “believers” that we are called upon to emulate George Müller. Let us consider the matter more fully.

“He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him”  
(John iii. 36).

Can we paraphrase this solemn passage and say:

“He to whom God withholds the gift of faith . . . . the wrath of God abideth on him”?

Can man be held responsible for not believing, if believing is in the sovereign disposal of God? We might as well hold that man be held responsible for the fact that he cannot live without food, water or air. Before attempting an interpretation of this or any other passage, attention must be paid to the grammar. The word “that” in Eph. ii. 8 is the Greek *touto* and it is NEUTER; the word “faith” is FEMININE, therefore “the grace by

faith salvation” must be conceived of as a whole, the word faith forming *a part* of the parcel, and it is *this*, this scheme of salvation which, while it excludes works, admits faith, it is *this*, that is the gift of God.

A number of derivatives of the Greek root *do* are translated “gift” in the N.T., which root is easily recognizable in the English words “donate”, “donor”.

*Didomi*, the verb “to give” occurs twelve times in Ephesians.

*Doma*, something given, a gift. Occurs in Eph. iv. 8 “And gave gifts unto men”.

*Dorea*, a free gift, in Eph. iii. 7 and iv. 7 “the gift of grace” and “the gift of Christ”.

*Doron* is a special form of the word, employed as an equivalent of the Hebrew *corban*, and it is this word that is selected by the Apostle to speak of salvation as “the gift of God”. *Doron* occurs twenty-one times, and with the one exception of Eph. ii. 8 it is used of gifts and offerings made by man either to God, or to their fellows. *Doron* is used of the gifts brought by the wise men (Matt. ii. 11) and of the gift offered to God (Matt. v. 23, 24). It is “corban” (Mark vii. 11), and so on. The word *corban* comes from the Hebrew *qarab* “to come near” and in a special sense, to bring an offering to the Lord. We learn from Rabbinical sources that there were thirteen Corban chests in the temple, formed like trumpets, each set apart for its own peculiar use. It was into one of the Corban chests that the widow cast her mites. The LXX uses the word *doron* in thirty-seven occurrences of the Hebrew *qarab*. In Leviticus for example (Lev. i. 2, 3, 10, 14, 15, etc.). The fact that Eph. ii. 8 uses a word that means an “oblation” something “offered” makes it all the more impossible that the passage should mean that “faith” is the gift of God. In what sense can faith be conceived of as an oblation, an offering made by God? We already know that the blessings of the church of the Mystery are peculiarly “all spiritual”, that the sphere of their enjoyment is peculiar “in heavenly places”, that the period of their choice is peculiar “before the overthrow of the world”. These make manifest the exceeding grace of God to which is added the “kindness” that is in store in the ages to come.

What can we say however when we learn that in this calling it is God Who makes the oblation, it is God, not the humble worshipper, Who brings the offering; it is God Who comes out with both hands full of blessing, and pours them out at the feet of the worthless and undone. Salvation by grace through faith is the gift, the oblation of God. Let us close our lexicons, let us put aside for a moment our grammars, let us rather bow our heads in worship as we say out of full hearts:

“Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift.”

**No.46. The Almonry (ii. 8 - 10).**

**“Not of works . . . . . unto good works.”  
pp. 221 - 224**

We have learned with wondering adoration that the great plan of salvation by grace through faith is the oblation (*corban*) of God. It hardly seems necessary to continue “not of works”, but He Who knows the heart of man, even redeemed man, knows only too well that he will seize upon any pretext to “boast”.

“Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship” (Eph. ii. 9, 10).

The word *ek* “out of” is emphasized here.

“And that not out of (*ek*) yourselves: it is the gift of God: not our of (*ek*) works, lest any many should boast.”

This is the consistent message preached by Paul. The same use of the preposition *ek* is found in Phil. iii. 9:

“And be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is out of (*ek*) the law, but that which is through faith of Christ, the righteousness which is out of (*ek*) God by faith.”

These passages but echo the basic teaching of the epistle to the Romans where the word *ek* is used continually with this meaning. Here are some of the passages by way of example:

“From faith”, “by faith” (Rom. i. 17).  
“By the deeds of the law”; “by faith”; “by works”; “of the law”; “of faith”  
(Rom. iii. 20, 30; iv. 2, 16).

In all these references, the preposition *ek* is used. Summing up the way of salvation in Rom. iii., the Apostle says “where is boasting then?” and answers his own question with the word “excluded” (Rom. iii. 27). Summing up the way of salvation in I Cor. i., he says “that no flesh should glory in His presence” (I Cor. i. 29). Boasting or glorying in Christ Jesus, is the antithesis of confidence in the flesh, according to Phil. iii. 3. Whatever changes may have been made after Acts xxviii., one feature remains constant; salvation is of grace, and Eph. ii. 8-10 is not revealing this truth for the first time; it is stressing and enriching it as the basis of the exceeding grace made manifest in the present dispensation of the Mystery. Instead of our works coming into the picture, our attention is drawn to the Great Worker Himself “For we are His workmanship”.

Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth and others, translated the word *poiema* “workmanship” by “handiwork” and the usage of the word in the O.T. favours this more intimate idea. For example Isa. xxix. 16 uses the word *poiema* in the LXX for the work of a potter. In spite of the busy activity of man, there is only one reference in the thirteen occurrences of

the word “maker” in the O.T. that refers to man, namely in Isa. xxii. 11; all the references in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Jeremiah, Hosea and the rest of Isaiah, speak of God as “The Maker”. Job found assurance in the fact that God had a desire unto the work of His hands (Job xiv. 15) and man’s dominion consisted in his suzerainty over the works of His own hands (Psa. viii. 3).

Psa. cii. 25, which speaks of the heavens as the work of God’s hands, is quoted in Heb. i. 10 as of Christ. The word creation brings with it something of the Majesty of the Divine fiat “He spake and it was done”, “Let there be light, and there was light”, but when the Apostle said “we are His workmanship”, His handiwork, there is something homely, something lovely about that shaping, moulding, handling of material, as the Great Potter forms out of bare clay a thing of extraordinary beauty. Because of this, the Greeks used the word *poiema* and *poietes* of a “poem” and a “poet”, for a poem, even though the child of inspiration, is nevertheless something upon which much love and labour must be spent.

It is reported that Tennyson revised his poem *Maud* a thousand times, and the reader will remember the comment of one lover of Shakespeare, when told that Shakespeare never blotted a line, “Would God he had blotted a thousand!” It is a wonderful thought that the Church of the One Body can be looked upon as God’s Poem. *Poiema* is used in one other passage, namely that of Rom. i. 20 “things that are made” where the Apostle says:

“The invisible things of Him from (since) the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.”

What the works of His hand in creation are to the world, making manifest His eternal power and Godhead, so the work of His hands is the church; it manifests the invisible characteristics of the God of all grace. We are a new creation, and indeed, creation immediately follows the making of Eph. ii. 10.

“Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God before ordained that we should walk in them.”

*Ktizo* “to create” occur seven times in the Prison Epistles, thus:

- “Created in Christ Jesus unto good works” (Eph. ii. 10).
- “For to make in Himself of the twain one new man” (Eph. ii. 15).
- “Hid in God, Who created all things by Jesus Christ” (Eph. iii. 9).
- “The new man . . . . created in righteousness” (Eph. iv. 24).
- “By Him were all things created” (Col. i. 16).
- “All things were created by Him, and for Him” (Col. i. 16).
- “The new man . . . . the image of Him that created him” (Col. iii. 10).

These references fall into the following pattern:

- A | Eph. ii. 10. Created in Christ Jesus. |
- b1 | Eph. ii. 15. New man. doctrinal
- c1 | Eph. iii. 9. All things. ref. to Mystery
- b1 | Eph. iv. 24. New man. practical
- b2 | Col. i. 15, 16. Image. Creator
- c2 | Col. i. 16. "All things." ref. to Body the Church
- b2 | Col. iii. 10. Image. created

It is evident that in the Prison Epistles, creation is mainly concerned with the Mystery and things relating to the Mystery, and the attempt to make Col. i. 16 bear the burden of universal reconciliation is seen to be ruled out by the limitation of the context and the evidence of the concordance.

There are some teachers, who because they have recognized the utter impossibility of "good works" ever being admitted as a procuring or a qualifying cause of our acceptance, seem to have developed an antipathy to good works altogether, as though Paul had not continued "not of works . . . . unto good works". Works are the visible fruit on the tree, making it evident that the invisible root is alive and active. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is a principle true for all time. Just as balance is exhibited in the epistle as a whole, so is it in its parts. To emphasize the complete exclusion of works as a cause of salvation is right; to omit reference to the need to produce good works after salvation is wrong. The only thing that is true is proportionate emphasis upon both doctrines. This quality of balance may be seen in other of the Apostle's writings. What can be clearer than the following?

"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us" (Titus iii. 5).

Yet in the next verse or so comes the balance:

"This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou insist strenuously that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works" (Titus iii. 8),

which is a complete parallel with Eph. ii. 9, 10:

"Not by works . . . . unto good works . . . . ordained that we should walk in them."

Both in our words and our works we may deny the Lord.

"They profess that they know God; but in works they deny Him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate" (Titus i. 16).

"Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine . . . . in all things showing thyself a pattern of good works" (Titus ii. 1, 7).

"The grace of God that bringeth salvation . . . . teaching us that . . . . we should live . . . . looking . . . . zealous of good works" (Titus ii. 11-14).

The last reference is another parallel with Eph. ii. 9, 10. The grace that saves us teaches us to "live . . . . looking". The redemption that saves us has a twofold object, viz.:

- (1) To redeem us *from* all iniquity.
- (2) To purify us *unto* good works.

This new creation has a characteristic walk. Exactly what the walk involves is outside the province of doctrine to explain, all it does is to state the fact and leave it to the practical section to develop, and this it does very thoroughly. In the doctrinal view there are but two walks known to God, the walk related to the old creation (Eph. ii. 2, 3), “in times past ye walked”, and the walk of the new creation (Eph. ii. 10), “unto good works that we should walk in them”. Between these two walks, what miracles are to be found; dead, quickened, raised, seated. No attempt is made to *alter the walk*, but God makes a new creature. Life is not altered by the walk; the walk but expresses the life.

“For which things’ sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: in the which ye also WALKED some time, when ye LIVED in them” (Col. iii. 6, 7).

“As ye have therefore RECEIVED Christ Jesus the Lord, so WALK ye in Him” (Col. ii. 6).

What is the meaning of the expression “before ordained” in this section? Does it teach that, after salvation, every word and action is fixed by predestination? That in the sphere of the new creation the believer has no responsibility? If so, why reward for service? Why suffer loss? Why exhort a believer to “walk worthy” if all is ordained beforehand? Evidently the Apostle did not entertain such an idea, for he says:

“Walk in love . . . . let no man deceived you with vain words; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience” (Eph. v. 2-6).

The words “before ordained” translate the Greek word *proetoimazo*. “I go to *prepare* a place for you” (John xiv. 3); “The *preparation* of the gospel of peace” (Eph. vi. 15); “They that were *ready* went in” (Matt. xv. 10); “The third time I am *ready*” (II Cor. xii. 14): these are examples of *etoimazo* and *hetoimos*. The word *hina*, translated “that”, may be rendered “in order that”, and the passage stands as follows:

“For good works, which God prepared beforehand, in order that we should walk in them.”

Titus iii. 1 says “Be ready to every good work”; the readiness or preparedness being on the part of the believer. II Tim. ii. 21 speaks of the believer being prepared unto every good work. *The Emphatic Diaglott* translates Eph. ii. 10:

“Good works, for which God prepared us, that we might walk in them.”

This is but an expansion of the great passage in Eph. i. 4:

“Chosen in Him before the overthrow of the world, that we might be holy and without blemish.”

Here then is a new creation, and there is accordingly a new walk suitable to the new creation. This walk is expressed in good works, and for these good works each member of the Body has been before prepared.

In this section of Ephesians (chapters i.-iii.), which is mainly devoted to the unfolding of doctrine, while the question of walk is raised, no details are given. That is supplied in the practical portion (chapters iv.-vi.), which opens with the exhortation to “walk worthy”. In Eph. ii., the two walks are just put into their categories. It is either the walk of the unregenerate “In time past ye walked according to the course of this world”, or it is the walk of the newly-created “good works which God hath foreordained that we should walk in them”.

This brings us to the end of the smallest section of this epistle, The Almonry, Eph. ii. 8-10. Yet what wealth is here, wealth not merely stored up, but out-poured. A glance back to verses two and three will show the condition, view spiritually, in which the recipients of this grace were “by nature”. The next section opens up the equally dark prospect that was before those thus saved, when looked at as they were nationally, Gentiles in the flesh.

# The First Principles of the Oracles of God

(A series especially addressed to new readers)

## No.8. Man formed of the dust, breathes the breath of life. pp. 16 - 20

The book of the generations of Adam given in Gen. v. 1, refers back to both Gen. i. and Gen. ii., linking the two accounts as of one person, act and period.

“This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him, male and female created He them.”

Here there is undoubted reference back to Gen. i. 26-28.

- (1) The likeness occurs here, *but not in Gen. ii.*
- (2) Male and female created refers to Gen. i. The actual formation of Eve is described in Gen. ii.
- (3) The blessing is a reference back to Gen. i. 28, the words “bless” or “blessing” *do not occur* in the second record.

The apostle when speaking of Adam in I Cor. xv. speaks of the “image” of the earthy as opposed to the “image” of the heavenly. If he is quoting at all, he must be quoting from either Gen. i. 28 or Gen. v. In the same context however, Paul quotes from Gen. ii., Adam is the one who was created “a living soul” (I Cor. xv. 45), and this is not written in Gen. i., or in Gen. v., but in Gen. ii. The inference is beyond question therefore, that in the estimation of Moses, who wrote Gen. i. and v. as well as Gen. ii., and in the estimation of Paul also, the man created on the sixth day, is the same man whose creation is given a fuller detail in Gen. ii. We make no attempt to square the teaching of Scripture with archaeology or with anthropology; that is not our business, the fact that cannot be circumvented is that Adam is spoken of as the “first man” and Christ as the last Adam and the second man. All who die, die in Adam, and no man living today in the remotest corner of the earth is outside that all inclusive embrace. Gen. ii. does not refer to a subsequent and second creation, but enlarges and goes into fuller detail concerning the constitution of one who was called into being during those six momentous days, namely Adam.

In Gen. i. 26 we read: “And God said, Let us make man in our image.” In Gen. ii. 7 we read: “And the Lord God formed man (Adam) of the dust of the ground.” It is the same God, it is the same man, the purpose of Gen. i. 26 being to speak of man’s peculiar distinction “the image” and “the likeness”, the purpose of Gen. ii. 7 to reveal the lowliness of his origin and his dependence upon the Lord. The word translated “formed” is used of the work of a potter (Jer. xviii. 2); in fact it is translated “potter” seventeen times. While we are fully prepared to admit that the figure known as *anthropopatheia* is employed here, ascribing to God what belongs to human beings by way of condescension, that does not remove the intimate relationship indicated between

the Creator and creature; He “formed” man. He did not simply say “Let man be, and it was so”.

The material out of which the body of this first man was formed is the material out of which the bodies of all his descendants were and are formed, “the dust of the ground”.

The word translated “dust” here may also be rendered “ashes” (as of an animal that has been burnt, Numb. ix. 17), “powder” (into which the vessels and the altars of Baal were stamped, II Kings xxiii. 4, 6, 12), “rubbish” (that had accumulated on the broken walls of Jerusalem, Neh. iv. 2), and “earth” (out of which iron can be taken, Job xxviii. 2). “The highest part of the dust of the world” in Prov. viii. 26 refers to the soil, without which neither vegetable nor animal life would be possible.

We often speak of the “ground” but how many of us associate the word with the verb “to grind”? The “ground” has literally been *ground* by the action of flood, fire and frost, and so made into a comparatively fine powder. From this “dust of the ground” the body of man was made, and to this at death his body returns. Let us now examine the composition of this wonderful frame, and see how far the “dust of the earth” enters into it.

The composition of the body of a man weighing a little over 150lbs. would be as follows:

Oxygen 90lbs., Carbon 36lbs., Hydrogen 14lbs., Nitrogen 3lbs.8ozs.,  
Calcium 3lbs.12ozs., Phosphorus 1lb.14ozs., Chlorine 4ozs., Sulphur 3½ozs.,  
Potassium 3ozs., Sodium 2½ozs., Fluorine 2ozs., Magnesium 1½ozs., Silicon ½oz.,  
Iron ½oz.

These are the main constituents of the human body, but there are other elements also present in small quantities. In addition to the 150 lbs. detailed above, we have a “trace” of the following:

Lead, Cerium, Argon, Manganese, Zinc, Vanadium, Beryllium, Aluminum,  
Lithium, Chromium, Helium, Iodine, Cobalt, Boron, Neon, Arsenic, Bromine,  
Scandium, Nickel, Lanthanum, Strontium, Titanium, Copper, Neodymium,  
Molybdenum, Silver and Tin.

Perhaps the reader would appreciate a few further words on the essential work that some of these elements perform.

POTASSIUM, which figures so largely in the composition of seeds, is the mineral basis of all muscular tissues, and is essential in the formation of proteins. It can be truly said: “No life without potassium.”

SODIUM.—This is one of the principal constituents of blood and lymph. Without sodium, lime and magnesia salts are liable to form injurious deposits in the body.

CALCIUM and MAGNESIUM.—Magnesium assists in the assimilation of phosphorus, while magnesium, calcium and iron form the albumen of the blood. One percent

of magnesium enables the lime taken into the body to harden in the formation of the bones.

MANGANESE.—It has been discovered that animals deprived of manganese lack the maternal instinct.

ZINC is associated with the action of vitamins.

NICKEL is associated with the insulin of the pancreas.

If it be true that there is “no life without potassium”, it is equally true that there is “no thought without phosphorus”. The elements fluorine and iodine are also important: fluorine plays an important part in the composition of the iris of the eye, while iodine in the thyroid gland is essential to growth and development.

The following is a summary of the various functions governed by these constituents of soil, seed and herb:

CALCIUM is a counter to acid, and is *the executive element*.

SULPHUR purifies, and is the *maid of all work*.

POTASSIUM stimulates the liver, and is *the balancer*.

PHOSPHORUS aids the growth of nerve and brain, and is the *thought medium*.

IRON is the vehicle of oxygen, and is the *master chemical*.

IODINE eliminates toxins, and is the *gland regulator*.

MANGANESE improves resistance, and is *the chemical of poise*.

SILICA gives gloss to the hair and sparkle to the eyes, and is *the optimist*.

FLUORINE protects against infection, and is *the youth preserver*.

CHLORINE keeps the body supple, and is *the laundryman*.

SODIUM prevents acidosis, and is *the alkalizer*.

MAGNESIUM is alkaline and sleep promoting and is *the refresher*.

Such is the composition of the body of man. He is of the earth, earthy. The story of Gen. ii., however, is not yet told. After telling us that the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, the record proceeds “And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul”.

Let us examine the two statements, “the breath of life” and “a living soul”. Contrary to popular theology, man is not the only “living soul” on the earth. This opinion is fostered by the A.V. which does not use the word “soul” in Gen. i., reserving that for man in Gen. ii. 7. In a case like this, however, the foundation upon which we must build must be the original Hebrew, and not a translation however precious that translation may be. The word translated “soul” is the Hebrew word *nephesh*.

### **Nephesh in Gen. i.**

“The moving creature that hath *life* (margin *soul*)” (Gen. i. 20).

“Every living *creature* (lit. living *soul*) that moveth” (Gen. i. 21).

“The earth bring forth the living *creature*” (Gen. i. 24).

“Everything . . . . wherein (there is) *life* (margin living *soul*)” (Gen. i. 30).

Here are the four occurrences of *nephesh* in Gen. i., and these demand our attention. “Soul” is predicated in this chapter of “creeping creatures” brought forth by the waters

(verse 20), “great whales” (verse 21), elsewhere called “serpents” (Exod. vii. 9), “dragons” (Deut. xxxii. 33), and “sea-monsters” (Lam. iv. 3)—“cattle”, “creeping thing”, “beast of the earth” (verse 25) and finally:

“Every beast of the earth, and every fowl of the air, and everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is *soul life*, or *living soul*” (verse 30).

### **Nephesh in Gen. ii.**

“Man became a *living soul*” (Gen. ii. 7).  
“Adam called every *living creature*” (Gen. ii. 19).

It is easy for us to point to this passage (ii. 7) as evidence of bias on the part of our translators and to ask why the English reader is led to believe that man differs from the beast and creeping thing. Similarly it is easy in the blindness that pride, even of perceiving one aspect of the truth, can bring, to fall into the equally fatal error of saying that man is nothing more than the beasts that perish. Let us observe one or two facts that are to be found in these two chapters.

Man is undoubtedly a living soul. Cattle and creeping things and great whales are also undoubtedly living souls. To stay here, however, is to be content with half the truth, which, as the poet says, is “ever the blackest of lies”.

In chapter i., where the animals are called “living souls”, man is not so called. When man is to be made, God does not say, “Let the earth bring forth”, but:--

“Let us make man in Our image after Our likeness: and let them have dominion . . . .  
so God created man in His own Image, and in the Image of God created He him; male and female created He them” (Gen. i. 26, 27).

Is it necessary, when repudiating the error of the immortality of the soul, to plunge into the equal error of denying all that is implied by this deliberation of God at the creation of man? While man and beast are alike “living souls”, man alone was created in the image of God. In Gen. ii. 7 we have the additional statement, not mentioned in Gen. i. 27, concerning the “breath of life”:

### **N’shamah.**

This word *n’shamah* is generally translated “breath” or “breathe” in the A.V., its other renderings being “blast”, “inspiration”, “soul” and “spirit”. The word occurs 24 times, and we believe in 23 of the occurrences man only is the subject. The one passage which demands a more lengthy analysis is Gen. vii. 21, 22.

Appendix 16 of *The Companion Bible* gives the 23 references to *n’shamah* in the O.T. For easy reference we number each occurrence selected from it.

1. “And breathed into his nostrils the *breath* of life and man became a living soul” (Gen. ii. 7). It may be queried who it is that is said to breathe, God or Adam, for the

pronoun “he” does not decide the question. This breath is by the nostrils, and therefore differs in nothing from that of the lower creatures. Be the answers to these questions what they may, here is the introduction of something special in the process of creation, something quite exceptional, occurring nowhere in the record of Gen. i., but finding somewhat of a parallel in the equally distinctive pause and counsel of Gen. i. 26.

2. “Thou shalt save alive nothing that *breatheth*” (Deut. xx. 16). We know that sometimes both man and beast were destroyed by the advancing Israelites, as was the case at Jericho. But when taking the next city, Ai, Israel were by divine command expressly told to spare the cattle. “And thou shalt do to Ai and her king as thou didst unto Jericho and her king: only the spoil thereof, and the *cattle* thereof shall ye take for a prey.” If we insist that *n’shamah* in Deut. xx. 16 must include cattle, we introduce a serious problem, but if we leave it to mean man, all is harmony. A glance at Deut. xx. 17, 18 will strengthen this view, for it immediately goes on to enumerate those who were to be utterly destroyed, namely, the Canaanites, and the reason given is “that they teach you not, etc.”.

3. “So Joshua . . . . utterly destroyed all that *breathed*” (Josh. x. 40). This is parallel with No.2. (***What is Man*** - be-xix)

Our space is nearly used up. The reader should look up the remaining occurrences, which are II Sam. xxii. 16; I Kings xv. 29; Job xxvii. 3; xxxii. 8; Psa. cl. 6 and Prov. xx. 27.

If these references are examined, it will be seen that all who have *ruach* “spirit” do not necessarily have *n’shamah* “the breath of life”. Psa. xviii. 15 speaks of the blast (*ruach*) of the breath (*n’shamah*) of Thy nostrils, and the quotations from Job xxxii. 18 and Prov. xx. 27 show a close connection between this breath of life, understanding and conscience, which goes beyond the range of the mere *nephesh* or living soul, without the additional breath of life. The living creatures (souls) of Gen. i. 21 had not conscience. If there be no such distinction, then Gen. vii. 21, 22 tells us that all died twice over.

Man stands therefore as it were between two worlds. So far as his body is concerned, he is a living soul, like the lower animals, and lower than the angels. But he was made in the image of God, he received the breath of life and this links him with the world above, and he is destined to be raised in His Redeemer above angels.

**No.9. Genesis iii. (1) The Serpent.**  
**pp. 35 - 38**

While no one can read the record of Gen. i. and ii. without being impressed with the wonder of creation, and the evidence of purpose that the creation of man in the image of God implies, we soon realize as we commence the third chapter, that it is here that the supreme purpose of the Bible is revealed, the conflict between Good and Evil, the nature of the enemy and the form of his attack, the countermove of the Creator and the opening up of the great Redemptive purpose that from Gen. iii. to the last chapter of the book of Revelation characterizes the whole teaching of Scripture.

Before attempting to explain any one feature of Gen. iii., it will be wise to see the chapter as a whole, and to indicate the trend of its argument, which trend is best visualized by noting the literary structure of the passage.

|   |  |   |   |         |
|---|--|---|---|---------|
| A |  | 1-5. The SERPENT (cf. "living creature", verse 1).<br>Procuring man's downfall.       | \ |         |
|   |  |   | \ |         |
| B |  | 6. Tree of knowledge.   | \ |         |
| C |  | 7. Human covering—LEAVES  | / | SATAN.  |
| D |  | 8-13. God's enquiry of the man and the woman.   | / |         |
| E |  | 14. <i>Serpent</i> cursed.  | / |         |
| E |  | 15. <i>Seed</i> promised.   | \ |         |
| D |  | 16-19. God's answer to the man and the woman.   | \ |         |
| C |  | 21. Divine covering—SKIN.   | \ | CHRIST. |
| B |  | 22-24-. Tree of life.   | / |         |
| A |  | -24. The CHERUBIM (cf. "living creature", Ezek. i. 5)<br>Pledge of man's restoration. | / |         |

In his first epistle, John declares that Christ was manifested (1) to take away our sins, and (2) that He might destroy the works of the devil (I John iii. 5, 8).

We assume, it will be observed, that "The Serpent" is the Devil, but we must not forget the Berean attitude which is commended by the Lord. We therefore examine the Scriptures to see if this is "so". In the summing up of the six days creation found in Gen. i. 31, we read "And God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good". If the Serpent of Gen. iii. belonged to the six days creation, then it was included in the "everything" that was "very good". But as the teaching of Scripture consistently affirms that this Serpent is evil, we are forced to the conclusion that it belonged to a previous creation, associated with the judgment indicated in Gen. i. 2 and is represented as an intrusion into the state of affairs indicated in Gen. ii. It is the last book of the Bible, the book that corresponds with Genesis, the first book of the Bible, that contains the explicit statement:

"That old serpent, called the Devil and Satan."  
 "That old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan" (Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2).

The word “old” does not refer to the age of the serpent, the Greek word *archaios* takes us back to the “beginning” *arche*. The serpent of antiquity is the Devil. He belongs to the “old world” (II Pet. ii. 5) the “old” creation (II Cor. v. 17). It will be noted further, that the Scriptures are not content merely to say that the serpent is the Devil, and that the serpent is Satan, but that both titles are employed together. Now “Satan” is Hebrew, and is found in Job i. 6; Psa. cix. 6; Zech iii. 1, 2 and is brought over into the N.T. where it is mentioned thirty-six times. That Paul believed and taught that the old serpent was the devil and Satan we can discover by reading his epistles:

“But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty.”  
“Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light” (II Cor. xi. 3, 14).

The Devil is the N.T. title and is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word Satan. The reader must distinguish between the title “Devil” in the singular, which is the Greek *diabolos*, and “devils” in the plural, which should in every case be translated “demons”.

Returning to Gen. iii. 1 we note that the serpent is spoken of as being more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. This at first sight is a difficulty. How can a mighty spirit, as the devil and Satan is set forth in the Scriptures, be compared with a beast of the field? We learn that after Judas Iscariot had received the sop at the table, that “Satan entered into him” (John xiii. 27). We discover that fallen angels “left their own habitation” (Jude 6) and that this word “habitation” is the Greek *oiketerion*, a word used of the resurrection body of the believer “our house from heaven” (II Cor. v. 2). Not only so, we read that when angels appeared to men, they were almost always in the form of men, so much so that Abraham prepared for them a meal (Gen. xviii. 2) to which the Apostle alludes when urging the entertaining of strangers, saying:

“For thereby some have entertained angels unaware” (Heb. xiii. 2).

For the purpose of deception, Satan selected the most subtil of the creatures that God had made, invested himself in that animal’s body, invaded the sanctity of the Garden, and inveigled our first parents into the disobedience and sin.

Referring to the structure of Gen. iii., we note that it opens and closes with two peculiar references. It opens with the devil inhabiting the form of a serpent, and it closes with the cherubim, which are elsewhere described as having the form of a man, a lion, an ox and an eagle, creatures unknown except by revelation, and evidently symbolic. The word translated “serpent” is the Hebrew word *nachash* which means “shining” and “brazen”.

It will be remembered that when the people of Israel were bitten by serpents, Moses was commanded to make a “serpent of brass” where the Hebrew words are *nachash nechoseth* (Numb. xxi. 9). This was afterward destroyed by Hezekiah, because of the idolatrous practices of Judah, calling it *nehushtain* “a piece of brass”. In a slightly different form *nachash* is translated “enchantment” and “to divine” (Lev. xix. 26; Gen. xlv. 5), and is associated with witchcraft, familiar spirits, necromancy, and

other abominations associated with spiritism and intercourse with evil spirits (Deut. xviii. 10-12).

The one purpose which Satan had in thus appearing to Eve in the garden was to deceive, to destroy and to gain a hold upon the newly created world that had come into being, supplant Adam the type, and Christ the anti-type, and become "The prince of this world" and "the god of this age" (John xvi. 11; II Cor. iv. 4). To us today, the appearance of such a sight, the speaking of such an animal, would not only startle us, but raise suspicion in our minds, but we must remember, Adam and Eve were a pair of innocents, suddenly awake in a world of wonders, where experience was no criterion as to what could or could not be expected.

As we have said, this *nachash*, this shining one, is balanced at the close of Gen. iii., by the cherubim. We must devote a complete article to the reason why the cherubim were thus placed at the East of the garden, and what these strange beings signify.

We close this article with a quotation from the prophet Ezekiel, whose prophecy opens (Ezek. i.-x.), closes (Ezek. xliii.), and deals in the middle (Ezek. xxviii.) with cherubim. The passage we quote is Ezek. xxviii. 12-19, to which we must return in a later article. We commend it to the meditation of our readers in preparation for future examination.

"Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.

Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.

Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.

Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.

By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.

Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: and I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee.

Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffic; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, and it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee.

All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee: thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more" (Ezek. xxviii. 12-19).

**No.10. Genesis iii. (2) The Cherubim.**  
**pp. 68 - 70**

We have already seen that the serpent of Gen. iii. 1 is placed in correspondence with the cherubim of Gen. iii. 24, both being animal forms invested with supernatural powers and associations. We shall discover that whereas the serpent procured Adam's loss of Paradise and deprived him of both life and dominion, the Cherubim, together with the flaming sword, are given as a pledge that Paradise shall be restored, dominion and life preserved and finally enjoyed. To explore this theme with any fullness demands a volume, and even the Apostle said when dealing with the cherubim "of which we cannot now speak particularly". This series is expressly prepared for those who are comparatively young in the faith, consequently much that could be said must be omitted, and only those essential features that will make an immediate contribution must be included.

The reader was asked in the preceding article to read Ezek. xxviii. 12-19. The serpent's words of Gen. iii. 5 are echoed in the blasphemous aspiration of the prince of Tyrus "thou hast said, I am a God" (Ezek. xxviii. 2), and will be found to have a bearing on the purpose and place of the cherubim. The King of Tyrus (Ezek. xxviii. 12, 13) can be *no son of Adam*. Of no man since the fall, can it be said that he sealed up the sum full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. This "king" had been in Eden, the garden of God (Ezek. xxviii. 13), and if we keep strictly to the record, we have four, and four only of whom this is true: Adam, Eve, the Serpent and the Lord.

Adam and Eve are obviously not intended here. Neither can the Lord be intended, for "iniquity" was found in this mysterious "king" and moreover he was for all his greatness a "created" being (Ezek. xxviii. 15). Only one of the four is left, namely "the serpent", the *nachash*, the shining one, and what a "shining one" is suggested by the description of Ezek. xxviii. 13! where nine precious stones, including the diamond, the sapphire and the emerald are said to be his covering. This mysterious king of Tyrus is named and his high office indicated.

"Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth: and I have set thee SO: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God."

The word "anointed" gives us the O.T. title "The Messiah" and the N.T. title "The Christ". Here we have a mighty being who was *the Lord's anointed*, who fell, and became the adversary (Satan) of both God and of man whom God had made in His image and likeness.

There is considerable difference of opinion regarding the meaning of the Hebrew word *cherub*. The word never occurs as a verb, and so we are deprived of an important means of discovering its meaning. *Rab* means whatever is great. "It is the formal name of magnificence or majesty or dominion", says Marius de Calasio. The Hebrew particle *ki* includes "likeness" and suggests the emblematic character of the cherubim, which

word could mean “like the greatness” or “like the majesty” or “like the dominion”. This last meaning could comprehend, not only the glorious majesty of the Lord that *was usurped* by Satan, but the delegated dominion given to Adam, which *was lost*. When Adam at his expulsion from the garden saw the cherubim “tabernacled” (as the word “placed” is literally), he saw a composite emblematic creature, with the face of a man, a lion, an ox and an eagle (see Ezek. i. 10), and in that emblem he saw himself (the man) and the dominion he had lost (the animal creation) which according to Psa. viii. 6-8 and Paul’s application of the words “all things under His feet”, look *back* to the type, Adam, and *forward* to the great antitype, Christ, pledging in Christ, the restoration of the dominion that had been lost, and associating that restoration with redemption (the Tabernacle and the flaming sword).

Without going into details, the following list of occurrences indicates the epochs in which the cherubim appear in the Scriptures. It must be remembered that “the four beasts” of the book of the Revelation are the same as the cherubim of the O.T. as a comparison with Ezek. i.-x. will prove.

### THE CHERUBIM IN THE SCRIPTURES

- (1) Ezek. xxviii. In Eden. Profaned, cast out. Anointed.
- (2) Gen. iii. In Eden. The pledge of life and restoration.
- (3) Exodus. The tabernacle and the covenant.
- (4) Kings. The glory and the temple.
- (5) Ezekiel. The glory departing and then returning.
- (6) The Revelation. Paradise restored. Restoration.

It will be seen that the anointed cherub of Ezek. xxviii. refers to a period that lies before the creation of Adam. This mighty being by aspiring to some measure of equality with God, fell, and when he in the guise of the serpent tempted Eve, he used the same blasphemous aspiration as the bait, “ye shall be as God”. The tabernacling of the cherubim at the east of the garden was a pledge to fallen Adam that the dominion lost by sin would be restored. The references to Exodus, the book of Kings and the opening and closing chapters of Ezekiel, relate the cherubim with Israel. The fact that both in the Tabernacle in the wilderness and in the Temple in the land the cherubim are found in the holiest of all, shows that this pledge of restoration is vitally associated with atoning blood; the whole purpose is redemptive. Ezekiel shows the departing and the returning glory linked with the cherubim, and the references in the book of Revelation to the four “beasts” (literally “living ones” or “living creatures”) lead on to Paradise restored in Rev. xxii.

As we survey this list of references, two things press for attention. Why are there SIX sets of references? The whole purpose of redemption since the seven days of Gen. i., the Jubilee with its 7\*7 years, the great prophecy of Dan. ix. with its 70\*7 years, seems to demand that these epochs of cherubim reference should also fall into line. Yet there is no reference in the N.T. apart from the Revelation that supplies the gap, if gap there be. Again, the anointed cherub that sinned, seems to demand a corresponding reference to Christ, the Lord’s Anointed Who was without sin, Who, in contrast with the fallen one of

Ezek. xxviii., “thought it not robbery to be equal with God”. Yet it hardly seems right to class the Son of God with the cherubim. We remember however that there are four Gospels, not three or two, and that these four gospels have distinctive points of view thus:

- |            |                |                    |
|------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1. Matthew | The King       | Symbol: The LION.  |
| 2. Mark    | The Servant    | Symbol: The OX.    |
| 3. Luke    | The Man        | Symbol: The MAN.   |
| 4. John    | The Son of God | Symbol: The EAGLE. |

These characteristics have been considered with some care and illustrated by a drawing in a booklet entitled “The Four Gospels” which can be obtained from Mr. L. A. Canning.

When we realize that the fourfold presentation of the Saviour is God’s countermove to undo the works of the Devil, we find that we have, not only our perfect number of references, SEVEN, but also a complete structure of the whole series. The humility of the Son of God being the answer to the pride of the Anointed Cherub.

### **THE CHERUBIM**

A | The ANOINTED. His pride and fall.

B | Paradise LOST.

C | Tabernacle and wilderness.

Temple and Land.

Glory and Return.

A | The ANOINTED. His humility and triumph.

B | Paradise RESTORED.

Having considered the beginning of the redemptive purpose Gen. iii. 1, and its glorious close presented in symbol in Gen. iii. 24, we can now return to the story of man’s fall, God’s provision and promise, and follow with wandering faith the battle and the triumph, the promise and its consequences, that foreshadow both the cross and the crown in this great chapter of Gen. iii.

**No.11. Genesis iii. (3) The Temptation.**  
**pp. 135 - 140**

No statement is made in Gen. iii. to inform us as to the apparent absence of Adam. We do not know whether he was present or absent, all we know is that the Serpent addressed himself to the woman.

“Yea, hath God said?” “Can it really be?” (Rotherham).  
“Can it be true?” (Young).

This is the tempter’s opening gambit—to sow the seed of doubt. The first temptation recorded in the O.T. was presented in a garden of plenty, the first recorded in the N.T. was presented in a wilderness of want, but the opening words reveal the same line of approach: “If Thou be the Son of God.”

The stress should be placed on the word “every” when reading Gen. iii. 1:

“Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of EVERY tree of the garden?”,

the insinuation being that God was withholding something, that He was niggardly and He was depriving them of something good. The truth could have been expressed by placing the emphasis thus:

“What a lovely garden, every possible need so freely and fully supplied, nothing withheld that love and wisdom can grant, and only one small reservation in the midst of this prodigal supply, must surely indicate a loving protection, rather than a heartless and meaningless prohibition.”

But such an approach was not in line with the tempter’s attack. The woman had learned about the tree of knowledge of good and evil through her husband, Adam, and he had received the communication direct from the Lord. We place the words of the Lord and the reply of Eve together for comparison.

*The Words of the Lord.* “Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Gen. ii. 16, 17).

*The reply of Eve.* “We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die” (Gen. iii. 2, 3).

We note the omission of the word “freely” which plays into the tempter’s hand a little. We learn from Gen. ii. 9 that the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, but we are uncertain from the wording whether the tree of knowledge was in the midst or not. Eve said that it was, and we must give her the benefit of the doubt. The words “neither shall ye touch it are not found in the Divine commandment but may have been an added precaution suggested by Adam for their safety, and if so need not be quoted against her.

“Lest ye die” however is a serious understatement; the words “thou shalt surely die” allowing no room for doubt. It is looked upon as a form of spiritual bondage by some to keep to the letter of the Word, but it would have meant salvation to Eve had she kept rigidly to what God had said. Satan is a master at double dealing, and Shakespeare has put into the mouth of Macbeth some sentiments that we would all do well to heed:

“I pull in resolution and begin  
To doubt the equivocation of the fiend,  
THAT LIES LIKE TRUTH . . . . And be these  
juggling fiends no more believed  
That palter with us in a DOUBLE SENSE;  
That keep the word of promise to our ear,  
And break it to our hope.”

One has but to observe the like sounding names in the line of Cain and in the line of Seth, to be conscious of an attempt to deceive. In both is a son named Enoch, and Jude is careful when he makes his reference to define Enoch as “the seventh from Adam”. Both lines have a Lamech, the one boasting of his 70\*7, the other living until 777 years, and illustrations could be multiplied. Paul complained of those who preached another “Jesus”, and another “Gospel” in immediate sequence to the references to the beguiling by the Serpent of Eve (II Cor. xi. 3, 4). We are therefore well advised to note the reply of Eve to this initial temptation, and to resolve by grace to treat the very words of Scripture with reverence and care. However slight the change of wording, the Serpent apparently realized the success of his opening in the way in which the woman replied, for his next words are clear, emphatic and without equivocation or paltering in a double sense, “ye shall not surely die”.

Here the issues are plain, the Serpent’s words are a complete denial of the Word of God. Whether the words of the Devil were intended to lay the foundation of a doctrine or not, there has certainly arisen a system of teaching which denies the fact and the reality of death. Spiritism definitely affirms that there is no death, and alas many Protestant and Evangelical systems of Theology, by the introduction of the Philosophy of the natural immortality of the soul, deny both the realities of death and the essential necessity of the resurrection. This is not all however. The denial of the reality of death was but a bridge to a bolder assertion:

“For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.”

Again we have in these words “the equivocation of the fiend, that lies like truth”. It is written before this chapter closes:

“And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become AS ONE OF US, *to know good and evil.*”

But at what a price. “And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life and eat, and LIVE FOR EVER; therefore the Lord God sent him forth . . . .” (Gen. iii. 22, 23). The words “ye shall be as gods” are given in the R.V. “ye shall be as

God” the word *Elohim* being exactly the same in the opening of verse five “for God” as in the close “as God”. That “God” not “gods” is intended, Gen. iii. 22 bears its testimony.

In article No.7 of this series, a word or two has been given on the words “good and evil” to which the reader’s attention is drawn should he feel in need of a further gleam of light on a difficult subject. The consequences of disobedience to the Divine prohibition were immediately manifest. Their eyes were indeed “opened”. They “knew” but what they knew produced shame and a sense of guilt. In the process something that belonged to innocence had been forfeited. “They knew that they were naked.”

Here is a pair of innocents, tricked into disobedience, lured into the belief that they were being cheated of their due, whereas, it is clear from Heb. v. 14 that the knowledge of good and evil would most surely have been given to them, after a period had elapsed, when being “perfect” and “of full age” and having their “senses exercised”, they would have advanced as knowledge kept pace with responsibility. This “short cut” is not only evident in Gen. iii., it re-appears in the temptation of Matt. iv. 8, 9 and it underlies that other and similar temptation “let us do evil that good may come”.

### **THE CONFLICT OF THE AGES (Gen. iii. 15)**

We now approach the centre or the heart of this great chapter, the portion that contains the great primeval promise, namely Gen. iii. 15. The guilty pair are addressed individually, first Adam, then his wife and finally, the Serpent.

#### GENESIS iii. 7 - 21

- A | 7-11. They made themselves aprons.
- B | 12. The Man, I did eat.
- C | 13. The Woman, I did eat.
- D | 14. The Serpent cursed.
- D | 15. The Serpent enmity.
- C | 16. The Woman. Sorrow in conception.
- B | 17-19. The Man. Thorns, thistles, sweat.
- A | 20, 21. The Lord God made them coats of skins.

Not only does the subject matter fall into this obvious correspondence but the section it will be observed is divided into two parts. In the first half which ends with the curse upon the serpent, there is no hint of Redemption. The guilty man and woman could expect nothing but death, as already announced in Gen. ii. 17. With the opening of the second half comes the promise of the Seed of the Woman Who should bruise the serpent’s head. Instead of hearing the sentence of death pronounced, the man and his wife hear of childbirth, and of cultivating the soil, until some distant date when they would return to the dust from which they had been taken. True, conception and childbirth was to be accompanied by sorrow, and the equality of Eve with her husband suffered a reduction in status “he shall rule over thee”; true the soil that was to produce bread, would also bring forth thorns and thistles, and sweat of face. True, the food thus

provided would not make those who partook of it “eat and live for ever” yet, in spite of all this limitation, the curse, the sorrow and the toil, verses 16-19 constitute a reprieve, and this is justified by reason of the fact hitherto unrevealed, that Christ had been verily foreordained as a Lamb without blemish, and this reprieve is further justified by the symbolic clothing of the guilty pair with coats of skin. In all this there is wondrous truth expressed in word and in symbol, that demands our attention.

First let us consider the two coverings that were provided: the first by man himself, the second by God. Sin evidently needs a covering, for although the aprons of fig leaves were entirely inadequate, the Lord did not do something entirely different, He simply provided a covering that conformed to His own conception of what was adequate. The sense of shame, the attempt to propitiate God or gods, is well nigh universal. However crude or cultured the attempt may be, the sense of need is right, even though the method employed is wrong.

Herein we meet a vital principle that we do well to keep well before us. The whole scheme of Redemption, while confessedly the sole work of God, is nevertheless in harmony with the deepest convictions of the human heart, and faith will never make demands that the conscience must condemn, and that reason, when uninfluenced by sin and mortality, would reject. Adam and Eve knew that they needed a covering. God also agreed that this was so, the difference being that man made aprons of leaves provided a covering of sorts, but the coats of skin, not only provided a complete covering, but did so at the cost of life laid down. The word translated “apron” is usually rendered by the word “girdle”. This apron or girdle is sometimes of sackcloth, sometimes of linen, sometimes for the hanging of a sword, and is used many times in the phrase “gird up the loins”. In fact in Ezek. xxiii. 15 where we read “girded with girdles”, the second word is *ezor* “loin cloth”. Adam and his wife made a temporary covering out of a newly-developed sense of shame; God made “coats” of “skins” and covered not only one part of the body, but the whole of it.

The Hebrew word *kethoneth*, “coats”, in Gen. iii. 21, tunic, long coat, is used of the coats worn by the sons of Aaron. Is there a suggestion that the guilty pair, thus covered, were not only forgiven, but granted even fuller access than before? The word *kethoneth* occurs eight times in Genesis, the seven other occurrences than Gen. iii. 21 referring to the coat of many colours given to Joseph by Jacob his father, thereby marking him off as the firstborn and priest of the family! While Adam and his wife lay under the expectation of death, innocent animals were slain, thereby providing the first of a long series of types setting forth the basic truth that without shedding of blood is no remission.

The first recorded death in Genesis was the death of substitutionary victims which took place 930 years before Adam, who had been condemned, actually died. The same wondrous doctrine is set forth in Exod. xii., when at the Passover we read “there was not a house where there was not one dead” (Exod. xii. 30), the only difference between Israel and the Egyptians being, that in the house of the Egyptians, it was the firstborn that was dead, and in the house of Israel it was a lamb. Many other details could well occupy

our time and study, but we have limitations, and so pass to the great primeval promise Gen. iii. 15:

“I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel.”

In this prophetic promise lies concealed the conflict of the ages, the death of the cross, the triumph of the Saviour at the end, and the presence of two seeds. On the first day of creation God had divided the light from the darkness (Gen. i. 4), so now He divides the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, “I will put enmity”. This word translated “put” occurs next in Gen. iv. 25 where we read “God . . . . hath *appointed* me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew”. In the slaying of Abel we have the conflict of the two seeds set forth, anticipating by 4,000 years the death of Christ, whose blood speaketh better things than that of Abel. Cain “was of that wicked one”, the fruit of the Serpent’s seed.

The word enmity is the translation of the Hebrew *ebah* spelled in Hebrew aleph, yod, beth, he. Enemy is *oyeb*, aleph, yod, beth, and the name of the patriarch Job is spelled aleph, yod, vav, beth. Moses was inspired to use the same word in Gen. iii. 15 for enmity, that he employed when writing the prelude to the book of Job\* (\* - See the Booklet “*Job, or the Enigma of the Ages*”). While the seed of the woman thus spoken of in this great promise speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ, we must never forget that it includes also the true seed, those who were to be ultimately delivered from the authority of darkness. This we can prove by referring to Rom. xvi. 20. When Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, Christ had died, been buried, had risen again, ascended, and was at the time of writing seated at the right hand of the Father “from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool”. Yet Paul could write to the believers in Rome:

“The God of peace shall BRUISE SATAN UNDER YOUR FEET shortly”  
(Rom. xvi. 20).

This is conclusive evidence that in Gen. iii. 15 Christ and His people are indicated by the woman’s seed, and Satan and his followers are indicated by the Serpent’s seed. We will return to this most vital teaching of Scripture later, but at the moment we must continue our examination of the terms used in Gen. iii. 15. When we read of the bruising of the head and of the heel, our thoughts naturally travel to Isa. liii., where the Saviour is set forth as “bruised for our iniquities” and where it is written “it pleased the Lord to bruise Him”. We must however recognize that something different is intended in Gen. iii. 15, if only because the word there translated “bruise” is peculiar. In Isa. liii. 5, 10 the Hebrew word is *daka*, but in Gen. iii. 15 the Hebrew used is *shuph*, and whether we understand the meaning of the two words or not, it is evident on the surface, that they spring from entirely different roots. *Shuph* occurs elsewhere only in Job and the Psalms:

“He *breaketh* me with a tempest” (Job ix. 17).  
“Surely the darkness shall *cover* me” (Psa. cxxxix. 11).

The figure is of overwhelming tempest and darkness, anticipating once again that which the Saviour Himself said was the hour and the power of darkness. The word reappears in Gen. xlix. 17 in a duplicated form. *Shephiphon* “Dan shall be a *serpent* by the way (*nachash* as in Gen. iii. 1, the only other chapter in Genesis where *nachash* is used), an adder (*shephiphon*, derived from the same word that is translated ‘bruise’ in Gen. iii. 15), that biteth the horses heels (*aqeb* the word translated ‘heel’ in Gen. iii. 15), so that his rider shall fall backward”.

Here we have light upon the wording of this great primeval promise. Many expositors have turned to the story of the heel of Achilles, in illustration of this figure, but it is well to remember that Achilles was unknown when the promise was made in Eden, and is evidently a Greek adaptation of the original record. The references to the “heel” (Heb. *aqab*) and “to supplant” or “take by the heel” (Heb. *aqab*) are interesting. The two other references to the heel in Genesis are xxv. 26, where we read of Jacob, that his hand took hold on Esau’s heel, and Gen. xlix. 19 where it is translated “at the last” in the sentence “he shall overcome at the last”; which the R.V. renders “he shall press upon their heel”. This last reference it will be noted is in the vicinity of the reference to the adder and the heel already considered.

In the light of these passages, Gen. iii. 15 seems to say that the conflict of the two seeds, and pre-eminently between Satan and Christ, will be intense, overwhelming as with darkness and tempest; that the attack of the serpent will be like that of the adder that biteth the horses heels, and the emphasis upon the idea of supplanting that the heel-catcher indicates, gives further light upon the intention of the Serpent both in his attack in Eden and down the ages. He is, in intention, the great Supplanter. The head is the vulnerable part of a snake, but the Saviour in giving this fatal blow, receives one almost as deadly. He must be bruised in the heel who attacks this *shephiphon*, this *nachash*, this adder. In the light of Rom. xvi. 20, and of the book of the Revelation we can rejoice that ultimate victory is assured.

## No.12 MISSING

**No.13. “He shall see His seed.”**  
**pp. 176 - 180**

We now arrive at the necessity to concentrate our attention upon a most vital theme, and to this we now address ourselves.

In all our published studies we have sought either to exhibit the one all embracing purpose of the ages, or to indicate by more detailed study, the subsidiary doctrines that pertain to the unfolding dispensations. From one angle we believe that the suggestion put forward in an earlier study is a true one, that the whole of the Bible and its unfolding purpose can be visualized in terms of the Jubilee, an institution in Israel that emphasizes the sabbatic time periods of the great unfolding, and the emancipation, and restoration as its goal. From another angle we have seen that the one all embracing purpose of the ages can be expressed in the words of the Apostle “the end . . . . that God may be all in all” (I Cor. xv. 24-28), and that “conformity to the image of His Son” is an essential feature in that consummation.

Our studies in the book of Job have brought into prominence not only the conflict of the two seeds so dramatically therein portrayed, but have compelled us to perceive that in understanding of what is involved and implied by the “Seed” as it pertains to Christ Himself, to the believer, and to the false seed of the Serpent, as revealed in both O.T. promise and in N.T. fulfillment will also shed great light upon the purpose of the ages. To this investigation therefore let us apply ourselves, praying that all our studies may be conducted in the conscious Presence of the Author of both Revelation and Salvation.

Our first investigation must be into the words employed. We observe that the word “seed” as found in the A.V. is a translation of either the Hebrew words *zera* or *perudoth*, or the Greek words *sperma*, *sporos*, *spora* or *speiro*. *Perudoth*, “the seed is rotten under their clods” (Joel i. 17) need not disdain us; it is derived from the Hebrew word *parad*, “to be separated or scatter”, and does not occur elsewhere. The word *zera* is the word we must consider both in its primitive meaning and in its usage. This word is derived from *zara* “to spread or scatter” as in Zech x. 9 “I will sow them among the people”. In two passages, *zera* is translated “child” (Lev. xxii. 13; I Sam. i. 11), but the most frequent translation of the word is “seed”. It enters into the composition of the name Jezreel, “sown of God” (Hos. i. 4).

The word “seed” is used in the Scripture of man, of beast and of plant. We meet the word “seed” in the first chapter of Genesis, where the substantive occurs six times, and the participle, translated “bearing” and “yielding” in relation to seed, three times.

“The herb ‘seeding seed’ and the fruit tree yielding fruit, after his kind, whose seed is in itself” (Gen. i. 11).

In the first case, this is a statement of material fact, but the record of Gen. i. has more in it than the record of material creation. Paul’s use of Gen. i. 2, 3 in II Cor. iv. 6 “for

God, Who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts” is an indication that this record subserves spiritual purpose.

We are therefore prepared to find that what is said of the seed of “herb” and of “fruit trees” will be also true of “the seed” in its highest and spiritual sense.

Three items of interest call for notice.

The expression “yielding seed”, or as it is literally “seeding seed”, brings before us the initial fact that a succession, a progeny is in view.

The statement “after its kind” assures us that the continuance or succession preserves its relationship and likeness to the parent seed. Intermixture is apparently disallowed.

“Whose seed is in itself” further impresses us with the bounds that are set, and which are not to be transgressed.

These features are true of plants and of animals, but when we learn, as we shall when reading Gen. iii., that there is One, Who is called The Seed of the Woman, Who is in conflict with another seed, the seed of the serpent, these statements take upon themselves a deeper significance. The power and purpose of a seed to continue the line, and its relation to the creation of man “made for a little lower than the angels” should be noted. So far as we know, angels are separate creations, “they neither marry nor are given in marriage”, and have no seed. Adam, by his creation, was allied to the animal world in that he could be the father of a succeeding race, and so distinct from the angelic world, where progeny is unknown. In this, the Scripture suggests that he was a figure of Him that was to come, the second Man and the last Adam, who in a higher and spiritual sense was to “see His seed”.

Unlike the angels, all men are derived from a common ancestor, and are made of “one blood”, and the teaching of Rom. v. shows that Adam and Christ stand as type to antitype and that “as by one man’s disobedience many were constituted sinners so by the obedience of One shall many be constituted righteous”. Mankind are organically one as the angels never could be.

When Seth was born, his mother called his name Seth, “for God, said she, hath appointed me ‘another seed’ instead of Abel, whom Cain slew” (Gen. iv. 25). Here we have reference to both the attack upon the true seed, and to its preservation. The Ark was prepared by Noah at the command of God with the express purpose of keeping seed alive upon the face of all the earth (Gen. vii. 3) and the destruction of all flesh by the flood is intimately connected with the abnormal alliance of the sons of God, with the daughters of men, and their resulting hybrid progeny, the seed of the serpent. With Noah’s seed, preserved in the Ark, the covenant of Gen. ix. 9 was made.

The next reference to a seed is that of Gen. xii. 7 where the promise of God to Abraham is expressed in the one sentence “unto thy seed will I give this land”. The Bible record is one of conflict, and this conflict is between two seeds, the establishment of the line through which that seed should come, namely that of the descendants of Shem, and the family of Abraham, occupies the bulk of the O.T. Scriptures. Ishmael is passed by and Isaac is chosen, Esau is set aside and Jacob chosen. Of the sons of Jacob, Judah is

chosen, and of Judah, the family of David, and so on unto the birth of Christ at Bethlehem. We are however conscious that in thus stating the case, we have narrowed our survey down to One, namely Christ, whereas it is perfectly clear from Scripture that the seed of Abraham was to be multiplied as the stars of heaven and as the sand of the sea shore. We must return accordingly to Gen. iii., where the great prophecy concerning the Seed of the Woman is recorded and consider it closely.

It is however impossible to hope to arrive at any clear understanding of the import of Gen. iii. 15 if we do not see its relation with the surrounding context. We must go back at least to Gen. ii. 18-20 where we read that the animals were caused to pass before Adam who named them all, yet, adds the passage “for Adam there was not found an help meet for him”. Common and uncritical usage has introduced into our language the word “helpmeet” which first being improperly hyphenated, then became taken to mean “help-mate”. This however does not fully express the truth intended. True, the wife is a help-mate, but the intention of Gen. ii. 18 goes deeper. The Hebrew reads *ezer* “help”, *ki* “as”, and *neged* “the front part, the front of a thing next to the speaker, before, in the presence of, over against” (*Gesenius*).

The LXX translates these words, once by *kat’auton* “according to him”, and *homoios auto* “like to himself”. Here it is insisted that the principle already enunciated “after its kind” operates in the matter of man and marriage. The process whereby the woman was brought to man illustrates the principle “whose seed is in itself”. Man by his constitution is called a being that “breathes”: “And the Lord God . . . . breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Gen. ii. 7). “All in whose nostrils was the breath of life” (Gen. vii. 22). With this we should remember the word translated “rib” is in the LXX rendered by the word *pleura* and is associated with the lungs and breathing. Woman was evidently, like the seed in the plant “after its kind”. Adam looked upon the woman brought to him as a help meet for him and said “This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh”, and Jacobs, in the *Anthologia Palatina*, shows that the Greek word *pleura* was used for “a wife”. The progeny of such a pair must be unmixed and “after its kind”. Another matter of importance is the evident relation of Gen. ii. 25 with iii. 1. In both verses a word derived from the Hebrew word *arom* is found. In Gen. ii. 25 it is translated “naked”, and the spelling of the Hebrew word can be shown in English as *arohm*, and in iii. 1 it is translated “subtil”, the spelling of the Hebrew word in English being *aroom*. In the first occurrence the primitive meaning of nudity is retained; in the second the secondary meaning to be cunning or crafty in a bad sense is added.

The figure of the seed is however not quite out of mind, although to the modern and Western reader there is nothing to call up the idea of “seed” in these words. When the word takes the feminine form in the plural *aremah*, it is then translated “heap of corn” (Ruth iii. 7), and this because the corn was “naked” or stripped of husk and straw, the threshing being done on the spot. To this the Apostle refers in I Cor. xv. 37 when speaking of the resurrection body as “bare grain”. Here the word translated is *gumnos* “naked” and so translated in connection with resurrection in II Cor. v. 3 “We shall not be found *naked*”. Adam and his wife were “bare grain”, stripped of all that is suggested

by “chaff” or “husk”. Bare or naked grain was grain or seed *ready for sowing*, ready to be “fruitful and multiply”.

We are reminded in I Cor. xv. moreover that “to every seed its own body” is a principle as true in the spiritual reality of resurrection as it is in the physical creation. The body of the believer, like the body of Adam is at first “natural” and afterward in resurrection “spiritual”, for, “there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body”. The natural body is that which we receive from “the first man Adam”, the spiritual body we receive from “the second Man, the Lord from heaven, the last Adam”.

This association of the believer with Adam and with Christ, and the two bodies that are in view, is embraced in the figure of the “image”.

“As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly” (I Cor. xv. 49).

The over-reaching subtlety of the serpent, while plunging man into sin and death, opened the door for the Redemptive purposes of God to operate, and symbolically and by redemption man was “clothed upon” before being expelled from the Garden, anticipating the fully clothed condition which will be attained only in resurrection. It is to be noted with worship and wonder, that the Hebrews word translated “skin” is a derivative of the word “naked”, and differs only from the Hebrew word for “naked” by the absence of the final letter “*m*”, skin being “*ar*”, naked being “*arum*”. Before this clothing of the nakedness of the man and his wife took place, the promise of the Coming Seed is given:

“I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel” (Gen. iii. 15).

With the light we have received in this preparatory study, let us approach this great central prophecy with chastened hearts, yet with exultant spirits, for here lies enshrined the purpose of the ages, its conflict and its ultimate triumph.

**No.14. Light on the purpose from Heb. ii.  
pp. 191 - 194**

The second chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews is necessarily an integral part of the epistle, and the interpretation of this chapter or any one verse in it cannot be attempted without due regard to the purpose of the epistle and its structure as a whole. Acknowledging this, we would nevertheless draw the reader's attention to several elements of truth that emerge from a study of this chapter:

- (1) Angels evidently had some form of rule or jurisdiction in the past, but are not to hold a similar role in "the world to come" (Heb. ii. 5).
- (2) Immediately following this statement is a quotation from Psa. viii. concerning man who was made "for a little lower than the angels" who was a shadow or type of the Lord, "the last Adam" (ii. 6-9).
- (3) Something connected with the nature of Adam leads the Apostle to dwell upon the "oneness" that has been established between the Redeemer and the redeemed, "all of one", "brethren", "Behold I and the children which God hath given Me", "flesh and blood . . . . He Himself likewise took part of the same" (ii. 11-15).
- (4) Immediately following this statement is the comment "For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham" (ii. 16).

The earlier rule of angels that is in mind in Heb. ii. 5 is connected with the law as is evident from verse two "For if the word spoken by angels . . . . every transgression and disobedience" and the Scriptures teach that the law of Mount Sinai was administered by angels.

The epistle to the Galatians which has some features in common with Hebrews, and may have been a "covering letter" sent with that epistle says:

"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator" (Gal. iii. 19).

Stephen, also in his speech, says of Israel:

"Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it" (Acts vii. 53).

The world to come of which the Apostle speaks, will not be put in subjection to angels, but to man, who was made "for a short time" (*brachus*) "less" or "inferior" to the angels. This man Adam was a type of Him Who was to come, to whom subjection over all things foreshadowed. While the A.V. reads in Heb. ii 9 that the Saviour tasted death for "every man", the following verse is more explicit and declares that He Who thus tasted death for "all", brought many "sons" to glory. These subjects of grace are further called "brethren" and "children" and the oneness which is stressed is a oneness not only of spirit and of purpose, but of "flesh and blood", the Saviour fulfilling the dual role of the Avenger of blood and the Kinsman Redeemer, indicated by the two words "destroy"

and “deliver” (Heb. ii. 14, 15). Finally, the Apostle does not say in verse sixteen that in passing by the angels He took on Him the seed of ADAM, but that He took on Him the seed of ABRAHAM (Heb. ii. 16).

If the Saviour took not on Him the seed of Adam, then we Gentiles have no Redeemer, but we know that this is not so. Why then does the writer of this epistle limit the seed to that of Abraham? The same answer that we give to the apparent limitation in the genealogy of Matt. i. 1, will suffice here also. The presence of the genealogy of Luke iii. which goes beyond Abraham to Adam, prevents any real limitation being read into Matt. i. 1, the answer to the problem being that the purpose of Matthew was fully served by establishing the fact that the Saviour was the “Son of Abraham”, but that this did not deny or exclude the fact that He was also the Son of Man in the fullest sense, even as he is “the Second Man” and “the last Adam”. This limitation in Heb. ii. 16, however, is of extreme importance in this sense, it suggests that what happens of Israel may be looked upon as an epitome, a miniature, of that which befalls the race, and we discover that where sometimes the teaching of Scripture concerning the race may not be very explicit, it becomes so when the analogy of faith realizes the place that Israel occupy in the revelation of truth.

The rule and dominion of angels as related to Israel is limited to Sinai in Heb. ii. 1-3, but it points back to a dominion that angels exercised before the “foundation (or overthrow) of the world”. This principle of interpretation can be seen at work in the epistle to the Romans. In Rom. v. 12 the Apostle goes back to Adam and the eighth chapter which speaks not of Israel, but of creation itself that shall be delivered (Rom. viii. 20, 21), continues the theme. With the opening of Rom. ix., however, Israel dominate the argument to the end of chapter xi. It may not be possible to put one’s finger on any one text and say “that verse defines who are *in Adam*”, but the analogy of Israel’s calling makes it very clear who are meant by “all in Adam”.

For example, we can quote Rom. xi., and maintain that “ALL” Israel shall be saved, and if no reference is made to the teaching of Rom. ix., we may feel convinced that “all means all” and that this passage is universal in its embrace. The eleventh chapter however is preceded by the ninth, and *there* we are left in no doubt as to the extent of “all Israel”.

- (1) They are not all Israel who are of Israel.
- (2) Merely to prove descent from Abraham is not sufficient.
- (3) The seed are called only in Isaac.
- (4) That is to say, the children of the flesh are not the children of God, but the children of the promise, these are “counted from the seed” (Rom. ix. 6-9).

Therefore when we read “all Israel shall be saved”, it does not refer to the mere physical descendants of Abraham, for if it did, Ishmael would be included; it refers to a promise and reckoning, which later is revealed to be an “election”, an election which reckoned Jacob as the seed but excluded Esau. This principle, namely the fact that Israel presents the purpose of the ages in miniature, can be seen in the construction of the book of Genesis.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Genesis i. to x.<br><b>THE RACE</b><br>Adam to Noah<br><i>The Ark</i> | Genesis xi. to l.<br><b>THE NATION</b><br>Abraham to Joseph<br><i>The coffin</i> |
|---|--|

When Peter wrote about the world that then was being overflowed with water (II Pet. iii. 6) he may not have referred to Gen. i. 2, but to the flood in the days of Noah, but seeing that he wrote for Hebrew readers that would be quite in harmony with the Scriptural rule, the flood in the days of Noah being the background of the call of Abraham, even as the deep of Gen. i. 2 is the background of the creation of Adam. We can well believe that some readers will look somewhat askance at the way in which we have put the “ark” of Noah and the “coffin” of Joseph in correspondence.

In the N.T. the same Greek word is used of the Ark of Noah, and the Ark of the Tabernacle, namely *kibotos*, which shows that they are to be considered as similar. This word is employed for both arks in the Septuagint version. The words employed by Moses, however, differ. He uses the word *tebah* for the Ark of Noah, and the word *aron* for the Ark of the tabernacle. Parkhurst says that the word *tebah* is derived from the same root that gives us *tohu* meaning “hollow”, the word which is translated “without form” in Gen. i. 2, and that reference of itself is suggestive in linking the “deep” of the overthrow with the means of deliverance from the deluge in the days of Noah. Whether we are likely to discover the true root meaning of *tebah* is questionable, but the Scriptural use of *tebah* has a lovely human touch about it. Apart from the references in Gen. vi.-ix. this word occurs in one other passage namely in Exod. ii. 3, 5, where it is used of the ark made by the mother of Moses in which she placed her infant son:

“She took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with slime and with pitch.”

The ark made by the mother of Moses was treated with “bitumen” or “pitch” but the ark made by Noah was treated with a “covering”, the word “pitch” not being the same as that used in Exod. ii. 3. One cannot help feeling that when Moses came to write the record of the Flood he could not help remembering the little ark in which he had been entrusted to the Nile, and the choice of the same word in Gen. vi.-ix. may indicate a loving remembrance of that Hebrew mother in Egypt.

How does all this justify the correspondence with Joseph’s “coffin”? Well, the self same word *aron* that is found in Exod. xxv. and translated “ark” is the word translated “coffin” here, and had Moses not been influenced by his childhood remembrances, the N.T. and the LXX make it plain that he might well have used the word *aron* (translated “coffin”) in Gen. vi.-ix. also.

**No.15. The evident importance of the Seed  
in the unfolding purpose.  
pp. 231 - 234**

We have seen by the examination of Gen. i.-iii. that “The Seed”, its purity, its preservation and its enemies therein foreshadowed, justifies the title that has been given to these early chapters of Genesis, namely “The Seed Plot” of all Scripture. If this be admitted it will be further acknowledged that, lying at the very centre of the purpose there foreshadowed, is the dual prophecy concerning the Seed of the Woman and the seed of the Serpent (Gen. iii. 15), and that any attempt to understand or explain the purpose of the ages that fails to give a prominent place to this prophecy, must necessarily be deficient and possibly misleading. Before concentrating upon the actual terms of this prophecy let us take a large view.

The last of the prophets is Malachi, and he it is that points back to Gen. ii. and iii., and by so doing brings the teaching of the whole of the O.T. revelation to a full circle. When we open the N.T. we are confronted with a genealogy “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ” as the son of David, the son of Abraham, and in a peculiar sense the son of the woman, a son who is nevertheless Emmanuel “God with us”, and in perfect correspondence with this, on the last page of the N.T we read of Him Who is both the “Root” as well as “the Offspring of David”.

We have therefore O.T. and N.T. linked together as prophecy and fulfillment, by these four passages:

- A | Gen. i.-iii. The Seed of the Woman.
- B | Mal. ii. 10-16. The Seed of God.
- A | Matt. i. The Son of the Virgin. Emmanuel.
- B | Rev. xxii. 16. The root and offspring of David.

Let us examine this passage in Malachi.

The A.V. reads in Mal. ii. 15 “a godly seed”, but in the margin informs the reader that the Hebrew reads “a seed of God”. When the O.T. writer wished to speak of the “godly” he used the Hebrew *chasid*, a fitting word, meaning one who has received grace, and so should be gracious. Here, in Malachi, something deeper is intended and the Hebrew word *Elohim* should be translated “God” in chapter ii. 15 as it is in the six other passages where it occurs in Malachi. Malachi reproves both the priests and the people, and the first two chapters are devoted to this dual theme. It would take us too far afield to exhibit the complete structure of Malachi but a brief outline of Mal. ii. 10-16 will enable the reader to see the unity of the theme, and the essential features will be thrown into prominence.

## Malachi ii. 10 - 16

- A | 10. ONE Father ONE God. |
  - a | 10. Covenant of fathers.
  - b | 11. Treacherous dealing.
- B | 11. The daughter of a strange god.
- A | 15. ONE made Wherefore ONE? |
  - b | Treacherous dealing.
  - a | Covenant of marriage.
- B | 15. A Seed of God.

Israel's departure from their God, the dishonouring of the Covenant, the profaning of the holiness of the Lord, is associated with marriage with the daughter of a strange god, even as the purpose of God both at the creation of man, and afterwards in the separating laws of Israel indicates that He sought "a Seed of God". The law forbidding the sowing of "mingled seed" (Lev. xix. 19) had more in its intention than good husbandry, and its bearing upon the peculiar character of Israel is seen in Ezra ix. 2 and the remainder of the book, where great grief is manifested at the "mingling of the holy seed" with the people of the land. Nehemiah also spoke severely concerning this same act, instancing Solomon's sin in these things . . . . in marrying strange wives (Neh. xiii. 23-27). In the prophecy of Daniel we see very clearly that the "strange god" will be associated with the blasphemous beast of the time of the end (Dan. xi. 39), and in the forecast of Gentile dominion, Daniel reveals that at the time of the end some shall "mingle themselves with the seed of men" (Dan. ii. 43), which suggests that "as it was in the days of Noah" so shall it be at the time of the end.

To make the people of Israel aware of their profanation, the prophet Malachi leads them back to Gen. ii.:

"Did not He make one?"

Both the record of Gen. ii. 18-25, and the comment of the Saviour in Matt. xix. 4-6 stress the fact that to Adam God gave one wife. Yet, continued the prophet, this limitation was not due to any deficiency, "He had the residue of the spirit (or breath)", and could have provided Adam with a number of wives had He so intended. At marriage man and wife become "one flesh", and this holy unity is designed by God to further His purpose, He sought thereby "a Seed of God". This fact will become more evident when we are examining the teaching of Scripture concerning the seed of the serpent.

Coming to the genealogy of Matthew, we observe that it is the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham, the son of Mary, Emmanuel, God with us. In that genealogy there is a name that strikes us: it is Zorobabel (verse 12). We have already seen that the Hebrew word for "seed" is *zera* and so Zorobabel, or Zerubbabel as it is written in the O.T. speaks either of the seed or the shoot of Babel, or Confusion, or of those who were "scattered" in Babylon. It is arresting, whatever its primary meaning may be for another reason, and that is its recurrence in the genealogy of Luke iii.

Zerubbabel is called “the son of Shealtiel or Salathiel” (Ezra iii. 2, 8; Hag. i. 1; Matt. i. 12; Luke iii. 27), but in I Chron. iii. 19 he is called the son of Pedaiiah, the brother of Salathiel (17, 18). We may not know just exactly what occurred, but that something of importance happened we gather by consulting the genealogy given in Luke iii. There, we read once more of Zerobabel and Salathiel (Luke iii. 27). At first one may see nothing remarkable in this fact. Are not Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David found in both genealogies? Why should not these two men figure in both?

The answer is that David had two sons, Solomon and Nathan. The line that is pursued in Matthew’s genealogy is that *through Solomon*, but the line pursued by Luke is that *through Nathan*. Now no man can be the son of his father’s brother, and consequently when we read in Luke that Salathiel was the son of Neri who was in direct descent from Nathan, we must understand the expression to mean “son-in-law” and this is substantiated by examination of the passage:

“Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, being legally reckoned (*nomizo*) the son of Joseph, who in his turn was legally reckoned the son of Heli. Heli was the father of Mary (Dr. John Lightfoot quoting Hieros, Chagigah) and Joseph the son of Jacob (Matt. i. 16) became his son by marriage.”

There is, however, more in this genealogy than meets the eye. To illustrate our point, let us turn back to Gen. xxxvi. It is clear from verses 24 and 25 that “Anah” was a man. “He” fed his father’s asses, and was “the father” of Aholibamah.

With this knowledge let us read Gen. xxxvi. 2:

“Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite.”

To the uninstructed this reads as though “Anah” a man, is called “the daughter of Zibeon”. The truth is of course that the genealogy should read:

“Aholibamah was the daughter of her father Anah, and so Aholibamah was also the daughter of Zibeon, not that her father Anah was the daughter of Zibeon.”

So, when we read in the genealogy of the Saviour, the words “which was the son of” that recur throughout, refer always to Christ:

“Jesus (as was legally reckoned) the son of Joseph, and so the son of Heli, and at length the son of Adam and finally the son of God.”

Luke does not teach here the Adam was the son of God although this is not denied, the phrase is a continuous and unbroken succession from Jesus Christ to God His Father, Joseph at one end of the scale and Adam at the other being but human links in the chain.

Owing to the failure of Jechoniah who was written “childless”, it appears that a marriage took place uniting the line of Zerobabel through Solomon, with the line that descended from Nathan, and so to Mary the mother of the Christ, the Woman’s seed. Both Matthew and Luke speak of the virgin birth of Christ, but this is too solemn a

subject to attempt to crowd into a paragraph. We must give our attention to the teaching of Scripture regarding the Seed of Abraham, the seed of David, the bearing of Rom. xvi. 20 upon the prophecy of Gen. iii. 15, the purport of the words relative to the parable of the Sower "How then will ye know all parables?" (Mark. iv. 13), and the words of Gal. iii. 16 and 29 "Not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ"; "then are ye Abraham's seed", before the main issues of this important subject are even touched upon. These items we hope to deal with in future articles of this series.

## Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth. (Second Series).

### No.64. (22) GALATIANS.

#### Galatians iii. 13 - 20.

#### The curse of the law (iii. 13).

pp. 13 - 16

With verse thirteen, we enter a new section of the epistle, as indicated by the structure; a section denominated “Redemption”, which together with its corresponding member, iii. 24 - iv. 7 contains the only occurrences in Galatians of the word *exagorazo*.

|                      |           |   |                                |
|----------------------|-----------|---|--------------------------------|
| D   iii. 13-20.      |           | i | Exagorazo. Redeemed. Heirs.    |
|                      |           | j | Covenant prior to Law.         |
|                      | * * * * * |   |                                |
| D   iii. 24 - iv. 7. |           | j | Schoolmaster prior to Christ.  |
|                      |           | i | Exagorazo. Redeemed. Adoption. |

“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).

It has been a matter of debate among commentators of all times, as to the parties intended by the word “us”. Some have maintained that since the Gentile and his salvation is as much in view as that of the Jew, that the word “us” must comprehend them both, and that the “law” in view is not to be limited to the law given at Mount Sinai, but of that law which came into operation with Adam. The matter is of sufficient importance to justify a careful study. And first, let us observe what “law” has been in mind throughout the epistle so far. There are thirteen occurrences of *nomos* “law” in Gal. i.-iii. 13. Of this number, *nomos* occurs with the article “the” in three places, the remaining ten occurrences being *anarthrous* i.e. without an article.

Those which are *anarthrous* deal with “law” as opposed to “faith”, without exactly specifying the law of Moses. These references are Gal. ii. 16, 19, 21; iii. 2, 5, 10 (first occurrence in the verse), 11. The remaining references which speak of “the law” are:

“Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them” (Gal. iii. 10).

“And the law is not of faith” (Gal. iii. 12).

“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law” (Gal. iii. 13).

It is clear that the “curse” is specifically related to “the book of the law”, and if we continue our collection of passages we shall find that this law is dated, being given four hundred and thirty years after the promise made to Abraham (Gal. iii. 17) which (1) makes it impossible for it to refer to Adam in Eden, (2) compels us to limit the

expression to the law given by Moses. Further, the statement of verse nineteen “it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator” is a reference to Sinai as we shall see later.

Again, if the “us” of Gal. iii. 13 refers to all men both Jew and Gentile, it should have sufficed in verse fourteen to have written:

“Christ hath redeemed US . . . . that WE might receive the blessing”—but the apostle does not so speak. He says “Christ hath redeemed US . . . . that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles”.

Primarily, the pronoun “us” in verse thirteen refers to the Jew, and only in a secondary sense does it include the Gentile, and only so if he should be so foolish to put himself under the law, which is the very heart of the controversy.

To show the utter folly of the Galatian retrogression the Apostle tells them that such is the condition of those naturally “under the law” namely Israel, that they needed to be redeemed at such a cost that the mind almost refuses to believe the statement “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us”. As we shall see when considering verses fifteen onwards, the law stood in the way of the promise; it was temporary, and imposed only for a time, whereas the promise was of a permanent character, and was made four hundred and thirty years before. It was not a covenant that made demands upon the people, but was conceived in grace, addressed to faith, “to the end the promise might be sure” as the Apostle reasons in Rom. iv. 16.

The Apostle does not say that Christ became accursed, but that He became A curse, the abstract for the concrete. This is much more forceful than saying that Christ became a person who was accursed. For the same reason, it was said that the Saviour “was made SIN for us Who knew no sin”, God having laid upon Him the iniquity of us all and to emphasize the enormity of human hostility, He said not that man is an enemy, but that “the carnal mind *is enmity* against God”.

The passage of the law referred to by Paul is found in Deuteronomy:

“And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree: his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; (for he that is hanged is accursed of God); that thy land be not defiled, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance” (Deut. xxi. 22, 23).

Some interpret the words “accursed of God” by “accursed of the judges” for the word *elohim* is translated “judges” in Exod. xxi. 6; xxii. 8, 9. Other interpretations including “an insult against God” have been put forward, and the omission of the words “of God” by the Apostle when quoting the O.T. may have been in order to avoid any unnecessary explanation which would have made no contribution to his main argument.

The word “tree” is in the LXX and in the epistle to the Galatians; the Greek word is *xulon*. The Hebrew word used in Deut. xxi. is *ets* which, while primarily meaning a tree, is also translated “gallows” (Esther v. 14), “sticks” (Numb. xv. 32), “timber”

(II Kings xii. 12), and “wood” (Gen. vi. 14). The Hebrew word *ets* does not denote necessarily a *growing* tree, for it is associated with *atsah* to shut or fix and *etsem* “a bone”. In like manner, *xulon* is rendered in the N.T. “staves”, “sticks”, “wood” as well as “tree”. Liddell and Scott give as the meaning of *xulon*:

- (1) Wood cut and ready for use, such as fire wood.
- (2) A piece of wood, which includes “a pole, cross or gibbet”.
- (3) Live wood, a tree.
- (4) A blockhead, A block.
- (5) A measure of length—3 cubits.

The word enters into several English words, mainly of a scientific character such as xylite, xylophone, xylonite, etc., none of which have reference to a living tree. As the Roman form of gallows was either a stake or a cross, the word “tree” could be used interchangeably with *stauros*. It is noteworthy that Peter, James and John in their epistles never use the word *stauros* “cross”, neither do they use the word *stauroo*. Peter speaks of the Saviour bearing our sins in His Own body “on the tree”, but he was addressing Jewish readers. He used it in Acts v. 30 and x. 39. Paul uses it in Acts xiii. 29 when his audience was composed mainly of Jews (see the context). This avoidance of the word “cross” by the writers to the circumcision (with the two exceptions Heb. xii. 2 and Rev. xi. 8) and the fact that only to the Churches of Galatia (either in an oral address as at Antioch, or in an epistle, as in the epistle to the Galatians) does the apostle Paul use the word “tree” suggests very strongly that in Gal. iii. 10-13 he has the Jewish hearer prominently before him.

This becoming a “curse” and so removing the curse of the law, was:

“That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we (both Jews and Gentiles) might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.”

In the next verse, the Apostle turns from addressing the Jew, to the Gentile portion of the church. This is indicated by a new approach:

“Brethren, I speak after the manner of men” (Gal. iii. 15).

The argument takes a new turn; not only is the law set aside so far as salvation is concerned by the cross of Christ, but other equally cogent reasons may be given, and these he borrows from the law, not of Moses, but of the Galatians in connexion with the making of a will and the adopting of an heir.

This must occupy our attention in the next article.

**No.65. (23) GALATIANS.**  
**Galatians iii. 13 - 20.**  
**The Galatian Will (iii. 15, 16).**  
**pp. 32 - 35**

We have observed the strong Hebrew colouring of Gal. iii. 10-13, and the clearing of the way for the blessing of Abraham to come on the Gentiles through faith, apart from the law and its works. Gal. iii. 15-20 is occupied with a further argument to show how completely the law is set aside in the Gospel, and this appeals not to the Jew or to Jewish customs or O.T. types, but to the existing law of the land in which the Galatians lived.

“Brethren I speak after the manner of men” (Gal. iii. 15).

This expression introduces an illustration from common life in Rom. vi. 19. No knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures was necessary to understand “slavery” for many of those who read the epistle to the Romans were at the time slaves themselves.

Many commentators, because not possessed of certain historical facts now brought to light, and not safeguarded by humility in the presence of the inexplicable in Scripture, have not hesitated to pronounce the Apostle’s argument in Gal. iii. 15-20 as “very weak, and such as the Apostle ought not to use for the confirmation of a matter of so great importance” (Luther). Yet upon consideration it will be admitted, that whereas there was O.T. evidence for the fact that the original promise made to Abraham was addressed to “faith”, no such O.T. evidence was available to meet the next difficulty, namely, that the subsequent introduction of the law of Moses four hundred and thirty years after the promise, cancelled the terms made with Abraham and substituted in their place “works of law”. With a quick wit, sharpened as it must have been by his deep concern for these Galatians as well as used and illuminated by the Holy Spirit, the Apostle fastened upon the existing Galatian law of adoption to furnish an argument.

“Though it be but a man’s covenant.”

Here, before we can proceed, it will be necessary to settle the meaning of the word *diatheke* “covenant”.

In every case where the O.T. is in view *diatheke* must be rendered “covenant”, agreeing with the Hebrew *berith*, which refers to the ceremony of cutting or dividing the sacrificial victim. Even where it is associated with the word “testator” in Heb. ix. 16, 17 a literal rendering of the passage leaves this translation of *diatheke* unaltered. Realizing this, many commentators have strenuously maintained that *diatheke* in Gal. iii. 15 must be translated “covenant”. Where disputants seem to have missed their way in this matter is the recognition of the clause we have used above: “in every case where the O.T. is in view”. Here in Gal. iii. 15 Paul is turning away from the O.T. Scriptures and appealing to some matter of common knowledge shared by himself and the Galatians.

There is a useful comment in Grimm's Lexicon which reads:

*“Diatheke. (1.) A disposition, arrangement, of any sort which one wishes to be valid; Gal. 3:15, where under the name of a man's disposition is meant specifically a testament, as it is a specimen and example of that disposition . . . . a testament or will (so in Greek witness from Aristophanes). (2.) a compact, covenant very often in the Scriptures from berith (Vulgate testamentum).”*

Here, by the happy choice of the word “disposition”, we may use it either in the sense of a man's will, or of God's covenant.

Sir William Ramsay, commenting upon the attitude of many writer, says:

*“The Biblical usage is a different topic . . . . The commentators have not been sufficiently careful to keep those two questions separate from one another.”*

The word *diatheke* is often found in inscriptions, and always in the sense of will or testament, and Paul by prefacing his comments with the words “I speak after the manner of men” shows what is in his mind. Dr. Bullinger, who strongly maintains the translation “covenant” in Heb. ix. 16, 17, says in his Greek Concordance:

*“Diatheke, a disposition, especially of property by will and testament. This word is the usual rendering of berith in the O.T. which certainly means a covenant.”*

The point of Paul's argument in Gal. iii. 15 is that a will once made is irrevocable. If we assume that the law governing the making of an ancient will is the same as that which is in force today, then we certainly find no cogency in the Apostle's illustration; but to quote Sir William Ramsay again:

*“Our procedure must be very different. We have to take the word diatheke in its ordinary sense, 'after the manner of men'; . . . . then we observe what is the character attributed by Paul to the known classes of will in other ancient nations, and so determine its origin.”*

Archaeology demonstrates the truth that this irrevocability was a characteristic of Greek law. The making of the will was the appointment of the heir, and this by a process was entitled “adoption”. When once such a will had been confirmed, no alteration was allowable or possible. Moreover a will today is secret; then, in Galatia, it was public and open.

The Roman-Syrian Law-Book cited by *Mitteis* well illustrates Gal. iii. 15:

*“It actually lays down the principle that a man can never put away an adopted son, and that he cannot put away a real son without good ground. It is remarkable that the adopted son should have a stronger position than the son by birth; yet it was so.”*

Every will had to be passed through the Record Office of the city. This illuminates the Apostle's argument “when it hath been *confirmed*”. The Galatians, fully acquainted as they were with their own laws, would appreciate the Apostle's argument. Granted that

a will had been confirmed, the heir appointed, the adoption made, then “no man disannulleth or added thereto”. If this be so, continues the Apostle, see how this bears upon the problem before us. The blessing of Abraham comes to you by a covenant made by God four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law at Mount Sinai; how then can you believe that such a law, coming so long afterwards should either disannul, or make the promise of none effect?

Before this conclusion is reached, however, Paul interposes another rather startling statement:

“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).

We must handle with extreme care this argument of the Apostle, otherwise we may do ourselves or others damage. First we remember that Paul was both a good Hebraist and a master of Greek, and he would know that the plural of the Hebrew word “seed” which is *zeraim* could not possibly be used in the original promise to Abraham, for *zeraim* means “various kinds of grain” just as the plural *spermata* does in I Cor. xv. 38. Ellicott’s note here seems so sane and so sound that we feel every reader would benefit by it. He says:

“We may here pause to make a brief remark on the great freedom which so many commentators have allowed themselves to characterize St. Paul’s argument as either artificial or Rabbinical, or as Baur, *Apost. Paul*, p. 665, has even ventured to assert ‘plainly arbitrary and incorrect’. It may be true that similar arguments occur in Rabbinical writers; it may be true that *sperma* (like the Hebrew *zera*) is a collective noun, and that when the plural is used as in Dan. i. 12 ‘grains of seed’ are implied. All this may be so—nevertheless we have here an interpretation which the Apostle, writing under the illumination of the Holy Ghost, has deliberately propounded, and which, therefore (whatever difficulties may at first sight appear in it) is profoundly and indisputably true. We hold, therefore, that there is as certainly a mystical meaning in the use of *zera* in Gen. 13:15, 17:8 as there is an argument for resurrection in Exod. 3:6, though in neither case was the writer necessarily aware of it.”

It may be that the true solution of the problem raised by this argument as to the word “seed” lies in the fact that He Who knew the end from the beginning, and intended that Christ should be the true Seed and the one Heir, so worded the original statement, avoiding all plurality, that when in the fullness of time He sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, there should be no obstacle in the way of believing this great and important truth.

If we read on in Gal. iii. we shall come to the words:

“And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Gal. iii. 29),

which is an evident reference back to the statement of verse 16.

The argument is now resumed with verse 17, and continues to verse 20, but as these verses contain much important teaching and at least one great exegetical problem, we must devote another article to its consideration.

## **No.66. (24) GALATIANS.**

### **Galatians iii. 13 - 20.**

#### **The argument from the Galatian Will applied (iii. 17 - 20). pp. 78 - 80**

“And this I say.” With these words the Apostle resumes the main argument of this section. It is not true to say that verse sixteen is a digression, or even a parenthesis, it is but the suspending of the main argument for a moment to ensure that Christ, the true Seed, shall be clearly seen in His rightful place before the conclusion is reached.

If verse seventeen ignores verse sixteen, and treats it as a parenthesis, what “covenant” is intended? If it be the covenant which is identified with “the promise” of verse sixteen, all is clear. It is that covenant, not “a man’s covenant” which is now the theme. This covenant, said the Apostle, was “confirmed before of God in Christ”, and that is shown to be the fact by his inspired teaching concerning the word “seed”. Therefore, if a man’s will when once confirmed stands, no man either adding to it or disannulling it, how much more shall not God’s covenant stand? “The law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.”

In another series of articles entitled “Time and Place” the chronology of the Scriptures is traced step by step from Adam to the Babylonian captivity, and it is obvious that any chronological note given here cannot demonstrate its accuracy, as no proof can be offered for the dates already assumed, but a word or two is necessary, as there has been a sorry misconception on the part of many eminent commentators, who by reason of their failure to discern things that differ, and observing that two periods are mentioned, one of 430 years (Exod. xii. 40 and Gal. iii. 17) and the other of 400 years (Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6), they have given way to such comments as:

“The difficulty lies . . . . in the Hebrew text of Exod. xii. 40” (Alford).

“The length of the sojourn is given in round numbers” (Lightfoot).

“Supposing it could be proved that St. Paul’s knowledge of ancient chronology was imperfect, this need not surprise us” (Conybeare and Howson).

#### **The 430 years:**

“Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years” (Exod. xii. 40).

#### **The 400 years:**

“Thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them 400 years” (Gen. xv. 13).

“His seed should sojourn in a strange land; and that they should bring them into bondage, and entreat them evil 400 years” (Acts vii. 6).

The 430 years date from the call of Abraham (Gen. xii. 4); but the 400 years date from the casting out of Ishmael and the weaning of Isaac. The 30 years difference in these two datings is made up as follows:

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Age of Abraham at the call of Gen. xii. 4.                             | 75    |
| * * *  | * * * |
| From call to marriage of Hagar (Gen. xvi. 3).                          | 10    |
| From marriage to birth of Ishmael (Gen. xvi. 16).                      | 1     |
| From birth of Ishmael to birth of Isaac (Gen. xxi. 5).                 | 14    |
|  | ----- |
|  | 25    |
| Add five years to the casting out of Ishmael and the weaning of Isaac. | 5     |
|  | ----- |
|  | 30    |

For a complete and detailed chronology of this whole period, the reader is referred to the series of articles entitled "Time and Place" in the *Berean Expositor*, Vol. XXXVI. The proof is not necessary here. It is sufficient for the purpose of the Apostle's argument that the promise made to Abraham was given *a long time* prior to the giving of the law, to show that the subsequent introduction of the law at Mount Sinai "doth not invalidate so as to render the promise inefficacious".

"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).

Very similar in form is the argument of Rom. xi.:

"If by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" (Rom. xi. 6).

The abrupt "but God gave it to Abraham by promise" silencing all objection, is similar to "but not before God" of Rom. iv. 2. While "the inheritance" promised to Abraham may include many and diverse blessings, one only is here in view. The one with which the argument opened "received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" and this question is never lost sight of in the development that follows. A question now arises, a question that forces itself once more into Rom. vi. and vii., namely, these things being so, "wherefore then serveth the law?" The answer given by Paul has been given many explanations; indeed, on verse twenty Lightfoot says "the number of interpretations of this passage is said to mount up to 250 or 300. Many of these arise out of an error as to the mediator, many disregard the context, and not a few are quite arbitrary".

It will be obvious to all that the actual person intended by the Mediator of verse twenty, will be decided by the meaning given to the words of verse nineteen "it was added because of transgressions". Looking at the law as a whole we can say that:

- (1) The law instead of bringing life and righteousness actually became "a ministry of condemnation".
- (2) Its pressure stirred up rebellion and revealed and multiplied transgressions.

- (3) It was temporary, given until “The Seed should come” and so in no competition with the age-abiding covenant made with Abraham.
- (4) It did not come direct from God, as did the promise to Abraham, but was mediated by angels in the first instance and by Moses and the High Priest in the second instance.
- (5) It was therefore in the nature of a contract, depending for its fulfillment on the observance of its conditions, whereas the promise made to Abraham in Gen. xv. was so given that Abraham was unable, even as he was unasked, to promise anything.

In one sense, this is sufficient for the purpose of following the argument of the Apostle, but the Word of God is a great deep, George John Gwynne, B.A., Rector and Vicar of Wallstown, Diocese of Cloyne, must be given the credit of bringing forward a fuller and more satisfactory interpretation than any other that the present writer has yet seen.

The questions which await solution, and upon which Gwynne was enabled to give fuller light, are:

- (1) What “law” is intended in the words “wherefore then serveth the law?” His answer is “the ceremonial law”.
- (2) “It was added”; his contention is that it is a law that was “superadded” to an existing law that is in mind and not the addition of the law to a promise made years before.
- (3) “Because of transgressions”; the primary meaning of *charin* “because” should be retained, not reversed, and that primary meaning is “on behalf of”.
- (4) The law that was superadded was temporary “till the seed should come”.
- (5) The Mediator is not Moses, but the High Priest.

When we examine this question in our next article, we shall learn that even Gwynne, keen as he was, missed the inspired guidance of one passage, which modifies his exclusion of Moses in the reference to the mediator, and compels us to include much more than the ceremonial law. But of this, more when we have all the material before us.

**No.67. (25) GALATIANS.**  
**Galatians iii. 13 - 20.**  
**The super-added law.**  
**pp. 108 - 112**

We commence, as promised at the close of the last article, an examination of Gal. iii. 19, especially on four counts. (1) What was “the law”? (2) Why was it that this was “added” and to what? (3) What is the true significance of *charin* translated “because”? (4) Who is intended by the Mediator?

“Wherefore then serveth the law?” This is a legitimate question. For while we grant that the promise given to Abraham cannot be invalidated by the law subsequently given, yet the law is the law of God and it cannot be lightly set aside. It must have a purpose.

Under the one category *ho nomos* “the law” we must allow three great subdivisions (1) The Moral Law, (2) The Sacrificial Law, (3) The Political and Civil Law. These Galatians were being induced to make their salvation secure by grafting on to the gracious plan of salvation revealed in the gospel *the ritual* of the law of Moses. “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved” (Acts xv. 1); and although they may not have been sensible to the implication, the Apostle assures them that if they submit to this rite of circumcision Christ shall profit them nothing; they become debtors to do the whole law, they are fallen from grace (Gal. v. 2-4).

When the Apostle asked the question:

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

the words “by the flesh” can well refer to the carnal observances of the ceremonial law. It is to this particular association with the ceremonial law that the Apostle refers in Gal. iv. when he likened their retrograde movement as parallel with a return to paganism, saying:

“Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years, I am afraid of you” (Gal. iv. 10-11).

Whitby has a comment on this passage which says:

“The Galatians are said to return to those elements, not because they before observed *Jewish ceremonies*, but because the *ceremonies of the law* being in matter mostly the same with those the Gentiles used to their heathen deities, by returning *to them*, they returned to those elements.”

This “law” the Apostle said was to continue “till the Seed should come”. In one sense, this is true of the whole law, whether it be the moral law, the ceremonial law, or the burdensome statutes and laws that governed the political life of Israel when in the land. All law, all the works of law, all ideas of ever attaining to righteousness and life by

law of any kind, for ever vanish in the presence of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Yet, it must also be remembered that the two epistles that most definitely exclude “the works of law” as factors in salvation, namely Romans and Galatians, are at great pains to emphasize its eternal validity (Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 13, 14). The command “Thou shalt not steal” is as binding upon a Christian under grace as it was upon a Jew under law (Eph. iv. 28); the honouring of father and mother was not abrogated and emptied of meaning at the advent of grace (Eph. vi. 2). The ceremonial law however has gone. Christ has “blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross” (Col. ii. 14), and the close proximity of “meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days” (Col. ii. 16) shows that the ceremonial law is in view. The elaborate ritual given to Israel “stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (literally *baptisms*), and carnal ordinances, impose on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come . . . .” (Heb. ix. 10, 11), we are certainly safe if we include the ceremonial law in that which was added “till the seed should come”.

“It was added because of transgressions.” *Charin* “because of”. A very great diversity of opinion has been held by commentators on the precise meaning of *charin* here. Ellicott has summed up these differences under three heads:

- 1.) *Ad coercendas transgressioniones*, to restrain transgressions, as Chrysostom and most of the old expositors;
- 2.) *Transgressionum gratia*, that is, to call forth transgressions, to multiply them, to bring them to a head, some modern expositors;
- and 3.) *Transgressionum causa*, in order to make known transgressions, and in this way to compel men to acknowledge their guilt, Calvin.

Ellicott objects to the first that it is untenable “because no satisfactory examples have yet been adduced of such a practically *reversed* meaning of *charin*”. The second though more plausible he rejects as being “open to the grave objection, that in a comparatively undogmatical passage it ascribes a purpose directly to God which would have certainly needed a fuller explanation”. The third he retains “with some confidence, which is lexically defensible, and yields a good pertinent sense . . . . to make man feel his need of a Saviour”. This is true, yet the lexical objection is strong, namely, “that the force of *charin* is *in gratium*” (Meyer).

It is undeniable that *charin* means “in any one’s favour, for his pleasure; for the sake of a person or thing, on account of” (Dr. Bullinger’s Lexicon). The number of occurrences is nine, and they are the following: Luke vii. 47 “wherefore”; Gal. iii. 19 “because”; Eph. iii. 1, 14 “for this cause”; I Tim. v. 14 “no cause of”; Titus i. 5 “for this cause”; Titus i. 11 “for . . . sake”; I John iii. 12 “wherefore”; Jude 16 “because of”. We will return to this word, its place and meaning, after we have considered the rest of the sentence.

“It was added” *prostithemi*. Now this word assumes that there exists something to which the addition can be made. For example, one cannot “add one cubit” to one’s stature unless one is already of some height (Matt. vi. 27); when the promise was given

that “all these things shall be added unto you” (Matt. vi. 33), the sense is “superadded”, added in addition. It is easy for a reader of Galatians to say “surely it means that the law of Moses” was super-added to the “promise” made to Abraham; but there are strong objections to this namely, the promise was given 430 years previously and there is no hint in Exod. xix. and xx. that either Israel or Moses spake or thought of the nature of the promise to Abraham which it seems they must have done, if the law of Sinai was actually superadded to that promise, and there is no apparent relation between the promise of Abraham and the law of Moses. Here is “no *epidiatheke*, but a totally fresh institution” (Meyer). The provisions of the promise are diametrically opposed to those of the law, and says Gwynne: “How this can with any propriety of language be said to be ‘superadded’ to it, is a mystery which I am unable to solve.”

When giving credit to Gwynne for directing our attention to the idea that the word “added” in Gal. iii. 19 refers to the adding of the ceremonial law to the existing commandments on the tables of stone, we suggested that even he had not observed that there is waiting for us a reference that, if studied, leads us out into even fuller light and certainty. That reference is Heb. xii. 18, 19. Before quoting this and following up its implications, the writer went through the commentaries that were immediately accessible—Lightfoot, Alford, Bloomfield, Ellicott, Webster and Wilkinson, McKnight, Valpy, Conybeare and Howson, Ramsay, Sadler, Lewin, Wordsworth and the Companion Bible, but not one of these valuable and helpful works makes so much as a passing reference to Heb. xii. 18, 19.

If the reader says “why should they?” the answer is that whoever attempts to interpret and explain a passage of Scriptures without putting forward prominently the principle “comparing spiritual things with spiritual” will necessarily, deprived of that light and authority, be compelled to depend upon his own sagacity, and the opinion of others. So it is that men of learning and understanding are found following one another in a blind circle, instead of humbly yet boldly enquiring at the Fountain Head. Every Greek concordance gives a list of *prostithemi*, commencing with Matt. vi. 27 as the first occurrence in the New Testament and ending with Heb. xii. 19 as the last.

In the presence of the names cited above, the present writer must retire if it be a matter of learning, erudition or scholarship, but however modest he may well be, the fact remains that the observance of the principle of I Cor. ii. 13 leads straight to the heart of truth, whereas the learning and the scholarship that ignored this principle never reached clear light. This moment of apparent boasting is allowed us, for what such simple observance can do for the writer, it can do for the reader, however retiring and unlearned he may be.

Let us now turn to Heb. xii.:

“For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more . . . . but ye are come unto Mount Sion . . . . and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant” (Heb. xii. 18-24).

Here in the phrase “the word should not be spoken to them any more” we have the word *prostithemi* “added” as used in Gal. iii. 19. Dr. Weymouth renders the passage “entreated that no more should be added”. Moses Stuart says of Heb. xii. 19 “the exact shade of the writer’s meaning is the hearers of which (voice) refused that a word should be added to *them*, viz. *autois rhemasi*, to those commands”. Now the Scriptures referred to in Heb. xii. 18, 19 are Exod. xx. 19; Deut. v. 5, 25; and xviii. 16. A consultation of these passages shows that after the actual giving of the ten commandments, the people pleaded that the rest of the law should be given through the mediation of Moses. Moses reminded the people of this, when reviewing the past in Deut. v.:

“The LORD our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The LORD made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The LORD talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire (I stood between the LORD and you at that time, to show you the word of the LORD; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount)” (Deut. v. 2-5).

Enlarging upon this in chapter xviii., Moses brings forward his own typical mediation as prophetic of the work of Christ.

“The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him ye shall hearken; *according to* all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the LORD said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in His mouth . . . .” (Deut. xviii. 15-18).

The “added” words are explained:

“commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou shalt teach them, that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess it . . . . all the ways . . . . that ye may live . . . . now these are the commandments, the statutes and the judgments . . . .” (Deut. v. 31-33; vi. 1).

The rehearsal of these “added” laws occupies the bulk of Deut. vi. 1-23. We cannot therefore limit the law that was “added” in Gal. iii. 19 to the ceremonial law alone, although the words “because of transgressions” do focus our attention upon that part of the added law, that had to do with sin and sacrifice, circumcision and ablution. Neither is it possible to exclude Moses from the office of mediator, that Gwynne in his exposition does, for Heb. xii. and Deut. xviii. settle that matter. What is true however, is that under the law, the mediation of Moses was not sufficient, the high priest also is a mediator, a type of Christ as the Mediator of the new covenant (Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15).

Returning to Gal. iii. let us note that in verse fifteen the Apostle said of the Galatian will “no man . . . . added thereto”. In verse nineteen he says the law was “added”. If we interpret this to mean that the law of Moses was added to the promise made to Abraham, we shall compel the Apostle to contradict himself. If we, in the light of Heb. xii., teach that the “added” law was that part of the law of Moses which was given to him as a mediator subsequent to the ten commandments, all is Scriptural and clear.

Paul's use of this fact in Gal. iii. is to force the Galatians to see how foolish they really were, to allow the imposition of such a law upon the glorious grace of the gospel.

*Charin* "because of" transgressions, retains its primitive sense, the law that was "added" included the provision of priest and sacrifice, shadows of good things to come. Neither the law as a whole nor the ceremonial law as a part, could provide righteousness or life.

"Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one" (Gal. iii. 20).

As we have said earlier, between 250 and 300 interpretations have been noted, of this difficult verse. These it will be profitless to discuss, for they all ignore the testimony of Heb. xii. The innate idea of a mediator demands *two parties*. This is true of the law, God being the One and the people of Israel the other contracting party. In the promise made to Abraham, "God was One". Abraham was caused to fall into a "deep sleep" (Gen. xv. 12) so that he could promise nothing. The Apostle therefore, picking up the argument started in Gal. iii. 15 concerning the Galatian will, proves the superiority of the promise made to Abraham, and the impossibility that the law, given 430 years afterward, should make it invalid or of none effect.

**No.68. (26) GALATIANS.**  
**Galatians iii. 21 - 23.**  
**"Shut up unto the faith."**  
**pp. 127 - 131**

In Gal. iii. 19 the Apostle asked the question "wherefore then serveth the law?" and provided the answer "it was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made". Now lest there should appear to be any inherent antagonism between the promise of God and the law of God, he puts another question: "Is the law then against the promises of God?" and his answer, like the answers to similar questions in Rom. vi. and vii. provides a complete denial of such an idea, "God forbid". The apparent antagonism is only produced by the attempt to compare things that differ. The promise of God, asks nothing of the flesh, and takes no account of human frailty; the law, however, as a covenant was rendered "weak through the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3), because a "covenant" implies contracting parties. To make the promise "sure", it was implemented by faith and grace (Rom. iv. 16); the law was not intended as a provider of righteousness and life, but rather that it should reveal human inability of produce righteousness, and lead the sinner to the only source of righteousness and life, the Son of God Himself as proclaimed in the gospel.

"For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. iii. 21).

The emphasis must not be placed on “given”, for assuredly a law had been given, and life was attached to complete obedience thereto (Gen. ii. 16, 17), but the emphasis must be placed on “*could* have given” for the failure of all men to render such obedience turned the commandment which had been ordained unto life, into an instrument of condemnation and death (Rom. vii. 10). This passage is in structural correspondence with Gal. ii. 21, where the Apostle wrote “if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain”. We proceed therefore to the next step in his argument, where once more the Scriptures are spoken of as though they themselves spoke and thought. Gal. iii. 22, 23 is in correspondence with Gal. iii. 8-13, and the following extract from the complete structure exhibits this feature quite clearly.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| C   iii. 8-12.   | f   The SCRIPTURE preached beforehand.         |
|                  | g   Justification by faith. <i>Ek pisteos.</i> |
|                  | h   <i>Hupo.</i> Under a curse.                |
|                  | * * * * *                                      |
| C   iii. 22, 23. | f   The SCRIPTURE concluded.                   |
|                  | g   Promise by faith. <i>Ek pisteos.</i>       |
|                  | h   <i>Hupo.</i> Under sin. Under Law.         |

The word “concluded” is a compound of *kleito* “to shut”, which in its turn is connected with *kleis* “a key”. The Apostle uses *ekkleio* in Gal. iv. 17 where the A.V. translate it “exclude”, and it is this same word that he emphasized in Rom. iii. 27 when he said “where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith”.

The word *sugkleio* “conclude” is used once again in Gal. iii. 23 “shut up” unto the faith, and to ignore its presence while attempting an interpretation of the same word in verse twenty-two is of course fatal. In verse twenty-two the Scripture is said to have “shut up” all under sin, in order that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe; and in verse twenty-three we learn that before faith came we were kept under the law, “shut up” unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. The words “shut up unto” are found in the Septuagint, as in Psa. lxxviii. 50 “He gave their life over to the pestilence”—shut them up with no way of escape, and Bengel sites Polybius “he was shut up unto the very hopes which his own slaves and friends “possessed”, and Irenaeus, “the sons of God are shut up to the belief of His coming”.

The Apostle, therefore, when writing Gal. iii. 22, 23 does not stress the condemnation that is associated with being “shut up” in prison, so much as that mankind by reason of sin were “shut up” to but one way of escape, and that way by faith in Christ, as distinct from works of law. The same truth is expressed in John’s Gospel and by Peter in different words, but with the same intent:

“No man cometh unto the Father, but by Me” (John xiv. 6).

“There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts iv. 12).

The promise is said to be “by faith of Jesus Christ”, and given to them “that believe”. There is no tautology here, the “faith of Jesus Christ” means something different from them “that believe”. Had the Apostle intended to teach the idea of *our* faith *in* Jesus Christ, he could have said without ambiguity, and indeed has said so in many of his Epistles. The “promise” is “by the faith of Jesus Christ”, that is the Saviour’s Own personal faith and faithfulness even unto death. His faith, not ours, is the source of this indefectible promise that nothing can disannul or make void. It becomes effective and personal to each seeking sinner that “believes”.

As many readers will not possess Volume XVIII of the *Berean Expositor* we believe the importance of this expression “the faith of Jesus Christ” will justify the re-printing of the following extract from the exposition of the epistle to the Romans.

### WHAT IS THE FAITH OF CHRIST?

The usual interpretation makes the faith of Jesus Christ to mean the believer’s faith in Christ, or the faith which Jesus Christ has enjoined. This would interpret Rom. iii. 21, 22 as:

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

This has neither good sense nor good doctrine to commend it. It appears that we must abandon this interpretation and come to the Word afresh. Referring to the structure of Rom. iii. 21-28 given on page 85 of Volume XVIII, we see that “the faith of Jesus Christ” (Rom. iii. 22) is balanced by the expression “the faith of Jesus” (Rom. iii. 26), a phrase translated in the A.V. “believeth in Jesus”. The two passages together stand in relation to the great cause of our justification—“to him which is of the faith of Jesus”. We are not left entirely without guidance on this subject, for the very next chapter takes up the expression in connexion with Abraham in a way that leaves little room for doubt as to its true import. In Rom. iv. 12 we read concerning Abraham that he was the father of those “who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham”. The faith “of” Abraham cannot mean my faith *in* him, or faith enjoined by him to me; it simply means Abraham’s own faith. I am enjoined to walk in the steps of that faith. Thus we have presented here the two aspects that are already found in Rom. iii. 22 and 26.

The apostle Paul, quite apart from the question of inspiration, would not, unless he were a careless writer, so soon have used the same expression with a totally different meaning, and that without a word of warning. Rom. iv., however, is manifestly an expansion of the argument of Rom. iii. 21-28 and consequently it seems difficult to resist the conclusion that the terms “the faith of Jesus Christ” and “the faith of Abraham” must be interpreted in the same way. In fact the testimony of the law and the prophets spoken of in Rom. iii. 21 is actually the basis of Rom. iv., which cites the book of Genesis and the Psalms on this very point (Rom. iv. 3-8).

## *Pistis*, ITS USAGE IN THE SEPTUAGINT

Paul's great teaching, justification by faith, is confessedly enshrined in the words of Hab. ii. 4, "the just shall live by faith". This one verse is quoted in three different connexions by the Apostle, viz., Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11, and Heb. x. 38. The Hebrew word that is translated *pistis* in the LXX of Hab. ii. 4 is *emunah*; this and the cognate word *amanah* are so translated many times, and with the idea of faithfulness, and not simply believing, e.g.:

- "His righteousness and His faithfulness" (I Sam. xxvi. 23).
- "Did ordain in their *set office*" margin = trust (I Chron. ix. 22).
- "The men did the work faithfully" (II Chron. xxxiv. 12).
- "All His works are done in *truth*" (Psa. xxxiii. 4).
- "We make a *sure* covenant" (Neh. ix. 38).

The Hebrew text of Hab. ii. 4 reads as the A.V.: "the just shall live by his faith (or faithfulness)." What that faith involved can be seen in Hab. iii. 17-19. The LXX departs a little from the Hebrew and reads: "The just shall live by My faith (or faithfulness)." The Apostle, who knew both the Hebrew and the LXX, omit both the pronouns ("his" and "my"), and so can use the verse in three different contexts, emphasizing one or other of the shades of meaning as the case demands.

"The just shall live by his and by My faithfulness" is a rendering which approaches the dual teaching of Rom. iii. 22 and 26. "The faith of God" (Rom. iii. 3) is practically synonymous with "the truth of God" (Rom. iii. 7), showing that Paul retained the O.T. meaning of the word. Gal. iii. 22 uses the two expressions "out of the faith of Jesus Christ" and "to them that believe": "in order that the promise out of the faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." To translate this: "in order that the promise out of believing in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" is not good sense, to say nothing of the demands of the context.

The context speaks of another possible source, *ek nomou*, "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 great cause and foundation of the glorious gift of the gospel. To put the law where God puts promise, to substitute a legal righteousness where God puts one by faith, may indicate zeal, even as Israel's similar action (Rom. x. 2), but, as Gal. iii. 16-18 shows, it is contrary to Scripture. Abraham's faith had no reference to Sinai and its covenant looked to Christ in Whom the promises were made. It is the faithfulness of Christ as the true Seed both of the woman (Gen. iii. 15), and of Abraham (Gen. xii. 7), and not His obedience to the law and covenant of Sinai that is ever uppermost in the Apostle's doctrine.

Before passing on we will put the reader in possession of a list of all the occurrences of the expression "the faith of . . . ." in the N.T. so that all may "search and see" whether what we teach is "so".

"Have faith of God" (margin), i.e. great faith (Mark xi. 22) (See parallels in Matthew and Luke).

“Upon (*epi*) the faith of His name” (Acts iii. 16). (The faith of the lame man in the Lord is not mentioned; faithfulness to all His name implies is rather the thought.) His name was called Jesus, “for He shall save His people from their sins” (Matt. i. 21).  
 “Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?” (Rom. iii. 3).  
 “Even God’s righteousness through Jesus Christ’s faith” (Rom. iii. 22).  
 “Justifier of him who is out of the faith of Jesus” (Rom. iii. 26).  
 “Who walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham” (Rom. iv. 12).  
 “A man is not justified by the works of law, but through faith of Jesus Christ . . . . justified by faith of Christ” (Gal. ii. 16).  
 “The promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Gal. iii. 22).  
 “Boldness of access . . . . through His faith” (Eph. iii. 12).  
 “Righteousness . . . . which is through faith of Christ, the out-of-God righteousness upon faith” (Phil. iii. 9).  
 “Buried . . . . also raised with Him through the faith of the inworking of God, Who hath raised Him from the dead” (Col. ii. 12).  
 “Your faith” (the faith of you) (I Thess. iii. 2, 5, 7, 10).  
 “Have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . . with respect of persons” (James ii. 1).

“When a writer would describe a person as the author or owner of a thing, the proper and obvious course is to write the name in the genitive case; if he desires to present him as the object of reference, a variety of forms suggest themselves (which are freely employed by N.T. writers, such as *eis*, *epi*, *pros*, and sometimes *en*, with their respective cases), by which his purpose can be effected without exposing himself to the charge of ambiguity, or the risk of misapprehension. Should he, however, passing over all these forms, select the genitive which is the natural expression of source or proprietorship, it is to be presumed that it was his intention so to do, and the genitive is to be understood subjectively” (Glyne on *Galatians*).

**No.69. (27) GALATIANS.**  
**Galatians iii. 24 - iv. 7.**  
**Redemption and Adoption.**  
**pp. 151 - 155**

The passage before us corresponds with iii. 13-20, thus:

|                      |           |   |                                |
|----------------------|-----------|---|--------------------------------|
| D   iii. 13-20.      |           | i | Exagorazo. Redeemed. Heirs.    |
|                      |           | j | Covenant prior to Law.         |
|                      | * * * * * |   |                                |
| D   iii. 24 - iv. 7. |           | j | Schoolmaster before Christ.    |
|                      |           | i | Exagorazo. Redeemed. Adoption. |

The two occurrences *exagorazo* “redeem” occur in these sections in the sense of “buying a slave out of a market in order to set him free”. In the former section, the law is preceded by the Covenant, in the latter, the faith is preceded by the law. In one “heirs” are in view, in the other “the heir” as the word “adoption” implies. Looking at the

section iii. 24 - iv. 7 as a whole we observe that the figure employed to enforce the next phase of truth is that of a minor under tutelage who finally enters into the status of a son and heir, and consequently becomes free from the discipline that belongs to childhood. The following structure sets this balance of teaching before the eye.

**Galatians iii. 24 - iv. 7**

- A | iii. 24, 25. The Schoolmaster. *Hupo* “under” |
  - a | The law was our schoolmaster.
  - b | Unto Christ.
  - b* | After faith has come.
  - a* | No longer under a schoolmaster.
- B | iii. 26-28. Ye are all children. |
  - c | Ye are children of God.
  - d | Baptized into Christ.
  - d* | Put on Christ.
  - c* | Ye are all one in Christ Jesus.
- C | iii. 29. “IF” ye be Christ’s then are ye Abraham’s seed and “heirs” according to the promise.
- A | iv. 1-5. Tutors, Governors, Elements. *Hupo* “under” |
  - a | The child. \
  - b | The Servant. \ The
  - c | The Tutors and Governors. / Figure.
  - d | Time appointed of the father. /
  - a* | When we were children. \
  - b* | The servitude. \ The
  - c* | The elements of the world. / application.
  - d* | Fullness of time; God sent. /
- B | iv. 6. Ye are sons. |
  - e | Ye are sons.
  - f | Spirit of His Son.
  - g | Abba Father.
  - e1 | No more servant but son.
  - f* | Spirit of His Son.
  - g | Abba Father.
  - e1* | No more servant but son.
- C | iv. 7. “IF” a son then an “heir” of God through Christ.

The fact that Gal. iii. 24 opens with the word “wherefore” indicates the connexion between the statement of verse twenty-three and the section now before us. The “schoolmaster unto Christ” is an expansion of the condition “shut up into the faith”, but on the surface there does not seem much connection between the office of a schoolmaster and the action of shutting any one up. Upon examination however we discover that the word thus translated, *paidagogos* “pedagogue”, means a guardian rather than a schoolmaster.

“Among the Greeks and Romans the name was applied to trustworthy slaves who were charged with duty of supervising the life and morals of boys belonging to the better class. The boys were not allowed so much as to step out of the house without them before arriving at the age of manhood” (*Thayer*).

In chapter iv. the Apostle returns to the figure, this time using the double office “tutor and governor”, *epitropos* and *oikonomos*, guardians, having special reference to the manners and morals of the child; and stewards, dealing more particularly with the property of the child. When Paul called himself “the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles” and went on to speak of the “dispensation” (*oikonomia*) that had been given to him, he knew that many stewards were slaves although promoted to high responsibility.

The Apostle takes one more step in the pursuit of this figure, and this time he speaks of “the elements of the world” instead of pedagogue, guardian or steward. The word “element” is *stoicheion* from *stoichos* a row, rank or series, hence any first thing or principle. It denotes (1) The letters of the alphabet; (2) The elements out of which the universe is composed; (3) The heavenly bodies, partly because of the regulation by them of times and seasons. Thus we have three developments of one argument revolving around the employment of three related figures:

- (1) The pedagogue.
- (2) The tutor and governor.
- (3) The elements of the world.

It is evident that in the last figure, the Apostle reaches his point and consequently, while we need not know much about pedagogues or tutors to appreciate his argument, we need to be well acquainted with his use of the words *stoicheion* “elements” and *stoicheo* “to walk as by rule”.

***Stoicheion*** is used by Paul five times as follows:

- “The *elements* of the world” (Gal. iv. 3).
- “Weak and beggarly *elements*” (Gal. iv. 9).
- “After the *rudiments* of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. ii. 8).
- “If ye be dead with Christ from the *rudiments* of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances” (Col. ii. 20).
- “Ye have need that one teach you again which be the *first principles* of the oracles of God” (Heb. v. 12).

***Stoicheo*** is used of or by Paul five times, as follows:

- “Thou thyself also *walkest orderly*, and keepest the law” (Acts xxi. 24).
- “Who also *walk* in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham” (Rom. iv. 12).
- “If we live in the Spirit, let us also *walk* in the Spirit” (Gal. v. 25).
- “As many as *walk* according to this rule, peace be on them” (Gal. vi. 16).
- “Let us *walk* by the same rule” (Phil. iii. 16).

The reader will doubtless have called to mind the context of some of these references. The Galatians were being put into bondage by the imposition of the *stoicheia* of the law, whereas the Colossians were being put into bondage by the imposition of the *stoicheia*

both of a vain deceitful philosophy and of ordinances cancelled by the cross of Christ. Both Galatians and Colossians, though led in different paths, came near the same thing in the end.

To the Galatians Paul wrote:

“Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain” (Gal. iv. 10, 11).

To the Colossians Paul wrote:

“Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ” (Col. ii. 16, 17).

The parallel between Galatians and Hebrews is found in the reference to the state of children as contrasted with that of adults:

“For every one that useth milk . . . . is a babe, but strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age” (Heb. v. 13, 14).

When we compare the contexts of *stoicheion* and *stoicheo* within the epistle to the Galatians itself we have the “weak and beggarly elements” of the law which pertain to childhood and bondage, contrasted with the walk that is beyond the touch of law, a walk that is in line with the new creation; and it was to wean from the one and lead to the other that the Apostle spent himself in writing this moving epistle. The “time appointed by the father” finds its equivalent in the “fullness of time” when Christ came into the world.

It is evident that if there is a plan and a purpose in the Bible, some control of time is essential if that plan and purpose is to be attained. It is made very clear in Scripture that there is a time and season “to every purpose under heaven”. This purpose is called “The purpose of the ages” (Eph. iii. 11 lit.). When the Saviour commenced His ministry he did so with the announcement “the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark i. 15).

It was the “fullness” of time also in the sense that the necessary preparatory period was finished. Nations had been permitted to grope in darkness and these times are called “the times of this ignorance” (Acts xvii. 30). Many different forms of government had been weighed in the balances and found wanting. Israel too had passed through the fire, and it had been proved to a demonstration that, however closely hedged about a people may be, however just the laws, no man can by his own works provide a righteousness that would be accepted with God. Jewish religion, Greek wisdom, Roman power all stood self confessed failures. The time had come for the Redeemer to be born.

“Made of a woman, made under the law” (Gal. iv. 4).  
*Ek gunaikos, genomenon hupo nomon.*

Many commentators have been tempted to read more into these words than the context demands. There is no *necessary* reference to the Virgin birth, it rather emphasizes the true humanity of the Redeemer. The sayings “man that is born of a woman” (Job xiv. 1), “among them that are born of women” (Matt. xi. 11) make no specific reference to the individual mothers, but rather indicates something universal, something that is true of all men. This universal fact would not exclude the fulfillment of the prophecy concerning “the seed of a woman” made in Gen. iii., it would most naturally direct the thought back to that germ of all prophecy, and in so doing would travel back before Abraham and lead back to Adam, thereby indicating that the Deliverer now come was akin to *all men* and not related only to *Israel*. The added words “under law” revealed that the Redeemer was fully qualified to deal with Israel’s special case, and so reveals how fully the ruined state of all men has been met by the gracious intervention of Christ. He thus came that He might *redeem*; He came that those redeemed might *receive*, and as a result that they may be enabled to cry “Abba Father”.

As we have already seen, the word translated “redeem” is used in Gal. iii. 13 with special reference to the curse of the law, so here He came to redeem them that were under the law. Such receive “the adoption of sons”. We gave some consideration to this subject when dealing with Gal. iii. 15-17, showing that by “adoption” is meant the appointing of the heir.

“Abba Father.” Here we have Aramaic and Greek, Jew and Gentile expressing in their own tongue this closest of all relationships. “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” The two words come together in Mark xiv. 36 and in Rom. viii. 15. Rom. viii. is the chapter of sonship (for structure that reveals this see *Just and the Justifier*) and “the Spirit” of which that chapter speaks is in the main “the sonship spirit”—a precious truth, a priceless privilege, often beclouded by confusing it with the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost and after. The structure shows that the Apostle clinches his argument in its two developments with “IF”.

“If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Gal. iii. 29).

This establishes the superiority of “promise” above “law”.

Now, having looked at the condition of “bondage” that is associated with “law”, and the condition of “sonship” associated with “promise”, Paul for the second time uses the “IF” of argument.

“Wherefore thou art no more servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ” (Gal. iv. 7).

**No.70. (28) GALATIANS.**

**Galatians iv. 8 - 12-.**

**The inexplicable return to “weak and beggarly elements”.**

**pp. 197 - 200**

We now come to the closing appeal of the great argument that occupies Gal. ii. 15 - iv. 12. The Apostle started his argument by appealing to Peter to consider what he was really doing when he attempted “to build again the things destroyed”, clinching the argument with an appeal, “I am dead to the law”.

Now having shown the place that the promise has above the law, the superiority of sonship above serfdom, the passing of the pedagogue and the coming in of the fullness of Christ, the Apostle turns to the Galatians who had been misled by Judaistic enthusiasts and applies to them the same form of argument and appeal that he had used with Peter. The structure demonstrates this, and we give the opening and closing members again so that the evidence shall be before us.

A | ii. 15-20. | a | *Phusis*. “By nature.” Jews.  
                  b | Build again things destroyed. *Palin*.  
                  c | Personal. “I am dead to the Law.”  
                  \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*  
A | iv. 8-12. | a | *Phusis*. “By nature” gods.  
                  b | Turn again to elements. *Palin*.  
                  c | Personal. “Be as I am.”

“We who are Jews by nature”, said Paul to Peter. “Ye did service unto them which by nature no gods”, said Paul to the Galatians. “If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor”, said Paul to Peter. “How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements”, said Paul to Galatians. Then Paul turns from argument to appeal, and said to Peter:

“I am dead . . . . I am crucified with Christ”—so he turns from argument with the Galatians and appeals to them, “Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am; for I am as ye are”.

The Apostle is not questioning the real existence of the gods of the heathen. That question does not arise, for however far the Galatians had slipped into ritualism, they had not given up their faith in the true God. Among the heathen there were “gods many and lords many” (I Cor. viii. 5), but, says the Apostle, you once served those who though no gods at all, were ignorantly considered to be so, yet now, even though you have come to a saving knowledge of the gospel, you have gone back in principle to the self same elements that held you in bondage before your salvation. “How turn ye again . . . . ye desire again.” The Apostle uses the word *palin* “again” twice, and in the second instance he follows it with the added word *another* “anew”.

The weak and beggarly elements to which the Galatians were turning were such observances as circumcision, holydays and the like, and at first it may sound strange if not untrue to say that these Galatians were returning to the service of pagan gods. The Apostle, of course, was not accusing them of a lapse into idolatry; what he would make them see by this rather severe method of argument was that by stepping down from the high and blessed position into which free grace had placed them to the “elements” of the law, with its ceremonies, its rites, its days and observances, they were going back at least to “elements” even though they were not returning to idolatry. The Apostle who venerated the law, and declared that the commandment was holy, just and good (Rom. vii. 12) nevertheless does not hesitate to speak of this law as comprised of “weak and beggarly elements” and places it on a parallel with the elements of paganism when such a misuse of the law is permitted so that it becomes either a competitor with, or a perfecter of the Gospel of grace.

The same charge of being “weak” is made against the law in Rom. viii. 3, but the Apostle is careful to say “weak through the flesh”. So here, there is no charge laid against the law as such, but against its misuse, for he has already declared, that “if righteousness come by the law, then Christ died gratuitously” (Gal. ii. 21). The Apostle calls the elements of the law “beggarly”, a word already used in its literal sense (Gal. ii. 10), and translated “beggar” in Luke xvi. 20 and 22, and it was so when contrasted with the riches of grace offered so freely in the gospel. Elements, whether Mosaic or pagan, were weak and beggarly when compared with grace, and for any believer who has been set at liberty to prefer “the yoke of bondage”, or who has been honoured with “sonship” to go back to the status of a “slave”, who has been relieved of the supervision of “tutors and governors” to seek the re-imposition of observances and ceremonials, seemed to the Apostle inexplicable.

He does not merely say “ye desire again” but “ye desire again afresh” *palin anothēn*. *Palin* by itself ordinarily means “again” (Gal. i. 9, 17; ii. 1, 18; iv. 9, 19; v. 1 and 3), the addition therefore of the word *anothen* must be intentional and demands translation.

*Anothēn*. This adverb is related both to place and to time. When it refers to place, it is translated “the top” (Matt. xxvii. 51) when it refers to time it is translated “from the beginning” (Acts xxvi. 5). When combined, as in Gal. iv. 9 with *palin*, it looks back to the position which was occupied before, and contemplates reoccupying it afresh. This but enforces the idea that to go back to legalism was all one and the same as to go back to paganism; it was but the exchange of one system of bondage for another.

In order that the Galatians should have no misunderstanding as to what the Apostle referred to, he proceeds to enumerate these *stoicheia* or “elements”.

“Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years” (Gal. iv. 10).

The Apostle was no arbitrary martinet; he endeavoured to act in grace, and in Rom. xiv., warns the strong believer against an uncharitable attitude towards a weaker brother who “esteemed one day above another” (Rom. xiv. 5). This Galatian movement

however was in an entirely different category; it was so serious that if persisted in “Christ would profit them nothing”. In another epistle the Apostle was obliged to speak strongly concerning the “elements” and concerning the observance of days:

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments (*stoicheia*) of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. ii. 8).

“Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances” (Col. ii. 20).

“Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ” (Col. iii. 14-17).

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

It is untrue to think of the Apostle as being “afraid OF” these Galatians; no servant of Christ was more bold in service; Ellicott renders the passage “I am apprehensive of you”, or as we might say today “I am fearful FOR you”. The words that follow “lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain”, must be regarded as the explanation of the Apostle’s “fear”.

To spend himself was Paul’s practice and desire, but to spend himself for nought was a sacrifice that did not commend itself to him. Earlier in this epistle he revealed how he blended the utmost caution with the utmost boldness “Lest by any means” he said “I should run, or had run, in vain” (Gal. ii. 2). The same economy is expressed in the epistle to the Philippians, when he said: “Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, nor laboured in vain” (Phil. ii. 16). Yet this extreme caution is immediately followed by exceedingly generosity, for he continues “Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all” (Phil. ii. 17).

So again, writing to the Thessalonians, the Apostle expressed his satisfaction that his entrance in unto them “was not in vain” (I Thess. ii. 1); and later, having heard of the trials through which the Thessalonians were passing, he wrote “For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain” (I Thess. iii. 5). There is no hard and fast rule for guidance in this matter, indeed it is a continual call for watchfulness, yet speaking for ourselves, hardly a week passes but what we willingly spend several hours endeavouring to help one correspondent, while at the very same time, we refuse to spend more than a few minutes on another. If we were asked to explain the grounds of such discrimination, we may be at a loss, but we can only say that unconsciously we have been putting into practice the lesson which is before us; we refuse, willingly to labour “in vain”, while rejoicing to be used to the utmost where sacrifice is rightly demanded.

The Apostle now brings this long section to a close by a personal appeal:

“Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am; for I am as ye are” (Gal. iv. 12).

Commentators both ancient and modern fall into two groups in their explanation of this appeal:

1. One group, taking the language of I Kings. xxii. 4 as a proverbial utterance say that Paul says "Let us be friends".
2. The other group consider that the Apostle alludes to the fact that he, a Hebrew and a Pharisee had already become like a Gentile so far as the law was concerned, and that he appeals to the Galatian believers to take their stand with him. Moffatt's rendering of Gal. iv. 12 is very free, but it gives a pointer "Do take my line brothers, I beg of you—just as I once took yours".

Ellicott sees in this a "dissuasive from Judaism urged on the ground of his own dereliction of it"; compare I Cor. ix. 20, 21. The structure, as always, decided for us that the sentiment of Gal. iv. 12 corresponds with that of Gal. ii. 19. It is not an appeal for their friendship, it is a parallel with the appeal made to Peter, calling attention to the Apostle's attitude to the law, and in effect saying "If I, a Hebrew, should have seen it essential to my salvation to die to the law that I might live unto God, how utterly inexplicable must your conduct be, being by race Gentiles, to turn back to that system after having been made Christ's free men".

With this appeal we bring this most vivid and vital section of Galatians to a conclusion. There is much more close reasoning and earnest appeal to be considered, but before we can proceed further, a survey of the next great section is called for. This we hope to give in our next article.

## **No.71. (29) GALATIANS.**

### **Galatians iv. -12 - 20.**

#### **The travail of an apostle.**

**pp. 234 - 237**

We have now given consideration to the first great central member of Galatians, namely Gal. ii. 15 - iv. 12, which can be summed up under the heading "The Cross v. The Law", and divided under the sub-headings Faith v. Works and Liberty v. Bondage. We now turn our attention to the corresponding great member, Gal. iv. 12 - vi. 10, which may be summed up under the headings "The Cross v. The Flesh", and subdivided under the sub-headings Spirit v. Flesh and Liberty v. Bondage. This great section must naturally be broken up into smaller portions if we are to study it intelligently, and so we concentrate our attention at the moment on Gal. iv. 12-20, which is in the nature of a personal appeal to the Galatians, referring to their past love and their present zeal and the evil influence of their Judaistic teachers.

The structure emphasizes the great difference which the Apostle observed between the reception with the Galatians had given him on a former visit, even though circumstances



them sorry with a letter” (II Cor. vii. 2-8) yet, as he afterward explained, his object in thus writing, was “not for his cause that had done the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong, but that our care for you in the sight of God might appear unto you” (II Cor. vii. 12).

So the Galatians were to remember that Paul did not allow personal grievances to interpose between himself and his duty. He still loved these erring Galatians; loved them so much that he uses the strange figure of going through the pains of child-birth on their account the second time.

“Ye have not injured me at all” but, he says, you know, on the contrary, how you received me when I first preached the gospel to you. What does he mean by “through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you”?

*Dia* “through” followed by the accusative, as it is here, usually denotes “the ground or motive of an action”. It is possible that the rarer meaning “throughout a period of infirmity” may be intended, and it is difficult for anyone at the present time to decide, simply because facts known to the Galatians are unknown to ourselves. The straightforward translation of the passage yields the idea that at the time Paul was suffering some physical infirmity. He had, in such unprepossessing conditions, not only preached the gospel acceptably, but in spite of the trial such a condition imposed upon them and himself, instead of “despising” and “rejecting” him as they might have done, they had on the contrary received him as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.

The word translated “reject” is *ekptuo*, literally “to spit out”, suggesting that the sickness which had fallen on Paul, rendered him somewhat loathsome or objectionable. He speaks of this infirmity as “my temptation”, which is altered in the R.V. and reads “and that which was a temptation to you”. The word “temptation” means a “trial”, and while this bodily infirmity of Paul would have been a great trial to himself, it was in fact a greater means of “trial” to the Galatians, and they had been proved worthy by it, for they had not only received the Apostle “as an angel”, weak and despicable as he then was, but had manifested such love and esteem for him that had it been possible, they would have plucked out their own eyes and have given them to him.

There are those who point to various proverbs which speak of “giving the very heart out of one” for another, but there are one or two reasons for believing that Paul refers to a definite affliction of his own eyes, rather than to making a proverbial reference here. In the first case, if this be a proverb, it is rather an extravagant one, and not in line with the usual practice of the Apostle, and secondly, it is not reasonable to use an extravagant proverb, and yet to limit its application by the matter of “possibility”—yet to limit its application by the matter of “possibility”—yet he says “if it had been possible”. Then, had this utterance been a proverb it would probably have read “You would have been ready to have given your eyes to serve me”, but here, Paul uses the word “to root out” and “give unto me”. There can be little doubt but that he suffered some form of ophthalmia, a disease very prevalent in the East in his day, and induced in him by the vision he had received on the road to Damascus. With such a disease, he would be

always very conscious of the pitiable spectacle he presented, and remembered the more with warmest feelings the attitude of the Galatians at such a time. Indeed said he “you felicitated yourselves” (Gal. iv. 15) on having such a teacher in your midst, and now, am I to understand that, seeing you on the brink of spiritual sin, I tell you plainly the truth concerning your violent lapse from grace, that I must therefore be your enemy?

The Apostle now turns from the deceived to the deceivers. Already in chapter i. we became aware of the presence of a pernicious influence at work among the Galatians.

“There are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ” (Gal. i. 7).

Was it the association of ideas that made him speak immediately after this about “an angel from heaven”? (see the sequence in Gal. iv. 14-17). Again, in chapter v., reference is made to those which “trouble” the Galatians (Gal. v. 10, 12).

Ellicott and Alford translate the word rendered “zealously affect” as “they are paying court” but there does not seem any evidence that the false teachers were paying court to the Galatians. The word *zelo* means to be zealous, then to covet or envy. So in I Cor. xii. 31 “covet earnestly”. These false teachers being moved with envy, had attempted to exclude the Apostle from contact with the Galatians.

“So then, I am become your enemy, forsooth, because I tell you the truth! They who persuade you to this effect, desire to gain you over to themselves, not by fair and honourable means, but by artful misrepresentation. They would shut you out from—whom? or from what? from whom, doubtless, but from their spiritual pastor and guide—the man who, of all others, stood directly in the way of their designs, and in order to damage him in their estimations they descended to those base and unworthy devices.”

After this conciliatory and personal note, Paul returns to the serious matter that called this epistle into being.

“My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice: for I stand in doubt of you” (Gal. iv. 19, 20).

Then follows the “allegorizing” of the story of Hagar, Ishmael, Sarah and Isaac in a further attempt to demonstrate the “foolishness” of the backward movement of these beloved Galatians, but this must occupy our attention in the next article.

**“Go ye and learn what that meaneth”**  
**(Matt. ix. 13)**

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

**No.7. Revelation.**  
**pp. 38 - 40**

In our study of the laws that govern the approach to “meaning” we have confined ourselves to the natural processes with which all men are endowed, but which, by reason of sin and death, are defective, and by reason of the spiritual character of the Scriptures are inadequate. The three natural steps, (1) Senses, (2) Memory, (3) Reason, now give place to three parallel steps, (1) Revelation, (2) Translation, (3) Interpretation, when dealing with the meaning of the Inspired Word. The slow and at times painful process of “trial and error” that must of necessity characterize the employment of the senses, gives place in the Spiritual realm to the inspired and positive statements of Revealed truth.

The infant, through his senses, can eventually find out something both of himself and of the world about him, but who by searching can find out God unto perfection? Instead therefore of spending our days slowly accumulating evidences, for the existence of God, for the nature of man, for the character of sin, or of righteousness, for the nature of the soul, for the purposes of the ages, for the nature of the Person and Work of Christ, we acknowledge that these are subjects of revelation, and that they yield their meaning and message to faith.

Let us seek to understand some of the implications of this terms Revelation. We can reduce the subject to five heads.

- (1) Revelation implies a Revealer, someone able to undertake and accomplish the task.
- (2) Revelation implies that there is something hidden, that will not perceived unless revealed, something beyond the attainment of human research or experiment.
- (3) Revelation suggests, moreover, that Some One is desirous of making Himself, His Purpose, His Truth known, and has taken infinite care in the process.
- (4) Revelation moreover is impossible unless there be one who can perceive and appreciate the subject revealed. Man the receiver must be, either by creation or regeneration adequately equipped to receive a revelation.
- (5) Revelation necessitates the employment of a fitting medium. Creation itself, the Story associated with the Stars, the law of God engraven on the conscience, and finally, the Revelation effected by the Word, first of all by the Scriptures the Written Word, and secondly by Christ Himself the Living Word.

Let us use this outline as a guide, and first, let us consider:

## (1) THE REVEALER.

In the wisdom of God, Nebuchadnezzar not only demanded of his wise men the interpretation of the dream that troubled him, but a revelation of the dream itself, and this illustrates the utter failure of the wisdom of this world to reveal the truth of God. If human wisdom had been capable, then “the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers and the Chaldees” (Dan. ii. 2), “the wise men, the soothsayers” (Dan. ii. 27; v. 7), “the star gazers and the monthly prognosticators” (Isa. xlvii. 13) should have been sufficient. But all was in vain. It is the testimony of Daniel that “there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets” (Dan. ii. 28).

In the A.V. we read:

“The secret *things* belong unto the Lord our God; but those *things* which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever” (Deut. xxix. 29).

While this makes good sense, this translation does not express the meaning of the original. Rotherham has the following footnote here:

“A very ancient official document . . . . has dots (denoting spuriousness) upon the words Yahweh our God. ‘When these are cancelled’, says Dr. Ginsburg, ‘we obtain the sense—“The secret things and the revealed things belong to us and to our children for ever if we do all the words of the Law”.’ That is, the secret things, or the doctrines which have not as yet been revealed (comp. Deut. xxxi. 11-14), belong to us and our children, or will be disclosed to us. It is remarkable that Rashi already expresses the opinion that the words L’YHWH ELOHENU, *To the Lord our God*, ought to have been pointed, but reverence for the Divine name prevented its being done” (G. Intro., p. 318, 321, 330).

Readers of the *Companion Bible* will find fuller explanation in Appendix 31.

Throughout the Bible, it is God that speaks, it is His Word that is recorded, and it is unnecessary just here to occupy space and time attempting to “prove” that which is the accepted basis of all our teaching. God is the Revealer, and the Scriptures are the record of that revelation. We pass therefore to the essential meaning of revelation and what the term implies.

## (2) REVELATION.

What is Revelation? What does it imply? First let us acquaint ourselves with the Hebrew word employed. It is *galah*, and to the uninitiated it is rather bewildering to discover that the same word, in the same construction of the verb, means “to reveal” and “to carry away captive”. This phenomenon usually indicates that there is a common root lying behind these two concepts which, once seen, makes all clear. The primary meaning of *galah* is “to uncover, especially to uncover and expose nakedness” (Lev. xx. 11-21). When a people are deported and carried into captivity the land that is left is conceived of as being “naked” or “uncovered”. The act of revealing anything is expressed in opening the ear (Job xxxiii. 16; I Sam. xx. 12; II Sam. vii. 27 margin) or opening the eye (Job xxxvi. 15; Numb. xxiv. 4) where in each case the true reading is “to uncover the ear, or the eye”. Gesenius says *galah* means “to be naked . . . . especially used of the ear by taking away the hair; of the face by taking away a veil”.

This brings us to the Greek words *apokalupto* to reveal, and *apokalupsis* revelation. The Greek word *kalupto* means the opposite of the Hebrew *galah* “to uncover”, it means “to cover” or “to veil” *kalumma* meaning a veil (II Cor. iii. 13). *Apo*, meaning “away from”, makes *apokalupsis* therefore an “unveiling”. The English words *veil*, and *reveal*, both come from the Latin *velum*, a covering or a veil—so that “revelation” in our own tongue means exactly the same as the Hebrew *galah* and the Greek *apokalupsis*. Secret or hidden things are the subjects of “revelation”. God is spoken of as “He that revealeth secrets” (Dan. ii. 29), and a “secret” *sathar* is something that is hid (Exod. iii. 6; Deut. xxix. 29; Gen. iv. 14). The unveiling of hidden secrets is the object of revelation, and cannot be attained by unaided human reason.

(3) THE REVEALER. *The personal element in the conception of revelation.*

The subject of revelation deals with the most wonderful of all subjects, the purpose of the ages, the problem of sin and its remedy, the manifestation of the nature of God and of man, and the revelation of grace in the person and work of the Redeemer. All this is personal to a degree. Man does not put up the request for revelation, God initiates the unveiling. Man would never have dreamed of the existence of the hidden secrets that form the core of Divine truth. God had a desire unto the work of His hands, He sought fellowship with His creatures, He crossed the barrier that divides the absolute from the conditioned, the invisible from the manifest. It is God Who reveals, and gives that revelation to man.

(4) THE RECEIVER.

The fact of a revelation, written or spoken in human language, using figures and ideas that are intelligible to man, not only presupposes a Personal Revealer, but demands *some affinity* on the part of the receiver. Just as it is impossible for one human being to conduct an argument until some common ground is reached where both persons concerned are in agreement, so it is impossible for God to communicate His Revelation unless the ones to whom such a revelation is directed have some common ground with the One Who made the revelation. God is Creator, man a creature, and a great gulf divides the two; but God created man in His image and likeness, *and by so doing* made it possible that the thoughts of God could be communicated to the lowly yet honoured work of His hands.

(5) THE MEDIUM.

As the ages unroll, and the need for a revelation of God’s purpose became insistent, so the means used changed until it was concentrated in “The Word”.

To the translation and interpretation of the Scriptures therefore we next turn our attention as we seek to attain to their meaning.

## No.8. Translation. pp. 71, 72

In the course of our pursuit for “sense” and “meaning” we come to the great fact that God has made a revelation of His Will and Purpose; that this revelation constitutes the Holy Scriptures, and that these Scriptures were written in Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek. Now if these languages were our mother tongue, or if we were as familiar with them as we are with English, the next step in our advance towards meaning, would be denominated “Interpretation”. But few if any of the readers of the *Berean Expositor*, are so familiar with these ancient languages as to be independent of the office of a translator. Those who are thus privileged are in need of no word here from us on the subject, and those who are not cannot be turned into translators by the perusal of an article. What then can we do? The teaching of grammar and the necessary practice in translation is quite outside the scope of this journal, we can only look at the translator at work, consider principles that guide him and come to whatever conclusions sound thinking and prayer may lead us.

The word “translation” does not occur in the Scriptures in the sense in which we use it in this article, but in the primary sense of transferring someone or something from one place to another (Col. i. 13; Heb. xi. 5). *Metatithemi* which is the word rendered “translate” in Heb. xi. 5 is used of carrying out the body of Jacob from Egypt to Sychem (Acts vii. 16), for the removing of the believer from the faith (Gal. i. 6) and for the change of priesthood consequent upon the death and resurrection of Christ (Heb. vii. 12). *Metathesis* “translation” in Heb. xi. 5 is rendered “change” in vii. 12 and “removing” in xii. 27. *Methistano* which is employed in Col. i. 13 is translated elsewhere “put out”, “remove” and “turn away” (Luke xvi. 4; Acts xiii. 22; xix. 26; I Cor. xiii. 2).

While the word “translate” occurs but once in the O.T. of the A.V. namely in II Sam. iii. 10 “to translate the kingdom from the house of Saul”, the Hebrew word thus rendered is in constant use. It is the Hebrew *abar* “to cross over” as of the crossing of Jordan. In II Samuel itself where the word *abar* occurs about forty-seven times, and in every passage except iii. 10, physical transference over or across is intended, as for example: “and there went over a ferry boat to carry over the king’s household” (II Sam. xix. 18).

It may be said that goods transferred by ferry boat from one side of a stream to another remain unchanged, but if we widen the breach and transfer goods from the shores of England to the shores of France, while the *material* remains the same, conformity to the new conditions, new customs, new dues, new prices, new climatic effects, must be taken into account. This crude illustration brings us to the first great controversy regarding the translation of the Scriptures or of any other book from one language to another.

“With a slavish literality delicate shades of meaning cannot be reproduced, nor allowance be made for the influence of interwoven thought, or of the writer’s ever shifting—not to say changing—point of view. An utterly ignorant or utterly lazy man, if

possessed of a little ingenuity, can with the help of a dictionary and grammar give a word-for word rendering, whether intelligible or not, and print 'Translation' on his title page. On the other hand it is a melancholy spectacle to see men of high ability and undoubted scholarship, toil and struggle at translation under a needless restriction to literality, as in intellectual handcuffs and fetters, when they might with advantage snap the bonds and fling them away, as Dr. Welldon has done" (Dr. Weymouth, Preface to First Edition).

Dr. Weymouth refers to the R.V. and better still to Darby's *New Translation*, saying that if the reader is bent upon getting a literal rendering, he will find it in these versions, but should be on his guard against their strong tendency of mislead because of the idioms that are found in the Greek of the N.T., Greek that is interpenetrated with Hebraisms, which "a literal rendering into English cannot but partially veil, and in some degree distort the true sense". Moffatt quotes from De Quincey's essay on "Protestantism", on the popular delusion that "every idea and word which exists, or has interchangeable equivalent in all languages". "Thus", continues Moffatt, "there is no exact English equivalent for terms like *logos* and *musterion* and *dikaioisune*".

On the other hand, J. N. Darby says, in connection with this same subject:

"My endeavour has been to present to the merely English reader the original as closely as possible. Those who make a version for public use must of course adapt their course to the public. Such has not been my object or thought, but to give the student of Scripture, who cannot read the original, as close a translation as possible."

Speaking of the A.V., Darby says:

"There is one principle which the translators avow themselves, which is a very great and perilous mistake. Where a word occurs in Greek several times in the same passage or even sentence, they render it, as far as they possibly can, by different words in English. In some cases the effect is very serious; in all the connection is lost. Thus in John 5 we have 'judgment' committed to the Son; shall not come into 'condemnation'; the resurrection of 'damnation'. The word is the same in Greek, and every one can see that 'not coming into judgment' is a very different thing from 'not coming into condemnation'. The whole force of the passage depends on this word, and its contrast with life."

The reader, though he know not a single word of either Hebrew or Greek, and has never attempted to translate a single sentence from one language to another, will be conscious that translation and interpretation are not so severely separated as not to mingle and influence one another. As we are not able to help the reader to become a translator, and as the ability to appraise any particular translation depends upon a combination of qualities and attainments that may be possessed but which cannot be given, we will pass from this specialized feature of translation, to the more general work of interpretation, in which all gifts and talents may be employed whether by scholars or common folk, whether they labour in ancient languages or merely use their own mother tongue.

## **No.9. Interpretation.** **pp. 116 - 118**

In our quest for “meaning” and “sense” we have arrived at the last phase “Interpretation”. We might do worse than commence this study with a quotation from Crabb’s *English Synonyms*:

“To *explain*, is generic, the rest are specific: *to expound* and *interpret* are each modes of *explaining*. Single words or sentences or symbolic sign is interpreted. It is the business of the philologist to explain the meaning of the words by a suitable definition; it is the business of the divine to expound Scripture; it is the business of the antiquarian to interpret the meaning of old inscriptions on stones or of hieroglyphics on buildings. An explanation serves to assist the understanding, to supply a deficiency, and remove obscurity; an exposition is an ample explanation, in which minute particulars are detailed and the connection of events in the narrative is kept up . . . . to explain is simply to render intelligible; to illustrate and elucidate are to give additional cleverness . . . . we explain by reducing compounds to simples, and generals to particulars; we illustrate by means of examples, similes and allegorical figures; we elucidate by commentaries, and the statement of facts. Words are the common subject of explanation; moral truths require illustration; poetical allusions and dark passages in writers require elucidation.”

INTERPRETATION. Interpretation is the act of explaining that which is otherwise unintelligible, not understood, or not obvious.

“Do not interpretations belong to God?” (Gen. xl. 8).

Interpretation unfolds the intent, meaning or reason of any sign or event:

“Pharaoh told them his dream; but there was none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh” (Gen. xli. 8).

Interpretation covers two allied processes: 1. Exegesis. 2. Hermeneutics.

“The Science which discloses to us the tenets of Holy Writ we call Biblical Exegesis or Interpretation. Biblical Archaeology and Biblical Introduction are the proper instruments for the accomplishment of that object, which we call the Historical Interpretation of the Scriptures; the *true* and perfect Biblical interpretation is thus comprised in the category of GRAMMATICO-HISTORICAL EXEGESIS” (Kitto).

“Hermeneutics and Exegetics are closely akin, but not identical. The former lays down the principles of Biblical interpretation; the latter deals with the practical application of the principles thus laid down. In other words, Hermeneutics is a science, Exegetics is an art” (Lloyd).

If Hermeneutics is the science, and exegesis the art of explanation, our course is clear. We must start with Hermeneutics. Now it may be that to many this word will itself need explanation, so let us devote the remainder of our space to the explanation and interpretation of Hermeneutics.

The word is evidently of foreign origin, and the first thing we must do is to “translate” the term. Hermes is the name in Greek Mythology which was given to the son of Zeus, the messenger of the gods; and so the god of science, commerce, eloquence, and many of the arts of life, is called “Mercury” by the Romans, or “Hermes” by the Greeks. The reader may feel a certain reluctance in using the name of a false god in connection with so sacred a task as the interpretation of Holy Writ, and so the next step must be to enable the reader to see that no such reluctance is manifested by the writers of the Scripture.

Hermes and Mercury. The idolatrous people of Lystra when they saw the miracle and heard the Apostle speak, said:

“The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men. And they called Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercurius, *because he was the chief speaker*” (Acts xiv. 11, 12).

Here, the idolaters indicated some reason for their choice, Mercury, or Hermes as the word is in the Greek of the N.T., being associated with speech. Hermes had become a proper name among the Greek, as Rom. xvi. 14 will show, while among those who turned away from the Apostle at the end was one named Hermogenes.

The verbs *hermeneuo*, *diermeneuo*, and *methermeneuo* are found in the N.T. all with the meaning “to interpret”. Let us consider the way in which these words are employed by the inspired writers.

#### *Hermeneuo.*

“They said unto Him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master)” (John i. 38).  
“Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone” (John i. 42).  
“Go, wash in the pool of Siloam (which is by interpretation, Sent)” (John ix. 7).  
“First being by interpretation King of righteousness” (Heb. vii. 2).

#### *Diermeneuo.*

“He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures” (Luke xxiv. 27).  
“A certain disciple called Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas” (Acts ix. 36).  
“Do all interpret?” “Except he interpret.” “Pray that he may interpret.”  
“Let one interpret” (I Cor. xii. 30; xiv. 5, 13, 27).

#### *Methermeneuo.*

“Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us” (Matt. i. 23).  
“Which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise” (Mark v. 41).  
“Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull” (Mark xv. 22).  
“We have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted, the Christ” (John i. 41).  
“Surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation)” (Acts iv. 36).  
“Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation)” (Acts xiii. 8).

In addition we have interpretation *hermenia* (I Cor. xii. 10; xiv. 26); and interpreter *diermeneutes* (I Cor. xiv. 28).

**No.10. What do we mean by “interpret”?**  
**pp. 131 - 135**

We have seen the importance of Interpretation in the quest of “meaning” and have considered some phases and aspects of the term. There are, besides the words *hermeneuo* and its compounds, other Hebrew and Greek words that must be considered before we are ready to go forward with the study of Interpretation.

It is one thing to possess tools, it is another thing to know how to use them. No amount of book learning will make a novice into a craftsman, and no rules that we can give will make a believer into a trustworthy interpreter of God’s Word. Yet the craftsman learns certain rules, and the unashamed workman will appreciate help in the great work of handling aright the Word of God.

What do we mean when we use the word “interpret”?

On one or two occasions it has been the writer’s privilege to speak to gatherings of the Lord’s people in other countries, and to have the assistance of an interpreter. One such person gracefully volunteered to interpret just whatever we chose to say, although he himself did not believe all the things we said. With the best intentions in the world, his mere literal interpretation failed. At another meeting of the same series another enthusiastic believer, who did most heartily endorse our teaching regarding the Mystery, undertook to be the interpreter, but his very zeal and anxiety that his hearers should not miss the point, or that no feature should be withheld, made him not only interpret what was actually said, but anticipate what might have been intended, and supplement by comments of his own, so that the address had to stop while an agreement was come to as to what was the correct role of an interpreter. We must never misinterpret the office of an interpreter as one speaker did, and call it an “interrupter”! There are alas many, who in the guise of translators or interpreters, obscure or distort the plain meaning of Holy Writ, from whose baneful characteristics may the Lord deliver us. While the A.V. is itself a human interpretation, and therefore must never be placed in the position that the inspired originals alone occupy, we shall not go far astray at this point if we collect together the different words found in the original that are translated interpret and interpretation in that Version.

We have in Gen. xl. 22 the first occurrence of the word in the story of Joseph:

“He hanged the chief baker: as Joseph had interpreted to them.”

The word used in this passage occurs fourteen times in Gen. xl. and xli., and is limited to the interpretation of dreams. We are not called upon to interpret dreams today, and consequently need not linger over this phase of the subject.

The next reference, however, is of the utmost importance and has a direct bearing upon our theme:

“To understand a proverb, and the interpretation; the words of the wise and their dark sayings” (Prov. i. 6).

At the first glance, one may think that something is astray in this translation, for how else could anyone *understand* a proverb, apart from its interpretation? We must put into practice a rule which is to be explained later in this series, namely, the observance of parallels.

To understand a proverb . . . . and the interpretation.  
The words of the wise . . . . and their dark sayings.

A proverb is obviously the word of the wise, therefore, if the rule of parallels be a sound one, the “interpretation” should have something in common with “dark sayings”. This word translated “interpretation” is found in Hab. ii. 6, where it is translated “taunting”. *The Companion Bible* renders it “satire, or the point of what is said”. One may translate “the words of the wise”, and give the most literal and consistent equivalents that can be conceived, and yet miss the “point”, and if this be so, we are giving chaff for wheat. The A.V. finishes the introduction to the book of Proverbs at verse six. It should however include verse seven:

“For putting a distinct meaning into a proverb or an enigma;  
Into the words of the wise and their intricate things;  
The fear of the Lord is the main knowledge:  
A wisdom and a discipline that fools despise” (Prov. i. 6, 7 Miller).

One may have the most fool-proof of systems, but no amount of method will take the place of that initial qualification “the fear of the Lord”. There needs to be not only the intelligent use of the concordance but a heart in concord with the will of God when the “point” of the passage is to be discovered and presented.

Another word translated “interpret” is found in Eccles. viii. 1:

“Who is as the wise man? and who knoweth the interpretation of a thing?”

The Hebrew word *peshar* “interpretation” occurs but once, but the parallel Chaldee *p’shar* is used in Dan. ii. 14 - vii. 16 thirty-two times, and always in connection with dreams of prophetic import given to Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar or Daniel. The recurring thought of Ecclesiastes is expressed in the question “what shall come to pass hereafter?” and consequently this passages in Eccles viii. 1 deals more with prophetic interpretation than the humbler service contemplated in this series.

When Joseph would hide his identity from his brethren we read:

“He spake unto them by an interpreter” (Gen. xlii. 23).

Here the Hebrew word is *luts* a foreigner, and is allied with *melitsah* “taunt” and “point”, already considered in Prov. i. 6. Its primitive meaning and most frequent translation is that of a “scorner”. The word *luts* means to speak unintelligibly, in a

foreign language, to stammer, hence to mock, and only in a derived and secondary sense does it mean an interpreter.

However strange the transition of thought may be from mocking, stammering, to interpreting, we have here for the first time in the many words used in Scripture, one that does bear upon our present quest. The interpreter, among other things, deals with a foreign language—in the case of the Scriptures, Hebrew and Greek—and he must possess two qualifications:

- (1) of apprehending the meaning of the original Scriptures, and
- (2) of making that meaning intelligible to others.

This second feature is another item that we shall have to deal with at large later. A word that comes nearer to the sense of interpretation that is intended in this series is found in Ezra iv. 7:

“And the writing of the letter was written in the Syrian tongue, and interpreted in the Syrian tongue.”

There appears to be something strange about this statement, for a letter written in Syrian could not be interpreted in Syrian—there would be no need for such interpretation.

The R.V. reads:

“Was written in the Syrian *character*, and set forth in the Syrian *tongue*.”

This gives the true meaning of the passage. For a letter might have been written in the Syrian *tongue* but in the *letters* of another language.

“The Chaldee and Syrian tongue was once all one, as appeareth in Gen. xxxi. 47; Ezra iv. 7; Dan. ii. 4. In character indeed they differed; they of Babylon, using one kind of letter; they, of Syria, another: this was that that nonplussed the Babylonian wizards about the writing of the wall, so that they could not read it, though it were in their own language, because it was not in their own letters” (*Lightfoot*).

This, however, is by the way. Our chief concern is the word translated “interpret” here, the Hebrew *targem*. This word is familiar to Bible Students under the form “Targum”, for it is used to indicate the Chaldee paraphrase of the O.T. It lives on today in the word “Dragoman”, the ordinary guide and interpreter of the East, and who, though he exhibits some faults that the true interpreter must avoid, ideally is a good picture of the Scriptural interpreter. We learn from the scrupulous care of the enemies of the Jews a lesson that every interpreter of Holy Writ should have at heart, namely, to consider nothing too trifling that will ensure the plainest possible presentation of the message to be given.

While the mere appearance of the printed page is secondary to the matter (and for the sake of the truth contained therein we have plodded through some very badly printed pages at times), yet a reasonable attention to paragraphs, and the separation of quotations

of Scripture from the rest of the writing, are details that should commend themselves to every unashamed workman. One more word from the O.T. and we pass to the New:

“The telling of the dream, and the interpretation thereof” (Judges vii. 15).

Here the word interpretation is *sheber*, which means “to break”, the word is so translated in Judges vii. 20 “*brake* their pitchers”, and the true interpreter “breaks up” the vehicle in which the revelation of truth is made, so that the meaning shall become as clear as the lamps in the hand of Gideon’s men when their pitchers were broken. Word study and grammatical analysis are not to be pursued *for their own sake*, but for the light contained within the earthen pitchers of human language.

Turning to the N.T. we find that there are two words that are translated “interpret”:

*Epilusis*. “No prophecy of the scripture is of any *private interpretation*” (II Pet. i. 20).

This however is not referring strictly to the “interpretation” of the Scripture, but as to how the Scriptures originally came into being. This is manifest by the sentence that follows, prefaced as it is with the explanatory word “for”.

“For prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by Holy Ghost” (II Pet. i. 21).

*Epilusis* should be translated “unfolding”. Like its cognate *analusis* to loose up or analyze, and *dialusis* to dissipate or dispense, *epilusis* means to solve, loosen, unbind. This word occurs in Mark iv. 34:

“But without a parable spake He not unto them: and when they were alone, He expounded (*epiluo*) all things to His disciples.”

Mark tells that the Lord expounded or solved the meaning of the parables, but Matt. xiii. shows us how He did so. The reader should ponder the Lord’s explanation of the Sower, and of the Tares, as examples of *epilusis*.

In the preceding articles of this series we have examined the meaning and usage of the Greek word *hermeneuo* “to interpret”, we can therefore devote the remaining articles of this series to a consideration of the principles of interpretation, so far as they may be of service to the unashamed workman in his endeavour to “preach the Word” and to “make all men see what is the dispensation of the Mystery”.

## No.11. Various systems of Interpretation Examined. pp. 148 - 151

Before one has learned by experience the necessity for giving instructions both negatively as well as positively, one is inclined to brush aside anything that does not appear to go straight to the point. A fuller acquaintance with human nature will bring one to realize the value of indicating what *not to do* as a supplement to the positive instruction. Anticipating the conclusion of this article, we state that the only method of interpretation that commends itself to us is known as the “grammatico-historical” system, but we feel sure the superiority of this method over all others cannot be appreciated unless those other methods are at least known. It will therefore be no waste of time if we consider and compare the various methods that have been adopted, in order that we may more fully appreciate the one which we here advocate.

### (1) *The Allegorical System.*

The men whose names come to mind when the Allegorical system is mentioned, are Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, born about B.C.20, and Origen, a Greek Christian, 185-254A.D. Philo’s theory is based upon the idea that the Scripture has a twofold message, the exoteric addressed to the *psuchikoi* (the natural man, the soulish man) and the esoteric which is addressed to and discerned by the *pneumatikoi* (the spiritually minded man). One has but to read I Cor. ii. 13, 14, 15 to realize that Philo had a substratum of truth for his exposition of the O.T.; it is however the abuse and misapplication of these features that rendered his interpretations of little value.

As an example, we observe that the four rivers named in Gen. ii. 10-14 which remain rivers and nothing more to the illiterate and unilluminated, become, in the allegorical interpretation, four virtues, namely, prudence, temperance, courage and justice. We must not confuse this allegorical interpretation however with the legitimate use of true type and symbol, for the Scriptures abound with these figures; but we must be on our guard against finding deeper and spiritual significations where none are intended, for sooner or later these will distort both doctrine, prophecy and practice.

### (2) *The Mystical System.*

The mystical system of interpretation seems to have been the result of a revulsion from the cut-and-dried teaching of the Schoolmen. The literal sense of the Scripture, in this system is discarded, and manifold shades and depths of meaning were sought in every word of Scripture. Tyndale has made some trenchant remarks on this system, which are worth repeating:

“They divide the Scriptures into four senses, the literal, tropological (i.e. figurative), allegorical, and anagogical (i.e. mystical)—the literal sense has become nothing at all . . . . Twenty doctors expound one text twenty ways, and with an antitheme of half an inch some of them draw a thread of nine days long . . . . They not only say that the literal sense profiteth nothing, but also that it is hurtful and noisome and killeth the soul. And this they prove by the text of Paul, II Cor. iii 6 ‘The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life’. Lo! say they, the literal sense killeth, the spiritual sense giveth life.”

(3) *The Pietistic System.*

The great principle that actuates this system is known as the “inner light”. A misapplication of I John ii. 20, 27 “But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things” sets the votary of this system free from the encumbrance of grammar and accepted meanings, and gives reign to the wildest imaginings and contradictory teachings. Like the two systems already renewed, it has a substratum of truth, namely, that without the Spirit of Christ within and the illumination of the Sacred Page by the Lord no amount of scholarship can avail. The early pietists were undoubted men of God, but their system degenerated into fanaticism.

(4) *The Accommodation System.*

The man whose name is closely associated with the Accommodation System is Semler, the father of the destructive school of criticism. Modernism is its logical result.

There is an accommodation that is right and true. The condescension of the Lord that uses the common language of man, the illustration by means of parable and type, the giving of “milk” to babes, and “meat” to full grown, these are examples of formal accommodation that graciously “speak after the manner of men”. The system which is before us is not this kind at all. It supposes that our Lord and His apostles “accommodated” their doctrines to the prejudice and ignorance of the Jews to whom they spoke. Because the Jews believed that a man named Moses wrote the Pentateuch our Lord is supposed to have endorsed the popular error! The system is so derogatory to the Son of God and to the God of the Bible that those who have any love for truth will need no further description of this system, which stands self-condemned.

(5) *The Moral System.*

“This system owes its origin to the celebrated Immanuel Kant.” Kant’s philosophy had rejected the objective and maintained that there was no certainty in anything but practical reason. This led to extracting from the Scriptures only such ideas as conformed to the principles of practical morality that were implanted in the human breast, and rejecting all else. The only value and purpose of the Bible was to teach and confirm the religion of reason. Kant wrote:

“The historical part of the Scriptures, which contributes nothing to make men better, is purely indifferent, and may be disposed of as we please.”

“We do not assert that the sense given by us to the holy books was intended by the authors, but . . . . assume only the *possibility* of the authors so intending.”

The reader will, we trust, have no room for a system that disregards the “sense intended”, and in its place “assumes only the possibility” of such intention!

(6) *The Naturalistic System.*

This system is the one associated with Paulus, a German Theologian of 1828A.D., of which the following specimens will be sufficient. His exposition of John vi. 19 is:

“When they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty stadia they see Jesus walking about over the sea (on the bank or shore, which is higher than the sea) and near the ship (which kept near the shore).”

The explanation offered for the feeding of the 5,000 is that the disciples began to share out the bread and fish, and so following their example the whole multitude shared round what they had and all were satisfied! We need give no further notice of this system.

Closely allied with the naturalistic system is the Rationalist mode of interpretation, which does not seek from the Scriptures its teaching but receives only that which squares with some previously accepted philosophy. “An external standard is set up to which Scripture must bend” (Davidson).

This description also applies to that system that selects its specimen texts and quietly says nothing about others that may not support the special view advocated. In other words “usage” is ignored”.

(7) *The Mythical System.*

This system proceeds on the assumption that the histories and biographies of Scriptures are not necessarily actual occurrences, but myths. In the *Life of Jesus* by Strauss and by Weisse, 1838A.D., the mythical system is given full scope. The genealogies of Christ given in Matthew and Luke merely indicate that there is a connection between Judaism and the new message of salvation. Joseph is neither the real father nor the step father of the Saviour, he symbolizes the relation of Judaism and Christianity. The historic sense is entirely lost. In the words of Strauss, either “the divine cannot have taken place in such a way, or that which has so taken place cannot have been divine”. The apostle Paul speaks of the teachers of the last days who:

“shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables (myths)”  
(II Tim. iv. 4).

(8) *The Apologetic and Dogmatic System.*

The objection to this system is that instead of approaching the Scriptures to discover what they teach, it approaches Scripture to discover proofs for doctrine already formulated and held. It is no justification of this system that many of the doctrines thus supported turn out to be Scriptural; the doctrine may be right but the procedure is wrong. We are not to ransack the Bible to find proof texts, but to humbly and earnestly give heed to its own statements of truth and desire them all without reserve and without partiality; Usage again!

(9) *The Grammatico-historical System.*

“Nearly all the treatises on hermeneutics”, says Moses Stuart, “since the days of Ernesti, have laid it down as a maxim which cannot be controverted, that the Bible is to be interpreted in the same manner, that is, by the same principle, as all other books . . . . these principles are coeval with nature . . . . the person addressed has always been an

interpreter in every instance where he has heard and understood what was addressed to him”.

This is the system of interpretation that commends itself to those who seek truth at the fountain head.

**No.12. Rule #1. “Rightly Divide the Word of Truth.”  
pp. 173 - 176**

We have looked at the meaning of the word “interpret” in our opening article, and now we turn our attention to those rules found either within the pages of the Word, or recognizes as fundamental and necessary by all interpreters in all spheres of their work. There can be no two thoughts as to what must be the first and fundamental principle, the chief guiding rule for the unashamed workman. The very term “unashamed workman” has been borrowed from II Tim. ii. 15, and in that great text will be found the guiding principle for all right handling of the Word of Truth.

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

The reader of the *Berean Expositor* will need no introduction to this text. It has been printed on the front page of this magazine throughout the years of its witness, and its application to the subject in hand has become second nature with us. Yet it is remarkable that while quite a number of volumes have been written entitled “Bible Hermeneutics” or similar titles, and canvass the subject from end to end, yet not once can we remember ever seeing II Tim. ii. 15 quoted, let alone commented upon by their authors.

In order that we should give the best to our readers, we have made it a point to consult various standard works. These includes Fairbairn, Davidson, Ernesti, Seiler, Campbell, Sawyer, Pareau, Bosanquet, Child, Terry, Cave and Marsh, together with articles in Encyclopaedias, Introductions and Handbooks, yet the fact remains, not one of these authors have been under any necessity to give “right division” a place in their schemes.

Although practically every reader is familiar with this theme, we must take nothing for granted, and must give it as much attention as though it were something new. We remember that Timothy was the son of a Jewish mother and a Greek father; that he lived in the province of Galatia, and that it is as certain as anything can be, that he read the Septuagint version of the O.T. (For an explanation of the title “Septuagint” and what it entails, the reader is directed to Volume XXII, page 33). Timothy’s mother who had taught her son the Holy Scriptures since babyhood (II Tim. i. 5; iii. 15) would most surely have instructed him in the book of Proverbs. Consequently when the Apostle wrote to him his second epistle, and Timothy saw the word which is translated “rightly dividing” in our version, he would have no need to consult a Greek dictionary, it would have been as familiar to Timothy as any word in the vocabulary of his faith. The Greek

word is *orthotomounta*, the present participle of *orthotomeo* from *orthos* “straight or right”, and *temno* “to cut”, as in the word *anatomy*. In the Septuagint version of Prov. iii. 6, that is to say in Timothy’s Bible, the word is found:

“In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall rightly divide thy paths.”

Even the word used in the A.V. signifies much the same, for if one is called upon to “direct” any one, it is of no service to describe half a circle and say the way is “over there”. When one directs the steps of another, it is essential that the district be “rightly divided”. This is not necessarily a long process. The simple pointing of the finger, and the words “over there” of necessity set aside all other points of the compass. Right division, as understood by Timothy would simply mean following the direction of the finger post along, the highway. All the redeemed are treading the way of life, but all the redeemed are not to be blessed in the same sphere or in the same company. Consequently there will be a sign post along the road which will point one way to an “earthly” and the other way to an “heavenly” inheritance; for some are to inherit the earth, as is abundantly attested by the Prophets, the Sermon on the Mount and the book of the Revelation. Another sign post bears the names Peter, Apostle of the Circumcision, and Paul, the Apostle of the Uncircumcision, as Gal. ii. 7-9 shows.

Believing Hebrews who endured to the end, looked for a heavenly city, as did Abraham, and were partakers of the heavenly calling (Heb. xi. 16; I Pet. i. 1, 4). This is the heavenly phase of the kingdom, and must not be confused with the higher calling of the Church of the Mystery. This church is blessed in heavenly places, far above all principality, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, and so is distinct from all other callings.

In Volume XXV, page 77 (???) we have reprinted the opening article of the series “The Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth”. We do not feel justified in going over the ground covered by that article except by way of a summary. The following items are touched upon, but it will suffice for the present to set them out in tabulated form.

| <b>RIGHT DIVISION</b>                    |   |
|--|---|
| L a w                                    | G r a c e                                     |
| Old Covenant.                            | New Covenant.                                 |
| Gospel of the Kingdom.                   | Gospel of the glory of Christ.                |
| Presence of miraculous gifts.            | Absence of miraculous gifts.                  |
| The Second Coming of Messiah to earth.   | The appearing in Glory.                       |
| Ordinances, ceremonials, shadows.        | The Body is of Christ.                        |
| The Twelve apostles (Matt. x.; Acts i.). | The Apostles of the Ascended Lord (Eph. iv..) |
| The Royal Priesthood.                    | The One Body.                                 |
| The restored Wife.                       | The Bride of the Lamb (???)                   |

In every one of these pairs of teaching most important “things that differ” appear, but instead of dealing with them further, let us open the book at II Tim. ii. where our text is found, and observe the many items that await the application of this principle in that chapter itself.

“The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also” (II Tim. ii. 2).

Here the Apostle “rightly divides” between the truth committed to himself as the prisoner of the Lord, and that committed to the Apostle of the Circumcision. Failure to recognize this distinction lies at the root of much confused teaching today. Timothy was to “rightly divide” among the redeemed, and commit this precious truth to those men only who were “faithful”. This however was not sufficient. All faithful men are not “able to teach others” and so a further process of right division must be put into operation.

“No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life” (II Tim. ii. 4).

We must “rightly divide” between the two words translated life namely *zoe* and *bios*. *Zoe* is used mainly of the life principle (John iii. 16) whereas *bios* deals with the phenomenon of life, the means of living (Mark xii. 44).

“Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel” (II Tim. ii. 8).

The same Christ had been raised from the dead as an historic fact independently of anybody’s gospel. He had been raised from the dead *according* to Peter’s gospel (Acts ii. 30) with a view to David’s throne, being somewhat different from the position that Christ held *according* to the gospel committed to Paul.

“Therefore I endure all things for the elect’s sakes, that they may also obtain salvation which is in Christ Jesus with *aiōnian* glory” (II Tim. ii. 10).

This is not salvation pure and simple, but *that* salvation which is accompanied with “*aiōnian* glory”. This distinction is the subject of the verses that immediately follow:

“It is a faithful saying: For if we died with Him, we shall also live with Him (*salvation in its simplest form*). If we endure, we shall also reign with Him (*salvation and aiōnian glory*). If we deny Him, He also will deny us (*i.e. of the added glory*). If we are faithless, He abideth faithful, He cannot deny Himself (*i.e. so far as initial salvation is concerned*)” (II Tim. ii. 11-13).

“Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers” (II Tim. ii. 14).

Here Timothy has to divide between “words to no profit” and “these things” that deal with salvation and glory.

Pursing our investigation beyond verse fifteen we observe that Hymenæus and Philetus did not actually *deny* the resurrection but *misplaced* it. They failed to “rightly divide” as to time (II Tim. ii. 17, 18). Then we see that the foundation of God has a seal with two sides, one emphasizing divine grace and the other human responsibility (II Tim. ii. 19). We further learn that there is need to “rightly divide” between the vessels that are found in a great house (II Tim. ii. 21), also we are taught what to “flee” and what to “follow” (II Tim. ii. 22), and to distinguish between “striving” and “meekly instructing” (II Tim. ii. 24, 25).

Here therefore in one chapter is a fairly good series of examples of the necessity of “right division”, and if we had gone beneath the surface and examined the words of the original, the number of example would have greatly increased. What has been brought forward however will suffice. Our first great principle of interpretation and the first great rule for the unashamed workman therefore must be that of “right division”.

# HEBREWS

## Perfection or Perdition

### No.6. The Express Image. pp. 155 - 158

We have seen that “the brightness of His glory” is illustrated by the Shekinah glory of the Tabernacle, the Presence rendered visible in the pillar of fire, and anticipated in the prophecy of Ezekiel. We now must ponder the words that follow:

“The express image of His Person ”

In Col. i. 15 Christ is said to be “the Image of the invisible God”, and it is evident that the word “image” is placed over against the word “invisible” with intention. The A.V. translators apparently intended us to understand that a different word was employed in the original of Heb. i. 3, for there we read not “image” but “express image”. The R.V. margin reads “impress”. However figurative the usage of such expressions as “express”, “impress”, “oppress”, “depress” and the like may be, the fundamental idea of “pressure” remains, and when we note that the word employed in Heb. i. 3 is the Greek *charakter*, we realize the reason for the translation given.

The Greek word *charakter* of course supplies us with the English “character”. The idea of “one’s character”, i.e. one’s personal qualities, is a secondary one, the primary meaning being a stamp, mark or sign engraved or stamped, the “mark” of Rev. xiii. 16, according to Wycliffe’s translation. The letters of the alphabet are called “characters” as also the handwriting of a person.

“I found the letter . . . . You know the character to be your brother’s?” (*King Lear*).

We no longer use the verb “to character” but in Shakespeare’s day this was so:

“O Rosalind! these trees shall be my book  
And in their barks my thoughts I’ll *character*” (*As You Like It*).

The Greek verb *charatto* means “to engrave” and is similar in sound to the Hebrew *cheret* “graving tool” (Exod. xxxii. 4), and *charath* “to engrave” (Exod. xxxii. 16). *Charagma* is used by Paul in Acts xvii. 29, when he said “we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device”. Classical usage of *charakter* shows that Plutarch employed it for letters engraved or inscribed on waxed tablets; Sextus Empericus for the impressions or impressed images made by seals; Aristotle for stamping and coining money, literally “putting the impress on it”, giving a coin its “image and superscription”.

Philo, a learned Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, born a few years before Christ, and who in 40A.D. petitioned the Emperor Caligula, wrote very fully regarding the Logos,

who is variously named The Image of God, the Firstborn Son, His Shadow. He says in one place that the *Logos* is designated “the impressed seal of God”. We found that the “brightness of His glory” looked back to the Tabernacle and its Shekinah, and we shall therefore not be surprised to find that the figure of something engraven takes us back also to Old Testament imagery. The apostle refers to the tables of the law as being “written and engraven in stones”, while Exod. xxviii. 11 and 36 speaks of the engraving of the stones of the High Priest’s ephod, and of his mitre, engraved with the words “Holiness to the Lord”.

In Heb. i. 3 Christ is set forth as “The character of His Person”. The introduction of the word “Person” here is somewhat of an anachronism, the theological term “person” was not in use until after the first four centuries of the Christian era, after the Arian controversy. The Greek word thus translated is *hupostasis*, and in none of its occurrences elsewhere can the translation “person” be tolerated. Could we possibly say “Now faith is the *person* of things hoped for”? (Heb. xi. 1). Could we imagine the apostle saying “If we hold the beginning of our *person* steadfast unto the end” (Heb. iii. 14)? Yet the same Greek word is so translated.

The English word “substance” is an exact equivalent of the Greek, but is derived from the Latin. Both *hupo* and *sub* mean under; *histanai* and the Latin *stare* have similar meanings, both being capable of the meaning “to stand”. The first meaning of the English word “substance” is *not* something physically solid as, for example, a brick, and the statement that faith is anything but a “substance” is only true if this lower meaning of the word is intended.

A dictionary gives the undermentioned meanings to the word substance in the following order:

“Being; something that exists, something real, not imaginary; something solid, not empty; that which underlies all outward manifestation; substratum; that which constitutes anything what it is: nature, real or existing essence; the most important element in any existence; the characteristics of anything; anything that has a material form: body, matter, estate, property. We call a noun a substantive because it designates something that exists, or some object of thought, either material or immaterial.”

We have gone to this length of definition because if we merely say that *hupostasis* means substance, we use a word of varied meanings. What we mean by substance here is “that which underlies all outward manifestations”. The hidden unknown characteristics of God are the *hupostasis* (substance) of which the Son, God manifest in the flesh, is the Express Image. It is well to remember that the Greek of the New Testament is a language used by men who thought in Hebrew, or at least had been trained in the Jewish school. The LXX therefore becomes of great service to us, showing us the Hebrew equivalents for these Greek words. In Psa. cxxxix. 15 (A.V. numbering) we read:

“*My substance* was not hid from Thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.”

Verse 13 speaks of the period of birth, but this verse speaks of something far more mysterious. This secret thing, wrought in the lower parts of the earth, the LXX calls “my *hupostasis*”, and this *hupostasis* is to birth (13) what the Substance of Heb. i. 3 is to the Express Image. While the verse which follows does not contain the same word in the LXX, it is nevertheless an expansion of the meaning of *hupostasis*.

“Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in Thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.”

In the earlier verses of the Psalm there is found this same thought of something hidden and unseen except by God (See verses 2 and 4). Another passage where the word occurs in the LXX, is Psa. xxxix. 5 “Behold, thou hast made my days as an handbreath, and mine age (*hupostasis*) is as nothing”. Here the word “age” is in Hebrew *cheled*, something that creeps imperceptibly, and so not manifest. “Time slips our notice and unheeded flies”. The Syriac version used *cheled* to translate, “to creep in” in II Tim. iii. 6.

Psa. lxxix. 2 gives us an example of the simpler concept of “standing”. Our own word “understanding” is a faculty of the mind, a meaning we can very well imagine a would-be expositor ridiculing, who simply used the dissecting knife and limited himself to the etymology “stand” “under”. In the New Testament we find *hupostasis* used in the sense of “confidence”, a most natural development of the idea of underlying reality, II Cor. ix. 4; xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14. Heb. xi. 1 reads, “Now faith is the *substance* of things hoped for”, something real, though not seen. The unseen faith of the worthies that occupy Heb. xi. was manifested in their lives.

Their *hupostasis* had its express image in their lives and conduct. One thing was common to them all. They lived, suffered, and died for something “unseen”, or “seen afar off”; they endured as seeing Him Who is invisible. If faith is the substance of things hoped for, we can use either term with good sense. Instead of the words, “By faith Abel . . . . Noah, Abraham”, we can say, By the conviction produced by the substance (the deep hidden reality) of things hoped for, Abel, Noah, Abraham did this or that.

Christ is the *charakter* of God’s *hupostasis*. No law or set of laws, no fasts, feasts, or sacrifices, no series of typical men could ever be the Express Image; Christ alone is that. It is this thought that permeates the epistle to the Hebrews. It is because of this that the title occurs *here*. It is essential to its true understanding that we remember that it would not have been employed if the theme of the epistle had not demanded it. Because Christ, and Christ alone, is the Express Image, He is above angels (Heb. i.), above Moses (Heb. iii.), and Joshua (Heb. iv.), above the high priesthood of the order of Aaron (v.-viii.), above all typical sacrifices and offerings (ix.-x.), and above all examples and patterns (xii. 1, 2). None but Christ in every phase of His *charakter* can express the glorious *hupostasis* of the invisible God.

No prophet, however closely he walked with God, could ever be “The Express Image of the Divine Substance”. This is the prerogative of Him Who is the Image of the

invisible God, originally the Form of God and called in John's gospel the *Logos*. As such He must set aside all types and shadows. They were not "the very image" (Heb. x. 1), even as John i. 17 tells us that the law, with its types was given by Moses, but REAL GRACE, the true antitypical reality, came by Jesus Christ.

Writing to the Corinthians, Paul had spoken of the passing glory that shone in the face of Moses, as contrasted with the abiding glory seen in the face of Jesus Christ, and in the epistle to the Hebrews in which the writer seeks to wean these believers from the "Word of the BEGINNING of Christ" and to lead them on to "Perfection", he brings them, in the opening verses of his exhortation, into the presence of Him in Whom dwells "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily".

The final attribute given to the Son, before His mediatorial work is introduced, is that He upholds all things by the word of His power, and this wondrous theme must occupy our attention in the next article of this series.

## **No.7. The Word of His Power.** **pp. 194 - 197**

God has spoken to us "in Son". We reiterate this unique expression that the marvellous truth contained therein may enable us to realize the glory of the One we call Saviour and Lord. He is the appointed Heir of all things; by Him the ages were made. He is the Effulgence of the glory of God; He, the Express Image of His substance.

The glories of the Son are not yet exhausted, for the passage proceeds, "and upholding all things by the word of His power". While the Greek word *phero* occurs over sixty times in the New Testament, it is only translated "uphold" once. It is rendered "bring" over thirty times, but the primary meaning of the word ("to bear") seems to be the one intended in the passage before us. Outside the epistle to the Hebrews the word occurs but twice in Paul's epistles:

"Endured with much long-suffering" (Rom. ix. 22).  
"The cloak that I left at Troas . . . . *bring* with thee" (II Tim. iv. 13).

The word is used five times in Hebrews:

"Upholding all things" (Heb. i. 3).  
"Let us *go on* unto perfection" (vi. 1).  
"There must . . . . be (*brought in*, marg.) the death of the testator (or covenant victim)" (ix. 16).  
"They could not *endure* that which was commanded" (xii. 20).  
"*Bearing* His reproach" (xiii. 13).

It will be seen that the word is one which has many usages. The primary idea of bearing as a burden, supporting and sustaining, seems to be the meaning in Heb. i.

Moses, when speaking of the responsibility he felt, in Numb. xi. 11, 12 says, “Thou layest the burden of all this people upon me”, and that God had said, “carry them in thy bosom”. In Hebrews we see “all things” (not merely the burden of one people) upheld by the word of Christ.

When considering the words, “the express image of His substance” we noted a parallel in Col. i. 15-17. We must turn to that passage again:

“Who is the Image of the invisible God, the Firstborn of every creature: for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist.”

We note that there are several parallels here with Heb. i. The Image of the invisible God, and the Express Image of His substance; the creation of all things, and the making of the ages; the statement that by Him all things consist, and that by His word all things are upheld; in both passages He is spoken of as the *prototokos*, the Firstborn. In Colossians the titles are introductory to revealing Christ as the Head of the Body, the church, and the Firstborn from the dead. In Hebrews the titles are introductory to His office as Mediator of the New Covenant, and the Firstborn in the habitable world whereof the apostle speaks in this epistle. The creation in its universal sense is intended in Col. i.; the ages and their burden occupy the thought in Heb. i. The former is held together by the hand that created them, the latter is upheld and carried by the word of His power. Something must be accomplished during the course of the ages, and the word of His power is pledged to bring it to pass. Concerning the Son it is written in Hebrews that He is the upholder of *all things*, appointed heir of *all things*, that *all things* are to be placed in subjection under His feet. It is a comforting as well as a majestic thought to realize that the burden of “all things” pertaining to the purpose of God is resting upon the Son of God. With matchless wisdom, with infinite grace, with mighty power, and with Divine foreknowledge, the whole of God’s marvellous plan is brought to its goal by that One Who died, rose again, ascended and is now seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

What is the means whereby the Son beareth or upholdeth all things? His hands made the heavens; His feet shall have all things placed beneath them; His body bore our sins. It is His Word, however, that upholds all things.

*Rhema* (word) differs from *logos* (word) in that it indicates a spoken word or command, e.g., “by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God”. We find *rhema* in Hebrews as follows:

- “The word of His power” (i. 3).
- “Tasted the good word of God” (vi. 5).
- “The worlds (ages) were framed by the word of God” (xi. 3).
- “The voice of words” (xii. 19).

The Word that framed the ages is the Word that upholds all things, the Word that called them into being will surely prevail over all opposition and bring all to perfection.

It is “the word of His *power*”. He was crucified in weakness, but He liveth by the power of God (II Cor. xiii. 4). He was marked off the Son of God with power, by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4). As the risen One He said, “all power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth” (Matt. xxviii. 18). This word “power” is rendered by “miracle” in Heb. ii. 4, and is linked with *rhema* in vi. 5, “the good Word of God, and the powers of the coming age”. The High-Priesthood of Christ differs from that of Aaron in that it is “according to the power of an endless life” (vii. 16); and in xi. 11, 34 it again occurs. It is the power of the risen Christ that makes His Word effective; He will destroy him that has the power of death, that is the devil. As the risen One He holds the keys of Hades and of death. He is the Son of God with power.

Let us turn for a moment to the records of His life on earth, for there we shall find, even in His humiliation, that His word was with power. When He said to the two fishers, “Follow Me”, there was no hesitation, “they straightway left their nets, and followed him” (Matt. iv. 19, 20); when the Lord had finished the “Sermon on the Mount” we are told, “the people were astonished at His doctrine, for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes” (vii. 28, 29). A leper came and worshipped Him, saying, “Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth His hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed” (viii. 2, 3). This miracle is followed by one that even more clearly testifies to the power of His spoken word. A centurion who sought the Lord on behalf of his sick servant said, “*Speak the word only*, and my servant shall be healed . . . . and his servant was healed in the self-same hour” (viii. 5-13). Shortly after this the Lord and His disciples are found in a ship, and upon a great tempest arising, the disciples call upon the Lord to save them; He rebuked the waves and a great calm followed, “but the men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey Him?” (viii. 24-27).

The miracle of the healing of the man sick of the palsy is a definite demonstration of the power of the Lord’s Word. He had said, “son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee”, and, answering the thought of those who heard these words, said, “for whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith He to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house” (ix. 1-8). So the record continues, His word then was most certainly with power.

If this is the character of His Word while in the form of a Servant, what shall be the character of His word as the risen Son of God with power? So Heb. xii. 25, 26 admonishes:

“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*: Whose voice then shook the earth: but now He hath promised, saying, yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.”

Although primarily this passage goes back to the giving of the law at Sinai, the Old Testament furnishes illustration of the Lord’s Word of power, “and God said, Light be,

and light was” (Gen. i. 3); “By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth”; “For He spake, and it was done, He commanded, and it stood fast” (Psa. xxxiii. 6, 9). Shall we not say that Psa. xxix., the Psalm of the “Voice”, looks forward to that happy day when the Son of God shall have brought or carried all things on to the reign of peace?

“The LORD will bless His people with peace” (Psa. xxix. 11).

The reader will remember the insistence that the structure of the epistle places upon the word “spoken”. The Hebrews naturally clung to the Law, and the record of the majestic accompaniment on Sinai would intensify their attachment to that law introduced by the words:

“And God spake all these words” (Exod. xx. 1).

Here in Christ they would or should perceive One whose Voice could not only shake the earth, but the heavens also, and be led to trust in Him whose Word is so powerful that it upholds all things. Creation is wonderful, but surely it is equally a wonder how the creation with its multifarious activities, combinations and possibilities, “consists”. Col. i. 17 and Heb. i. 3 give the only answer possible. He Whose hands laid the foundation of the earth, and Whose fingers made the heavens (Psa. cii. 25-27; Psa. viii. 3) is the only possible upholder. The discovery of atomic fissures, the consciousness of the terrific force that resides in the smallest piece of matter, only intensifies our appreciation of the Power that can and does hold these destructive forces in leash.

## **No.8. The Purification of sins.** **pp. 227 - 230**

The glories of the Son are not introduced into the opening verses of this epistle without intention; they are now to be focused upon the great work for which He left the glory, became a Man, and died upon the cross. The R.V. omits the words “our” and “by Himself” reading:

“When He had made purification of sins” (Heb. i. 3 R.V.).

We should, however, be aware that not only are these words found in several ancient manuscripts, but are confirmed by some ancient versions. Tischendorf restored them in his edition of 1858.

“In this verse the Apostle affirms the union of the human nature with the Divine, in the one Person of Christ, and then proceeds in a natural order to speak of His exaltation and session in glory in that nature” (Bishop Wordsworth).

“The Son of God being God Most High, *humbled Himself* and became Man; and as *Man He received* that glory which He *ever possessed as God*” (Theodoret).

“This purification was ‘by Himself’ *di’heautou* (Heb. i. 3), “through death” *dia tou thanatou* (Heb. ii. 14) “through His blood” *dia tou idiou haimatos* (Heb. ix. 12) and “through the sacrifice of Himself” *dia tes thusias hautou*” (Heb. ix.26).

This last expression I regard as the *full* form, expressing what is elliptically expressed in our text by *di’heautou* “by Himself” (Moses Stuart).”

The word *katharizo* is used for the cleansing of a leper (Matt. viii. 3), and the ceremonial cleansing of the outside of the cup (xxiii. 25). It is used in the epistle to the Hebrews, as indeed are the other forms of the word, and it will enlighten us as to the meaning if we consider all the other references in this epistle:

“How much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through the *aionian* Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge (*katharizo*) your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (Heb. ix. 14).

“For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying (*katharotes*) of the flesh” (Heb. ix. 13).

“And almost all things are by the law purged (*katharizo*) with blood” (Heb. ix. 22).

“It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified (*katharizo*) with these” (Heb. ix. 23).

“Our bodies washed with pure (*katharos*) water” (Heb. x. 22).

As we examine these passages we shall observe that they do not speak primarily of the forgiveness of sins, or the justification of the sinner; they do not speak of redemption, but of one only of its effects, viz., purification. The type which will indicate fairly clearly the object of the work of Christ in Heb. i. 3 is that of the “ashes of the heifer”.

The nineteenth chapter of Numbers gives a detailed statement of this institution. Let us briefly analyze the record:

- (1) The red heifer had to be without spot or blemish, and one upon which had never come a yoke.
- (2) It was slain “without the camp” (see Heb. xiii. 12).
- (3) The whole heifer, together with cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet, was burned to ashes; these ashes were used for the purpose of purification.
- (4) Uncleanness was contracted by touching a dead body, or by being in a tent wherein a man died, or by touching a bone, or a grave.
- (5) Purification was effected by mixing the ashes with living water and by sprinkling with a bunch of hyssop on the third and seventh days.
- (6) An unclean person who refused to be purified was cut off from the congregation; he had defiled the sanctuary.

It will be noticed that the whole question is one of defilement and its resulting exclusion from the service of the Lord. Some of the causes of uncleanness were quite outside the volition of the person involved, the touching of one slain in the field, or the death occurring in one’s own home were shadows of the defiling contact of the world. Had the water of purifying not been at hand, many would perforce have been absent from the Lord’s house. The great Antitype of the ashes of the heifer is “the blood of Christ”; this “purges the conscience from “DEAD works”. The reference to the defilement of Numb. xix. is obvious; the dead man, the bone, and the grave are here exchanged for “dead works”; the privilege of access to the Tabernacle being exchanged for “service to the living God”. The running water was a type of the “*aionian* Spirit”.

The next passage refers to the fact that almost all things by the law are purified with blood, and that the Tabernacle, the book and the people were thus purified.

“For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood” (Heb. ix. 19-22).

Here we have the other type of purifying, not the ashes of an heifer this time, but the blood of calves and goats. The effect, however, is the same; the result is purifying, and also a solemn dedication; the covenant, the Tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, all had to be CLEAN. The parallelism of Heb. x. 22 will perhaps now be more obvious, as also the way in which the type merges into the antitype, “hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience” is the New Covenant equivalent of “bodies washed with *pure* water”, as also the words, “let us draw near”, which is impossible without purifying. It will be evident that we must include “the blood of sprinkling” (Heb. xii. 24), and indeed all the references to blood in Hebrews.

Speaking without the book, and from a superficial acquaintance with its theme, one would feel certain that in the epistle to the Hebrews a full statement concerning redemption by the blood of Christ would be found. Redemption is not conspicuous in the first reference (Heb. i. 3) to the work of Christ, the whole imagery and teaching has to do with a people *already saved*, who *have* access to God, who *are pressing on* to Canaan, and who *need* the continual ministrations of the priest and offering for their sanctification. But let us see for ourselves; here are the references to *blood* in this epistle:

“The children are partakers of flesh and blood” (ii. 14).

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

“Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained *aionian* redemption for us” (ix. 12).

“For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh” (ix. 13).

“How much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through the *aionian* Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (ix. 14).

“Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood” (ix. 18).

“He took the blood . . . . and sprinkled both the book, and all the people” (ix. 19).

“Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you” (ix. 20).

“Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry” (ix. 21).

“And almost all things are by the law purged with blood” (ix. 22).

“And without shedding of blood is no remission” (ix. 22).

“Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place . . . . with blood of others” (ix. 25).

“For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins” (x. 4).

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

“Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing” (x. 29).

“Through faith he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest He that destroyed the firstborn should touch them” (xi. 28).

“Ye have not yet resisted unto blood” (xii. 4).

“To Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel” (xii. 24).

“The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.” (xiii. 11).

“Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate” (xiii. 12).

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the *aionian* covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will” (xiii. 20, 21).

Those that refer to redemption are ix. 12, 22; x. 4; and xi. 28; of these ix. 12 speaks of redemption as having been obtained already, and is not the result of the offering there, as verses 13, 14 prove; ix. 22, speaking of remission, may at first seem to be a direct statement, yet it is in the midst of a context dealing with the Covenant and Tabernacle, and rather indicates that the remission which is a part of the new covenant (Heb. x. 16-18) cannot be enjoyed without this blood of sprinkling that links the people and the book together; xi. 28 refers to the passover, the true type of redemption, which offering is outside the scope of the epistle, for Hebrews has no place for redemption from Egypt, its setting being the wilderness and its centre the Tabernacle. *Salvation in the evangelical and gospel sense is not the theme of Hebrews; it deals with a saved people, and their sanctification.* Redemption, in the evangelical sense, is presupposed.

The teaching of the epistle as to sanctification is directly bearing on the “purifying for sins”, which Heb. i. 3 brings so prominently forward. It figures again in ii. 11 and x. 10, 14, “we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all . . . . for by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified”. The context speaks of the New Covenant, of access into the holiest, and of despising the blood of the Covenant whereunto one is sanctified; it is not *the salvation* of the sinner, but the *perfecting* of those who are sanctified that is here in view; so we come back to Heb. i. 3. Of all the phases of the sacrificial work of Christ this one is selected; selected by reason of the fact that it is vitally connected with the purpose of the epistle. The greatness of the One Who thus provided the purifying, the Son of God, makes willful defilement a terrible thing. It does despite to the spirit of grace.

Heb. x. 12 tells us that after the Lord had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, He sat down; this is the testimony also of Heb. i. 3, “When He had made a purifying for sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high”. This has reference to His high priesthood, “we have such a High Priest, Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (viii. 1), and to Himself as the Pattern, “looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of faith, Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (xii. 2). Both the High Priest and the Pattern are for *believers*, so also this one phase of the work of Calvary, “the purifying of or for sins”.

**In Glory (Col. iii. 4).**  
**pp. 118 - 120**

Do these words indicate:

- (1) A sphere of blessing, or
- (2) simply the goal of salvation?

How easy to pose the question, how satisfactory to sit back and wait for the failure “to give a straight answer”, yet how false and misleading this “or” that divides the two propositions as though they neutralize one or the other. Much that appears as legitimate argument is a fallacy. The particular fallacy involved in the predicament posed in the opening dual question is really a mere trick, which consists in asking *two* or more questions as if they were *one*; then the respondent is trapped whether the answer is in the affirmative or the negative.

The standard illustration is asking a man “whether he has *ceased* beating his wife?” Lawyers are often guilty of this sophism when they insist on a “categorical answer” “yes or no”. If this logical “trick” be intentional it is reprehensible but not very dangerous. The dangerous sophism is when it is put forward with all honesty of purpose; it not only deceives its author, but it is more likely to deceive those who listen, especially if they hold the author of this fallacy in high esteem. Truth is not either pure black or pure white. All truth must be *related* to something else before we can arrive at truth itself. Glory is both a goal of salvation, and at the same time interpreted correctly only when its associations are included. For example: the all-covering theme of I Cor. xv. is “Resurrection”, the sub-divisions are “how”, “what” or “where”. The *all-covering* statement is that the dead, all the dead who fell asleep “in Christ”, shall be “raised IN GLORY” (I Cor. xv. 43). It is a fallacy however to conclude that this statement alone settles *where* resurrection will be enjoyed, or *whether* resurrection may be enjoyed in more than one sphere, while being all the time “in glory”. The words that immediately precede in I Cor. xv. 40, 41 make that clear:

“The glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is *another* . . . . for one star differeth from another IN GLORY.”

Sphere or place or whatever better word we choose, cannot be eliminated from I Cor. xv. 43. Glory is the accompaniment of the Second Coming of Christ in more than one aspect. For example:

“The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father” (Matt. xvi. 27).

“The Son . . . . shall sit in the throne of His glory” (Matt. xix. 28).

“Coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory” (Matt. xxiv. 30).

Here the same word “glory” is used as is found in Col. iii., yet no reader of *The Berean Expositor*, we trust, would dream of confusing the spheres wherein these appearings will take place. At the Transfiguration Moses and Elijah appeared “in glory”

(Luke ix. 31) but these words do not cancel out the differences that we see exist between the coming of Christ to the earth, and the hope of the believer of the Church of the One Body. When James and John asked that they might sit, one on the right hand and the other on the left “in the glory that is Thine” were they contemplating the blessed sequel to being potentially “seated together in heavenly places”? If so, what value is there in the principle of “Right Division”, or what difference is there between the ministry of our Lord, as the minister of the circumcision (Rom. xv. 8), and the testimony of our Lord, and of Paul His prisoner?

Coming now to Col. iii., we notice that the believer is enjoined to seek “those things which are ABOVE”. This supposes a different sphere and place, than that which holds “things that are below” and this is justified by the adverb of place “where” that immediately follows. “Where” does not denote quality, or quantity, but locality. The affection of the believer here is to be focused on:

- (1) *Where* Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.
- (2) On things *above*, not on things that are on the earth.

The following parallels are eloquent:

|   |  |       |        |
|---|--|-------|--------|
| A |  | Your  | LIFE   |
| B |  | Is    | HID    |
| C |  | With  | CHRIST |
| D |  | IN    | GOD    |
| A |  | Our   | LIFE   |
| B |  | Shall | APPEAR |
| C |  | With  | HIM    |
| D |  | IN    | GLORY  |

The pattern is complete. Point answers point and needs no advocate. If we are asked the question “WHERE” are these believers’ lives hid, there is only one answer “with Christ IN GOD”. If we are asked the question “WHERE will that life be manifested”, we can only answer “with Christ IN GLORY”. If we lift these words “in glory” out of their context and look upon them with the cold eye of the grammarian we can easily “prove” that they can have no relationship with any particular place or a sphere of blessing, but if we heed the exhortation of Col. iii. 1-3 we shall know “where” glory awaits us, whether we can convince the gainsayer or not.

As we said earlier, truth is not expressed simply in terms that are just black and white, it is expressed in terms that imply relationships. The glory for which we wait must be the sequel of the position we occupy now by faith, for in every calling:

“Faith is the substance of things hoped for.”

Now blest in heavenly places,  
    In Christ at God's right hand;  
And filled with all His fullness,  
    Complete in Him to stand.  
Sing to the praise and glory  
    Of Him Who thus hath shown  
Such gracious love and mercy,  
    To call us for His own.

As looking to Christ Jesus,  
    In Whom we find our peace;  
Our praise and adoration,  
    And love to Him increase.  
May we, who thus are looking,  
    Walk worthy of the grace,  
The blessed hope and calling,  
    Until we see His face.

O help us, by Thy mercy,  
    The shield of faith to take;  
To walk in love and meekness,  
    For our Redeemer's sake.  
Then shall we be all pleasing,  
    As we in love abound;  
To each and all forbearing,  
    May we in Christ be found.

*F. Bartlett*

# The Judgment Seat of Christ

## No.1. A Preliminary Enquiry. pp. 159, 160

There is nothing more solemn to the believer than that he must one day stand before his Redeemer and give an account of his stewardship, and this fact with its many consequences finds expression in a number of passages of the N.T. Neither is it confined to any one dispensation or calling. We find the principle expressed in the form of parable in the Gospels, and by doctrinal statement in the epistles.

The language in the epistles is plain.

“We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ” (Rom. xiv. 10).

The solemn fact is implied in such a passage as I Cor. xi. 31, 32:

“If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.”

A number of important distinctions call for consideration here. We propose an examination into this heart searching subject, and will seek an answer to the many questions that arise, including such as:

- (1) How does the teaching of Rom. xiv. 10 or I Cor. xi. 31, 32 harmonize with the doctrine of a full free forgiveness, justification and perfect acceptance in Christ?
- (2) How does the appearance of the believer before a judgment seat of any description harmonize with such a passage as Rom. viii. 33, 34?
- (3) Does this scrutiny at the judgment seat of Christ belong only to the earlier ministry of Paul, or does it find a place in the dispensation of the Mystery as well?
- (4) If we limit this judgment to the believer’s “works”, “service” or “stewardship”, can we affirm that disloyalty, self seeking or any other form of unacceptable service, is when found in the redeemed, something other than sin?
- (5) How does the award of “loss” at that day accord with the forgiveness of ALL trespasses?
- (6) What can be meant by receiving the things done in the body (II Cor. v. 10)? and how can a believer who has put on immortality in resurrection ever possibly “reap corruption”? (Gal. vi. 8). Is this “reaping” operative only in this life?

These and many like questions will press upon us for a Scriptural answer. In some cases we may have to confess that it is beyond our knowledge to provide one. We will “hasten slowly” and build as solidly as grace will permit. The first thing that seems to call for consideration is the term “the judgment seat”, and to this we devote the remainder of this article.

The Greek word translated “judgment seat” is *bema*, a word that occurs twelve times in the N.T., twice of the Lord, and eight times concerning earthly judgment seats, once a

“throne” and once “to set (foot) on”. This last translation, found in Acts vii. 5 (literally “foot room”) reveals that there is no element of “judgment” in the actual composition or derivation of the word. *Bema* comes from *baino* “to go, to step” and there are no less than forty-two variants of this root. For example, *parabasis* “a step aside” is translated “transgression”. *Anabasis* “a step up” is translated “stair”, etc. A *bema* is a raised platform erected for any purpose, but in actual use limited largely to a dais from which a sentence is pronounced, a decision given, an award made. It can mean a place of judgment such as that occupied by Pontius Pilate (Matt. xxvii. 19), or the judgment seat of Gallio (Acts xviii. 12, 16, 17), of Festus (Acts xxv. 6, 17) or of Caesar (Acts xxv. 10). In Acts xii. 21 Herod occupied the *bema* for the purpose of making an oration. Dr. M. Panton says “The tribunal before which the disciples appear is peculiar, it is a *bema*, not a *thronos*, a judgment seat for the investigation of disciples, not a throne for the arraignment of rebels”.

In Neh. viii. 4 the LXX employs the word *bema* for a “pulpit” and this can in no sense be construed as a judgment seat except in the sense that any and every reading of the Word causes the hearer an exercise of conscience. The Apocrypha uses the word *bema* for a pulpit (Esd. 9:42) and for “a judgment seat” (2Macc. 13:26); and some editions associate the word with the judgment of Urim and Thummim (Syr. 19:26; 45:11). Classical Greek uses the word *bema* for (1) A step, a pace. (2) A pace, as a measure of length. (3) A raised place, a tribunal, the Latin *rostra*; the verb *bematizo* does not appear to have been used in the sense of judging, but means “to measure by paces”. We may find this idea of measuring to see whether one has attained a specific standard coming out very prominently in our subsequent studies.

Of the twelve occurrences of *bema* in the N.T. two only occur in the epistles:

“We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ” (Rom. xiv. 10).

“We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ” (II Cor. v. 10).

It may be that some of our readers who have realized their perfect acceptance in the Beloved, may hesitate to bring any element of the judgment of a believer into the epistles of the Mystery. It should be remembered that the same epistle that teaches the Mystery, and stresses the fact that the believer has been made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, says:

“Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons” (Col. iii. 23-25).

Linked with this reference must be the references to “the day of Christ” found in Philippians. We therefore approach this very solemn subject with subdued hearts, seeking to give due weight both to the freedom from condemnation which is our blessed portion and to the scrutiny that is most certainly indicated in the reference “the judgment seat of Christ”. To the discovery of the truth we dedicate our grace given faculties, praying that all we commit to paper and print may be consciously published in view of “that day”.



employed. Judgment must either take place here and now, or it must take place before the *Bema*. If here and now, it may go so deep as to involve “the destruction of the flesh”, but the spirit will be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. So, if any believer partook of the Lord’s supper “unworthily”, he ate “damnation to himself”, and this damnation was immediate “For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep” (I Cor. xi. 29-30). Consequently, the Apostle admonishes the believer to “examine himself” and so let him eat that bread and drink that cup. Present judgment is set over against condemnation, the “we” who are chastened, set over against the “world” that shall be condemned.

A word or two upon the key words of I Cor. xi. 31, 32 is called for.

“If we judge ourselves, we should not be judged.” The two words here translated “judge” are not identical. The first word is in the Greek *diakrino* “to discern” (Matt. xvi. 3), and is so translated in I Cor. xi. 29 “Not *discerning* the Lord’s body”. Perhaps “discriminate” covers most of the passages where this word is used. “Who maketh thee to differ?” (I Cor. iv. 7) shows this clearly. The second word translated “judge” in verse 31, and again in verse 32 is *krino*, which in the noun form *krima* is translated “damnation” in verse 29, “condemnation” in verse 34. This word *krino* is used in chapter v. 13 for the judgment of them which are without, and of “going to law” (vi. 6).

The condemnation of the world is put over against the chastening of the believer by the Lord. Those who are “In Christ Jesus” can never come into the condemnation (Rom. viii. 1). While the believer can never share this condemnation with the unforgiven and unjustified world, he can and does experience “chastening” which touches him in body and estate. Chastening is the act of a *Father*, condemnation is the sentence of a *Judge*. Heb. xii. will be examined presently, in which this relationship of true son, father, and chastening is more fully developed, but before we turn to that chapter, there are other passages in I Corinthians itself that bear upon our theme that must be examined.

### **“EVERY ONE” or “EACH”?**

We have observed that in I Cor. v. and xi., there are references to a present “chastening” as over against a future “condemnation”, and must now supplement this examination by the consideration of an earlier and perhaps key reference found in chapter iii. This chapter of I Corinthians is a part of the larger portion contained in i. 10 - iv. 21, introduced by the words “It hath been declared unto me” and the chief failure of these Corinthians dealt with in this opening section was their carnality expressed, not here, as in chapter vi. by gross immorality, but by their tendency to division and faction. They ranged themselves as opposing sections under the leadership of “Paul” and “Apollos” and thereby revealed their spiritual immaturity, the consequence being that the damage done to the faith exposed them to severe censure here and now, as well as before the Lord in that day. In chapter iii., the Apostle reverts to these divisions saying:

“Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?” (I Cor. iii. 5).

These concluding words “even as the Lord gave to every man” become the starting point of a disquisition upon the difference between salvation and service, gift and reward, that will throw a deal of light upon the subject before us. Paul speaking of his own ministry likens it to “planting”, and the ministry of Apollos he likens to “watering”, but before he says another word as to the relative value of “planting” and “watering” he reminds us all that apart from the living “increase” or growth which can come alone from the Creator Himself, all such labour would be meaningless and vain. From that angle Paul can say:

“So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth: but God that giveth the increase.”

This at first reading seems drastic and unsympathetic—but the Apostle had an obvious lesson to teach before he could safely speak of the individual share of each believer in the mighty scheme. When however the fact that growth or increase alone comes from God is acknowledged, the relative value of individual service is recognized.

“Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one: and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour.”

Here, however divine the labour, or relatively more important one phase may appear than another, each one will be assessed by an impartial judgment. A matter that will need the most careful consideration is the scope of the words “every man” here. The same necessity for care will be present when we examine II Cor. v. 10 where at the *Bema* we learn “every one” will receive the things done in his body. There are two words translated “every”, “every man” and “every one” in the N.T. that need to be used with discrimination.

*Pas.* This word is translated “every man” in I Cor. ix. 25 where it means every man *without distinction*, the same applies to the translation “every one” in I Cor. xvi. 16. *Pas* is, of course, the word usually translated “all”, as in I Cor. i. 2 “*all* that in *every* place call”. The word employed by the Apostle however in I Cor. iii. 5 and II Cor. v. 10 is the Greek *ekastos*. Etymologists differ in their opinion as to the root of this word, but all are agreed that it means “each one separately or distinctly”. In I Cor. iii. 5, 8, 10 and 13, we are not dealing with “all . . . . everywhere” but with individuals, “each one”.

The words “Even as the Lord gave to every man” are preceded and explained by the words “ministers by whom ye believed”. “Each one” of such ministers shall receive “his own reward according to his own labour”. When the Apostle said “let every man take heed how he buildeth” he of necessity limited “every man” to those who were “builders”. So the double reference to “every man” in verse 13, does not refer to every one of the redeemed *as such*, but to every one who has work that can be tried so as by fire. This by no means limits this passage to so-called “ministers”; all believers have a work to do. It

is nevertheless important to realize that I Cor. iii. deals not with initial salvation but with subsequent service.

The passage we have quoted from II Cor. v. 10 “For we must *all* appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that *every one* may receive” cannot be interpreted apart from its context. The verse begins with “for” which links that he may be “accepted of Him”. Paul, equally with all the redeemed found his full acceptance in the Beloved, and this entirely by grace. Service, once again, not salvation is in view in this passage. The terms used by the Apostle in II Cor. v. 9 refer to acceptableness in the sight of God and relate to advice and walk. Where Gen. v. 22, 24 says that Enoch “walked with God” the LXX says he “pleased God”, as in Heb. xi. 5, 6. *Euairetos* “accepted” or “well pleasing” is connected with “reasonable service” (Rom. xii. 1), and with proving as by a separate walk that is “that good, and acceptable and perfect” will of God. So in Rom. xiv. 18; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20; Titus ii. 9 and Heb. xiii. 21, every occurrence is related to practice and not to standing or salvation by grace. It may be that every believer without exception, even “babes” in Christ will have to appear before this judgment seat, but our understanding of the references examined above, compels us to say that if “all believers” do appear there, they will appear not so much as those who are redeemed, but as those, being redeemed, who have manifested the life that they possess in “service”.

## Meditations on Psalm LI

### No.1. The Prophetic character of the Psalmist's Experiences. pp. 77, 78

Before we enter into the intensely personal character of David's sin, confession, cleansing and restoration, and by so doing see something of the nature of all sin and of all phases of salvation by grace, let us look at the Psalm from a somewhat different angle. Many, if not all the Psalms, have a dual character. For example, David was actually betrayed and the grief is genuine that causes him to cry:

"Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me" (Psa. xli. 9),

yet this was a prophecy of the betrayal of Christ by Judas. The reader will think of other Psalms that fall under the same category as Psa. xli., such as Psa. xvi. and Psa. xxii. Sometimes the prophetic element in the Psalm looks not so much to the Messiah, but to some experiences of Israel in the latter days.

As we read the closing verses of Psa. li. which speak of Zion, the building of its walls, the acceptable offering of sacrifices, we are conscious that there is a transition from the personal experience of David, to the experiences that shall yet be known by a repentant and restored Israel. David was guilty, so far as this Psalm is concerned, of two sins (1) murder and (2) adultery. If we include the testimony of Psa. xxxii. we shall have to add one more sin, the sin of obstinate refusal to acknowledge guilt. When we turn our attention away from David, to David's people, we realize that the selfsame sins are laid to their charge also.

#### *MURDER.*

"Ye . . . . killed the Prince of Life" (Acts iii. 15).

"The Just One; of Whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers" (Acts vii. 52).

"Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children" (Matt. xxvii. 25).

Israel, as a nation, are guilty of murder. They too must acknowledge as David did "bloodguiltiness" (Psa. li. 4). Of them it is written:

"I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon Me Whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son" (Zech. xii. 10).

#### *ADULTERY.*

"Backsliding Israel committed adultery" (Jer. iii. 8).

"Turn O backsliding children, saith the Lord; for I am married unto you" (Jer. iii. 14).

"Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with Me, O house of Israel, saith the Lord" (Jer. iii. 20).

*NON-REPENTANCE.*

“Only acknowledge thine iniquity” (Jer. iii. 13).

“Rend your heart, and not your garments” (Joel ii. 13).

“After thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath” (Rom. ii. 5).

Like David, Israel shall yet be “washed” “white as snow” (Isa. i. 18); like David, Israel shall be “restored” (Isa. i. 26; Joel ii. 25; Jer. xxxi. 10); and like David, shall become the teacher of God’s ways to transgressors (Isa. ii. 3; Zech. xiv. 16).

## Millennial Studies

### No.1. The Bottomless Pit and The Little Season.

pp. 6 - 10

We have remarked in another article that the *positive* teaching concerning the Millennium is confined to TEN VERSES of Holy Writ, namely Rev. xx. 1-10. All else must agree with what is there revealed before it can be admitted as a further revelation concerning that prophetic period.

The opening verses speak of the binding of Satan, Rev. xx. 1-3, which will be one of the great characteristics of this great Day. We have in these three verses, such words as “key”, “bottomless pit”, “a great chain”, “to lay hold”, “bound”, “shut up” and after the thousand years “to loose”. It would be an insult to the intelligence and the integrity of the reader to set out a detailed “proof” that these terms mean all that we associate with “imprisonment”. The “bottomless pit” however calls for examination, although no one we hope needs an explanation of the figure “bottomless”, which simply means “fathomless” or deep beyond human gauging.

The Greek word so translated is *abussos*, which becomes in English *abyss*, and this Greek word is found in the Apocalypse seven times. In Rev. ix. 1 and 2 it is joined with the Greek word *phrear* “a well or pit”, the remaining passages using the word *abussos* alone.

The way in which this word is distributed in the book of the Revelation clearly indicates that it is of importance. Let us see.

#### ABUSSOS in Revelation.

- A | ix. 1, 2-11. Key. Let loose. Locust scourge.  
The Angel called in Hebrew *Abaddon* in Greek *Apollyon*.
- B | xi. 7. The Beast ascends out of the abyss, overcomes saints.
- B | xvii. 8. The Beast ascends out of the abyss, Lamb overcomes (14).
- A | xx. 1-3. Key. Shut up. Loose. Deceive.  
Serpent called *Diabolos* (Greek) and *Satan* (Hebrews).

When we examine Rev. xiii. 1 we learn that the Beast rises up (same word as “ascend”) out of the *sea*, and this proves a help not a problem, for we shall find that the *abyss* is constantly associated with the sea. This of course we learn by considering its usage in the Septuagint. We find it equated with the sea in Job xxviii. 14; xxviii. 16; Psa. xxxiii. 7; xlii. 7; lxxvii. 16; cxxxv. 6; but more important still, we discover that in all these passages, the Greek word translates the Hebrew *tehom*, “the deep” of Gen. i. 2, and of Gen. vii. 11, the flood of judgment before the advent of Man, and the flood of judgment in the days of Noah. Psa. civ. 6 says “Thou coveredst it with the *abyss* as with a garment: the waters stood above the mountains”. Psa. cvi. 9 says “He rebuked the

Red Sea also, and dried it up: so He led them through the *abyss* as through the wilderness". Psa. cxlviii. 7 associates "dragons" with all deeps, and Isa. li. 9-10 does the same. Prov. viii. 23, 24 takes us back to "the beginning, or ever the earth was, when there were no abysses". Amos vii. 4 reveals that the great abyss could be devoured or eaten up "by fire" while the poetic vision of Hab. iii. 10, 11 associates the trembling of the mountains and the abyss lifting up its hands, with the paralyzing of the sun and moon. Such are the predecessors of the seven references to the Abyss in the Revelation. The first occurrences in Rev. xx. 1 and 3 link the purpose of the ages, just as surely as the re-appearance of the Paradise of Rev. xxii., links this passage with the expulsion of Gen. iii. All this gives point to the words of Rev. xxi. 1 "and there was no more sea", no more abyss, no more "deep". Associated with this connexion of the deep with Satan and his imprisonment, is the statement in Rev. ix. 14:

"Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates."

We can no more explain how this river could hold in restraint four such angels, and the "two hundred thousand thousand" demon horsemen that slay a third part of men, than we can understand what sort of "key" or "chain" or "abyss" could keep in hold such a being as Satan for a thousand years, but these are revealed facts and they agree. We can, however, see that the Euphrates has a connexion with Babel, even as the Abyss is linked with Gen. i. 2.

Returning to Rev. xx. 1-3, we see that the imprisonment of Satan is the first and the cause of a series of "restraints" that characterize the Millennial reign. The margin of Dan. ix. 24 reads "to restrain the transgression" where the A.V. reads "to finish transgression". The Hebrew word is *kah-lah* "to keep back, be restrained, shut up". The noun form of this word *keh-leh* is translated in its ten occurrences "prison" with six marginal notes which read: (lit. house of restraint). Transgression will by no means be "finished" when Dan. ix. 24 is fulfilled, it will be "restrained" or imprisoned along with the Devil, but will break out as soon as the Devil is loosed from his prison.

Dan. ix. 24 also says "to make an end of sins" and the margin reads "to seal up". The same word appears in the later reference in the same verse "to seal up vision and prophecy". The Hebrew word is *chatham* and appears again in Dan. xii. 4 "shut up the words and *seal* the book", and this "even to the time of the end". We meet the word again in Dan. xii. 9 "the words are closed up and *sealed* till the time of the end", and in Dan. vi. 17 "the king *sealed* it with his own signet". The words "shut up" and "close up" of Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, 9 but confirm the meaning of the words of Dan. ix. 24. *Satham* means "to stop up" as one would a well or source of water supply. Sennacherib attempted to stop the waters that supplied Jerusalem, and Hezekiah stopped up the watercourse of Gihon (II Chron. xxxii. 3, 30). We can therefore translate Dan. ix. 24 freely yet nevertheless truthfully "TO IMPRISON the transgression, to SEAL UP, as a book or as a well, sins".

We have seen that the "deep" of Gen. i. 2 finds an echo in the "abyss" of Rev. xx. We have seen the possibility of a "little season" when Satan, "that old Serpent", was loosed from the abyss of Gen. i. 2 and immediately set about his campaign of deceit in

Genesis that echoes the “little season” and the “deceit” of Rev. xx. There is however another parallel that bears upon the subject of “restraint” that we have before us, but for the key to this we must turn to Psa. viii. When it says “that Thou mightest STILL the enemy” (Psa. viii. 2) the word translated “still” is the Hebrew *shabath* and is used in Gen. ii. 3 in the words “He had RESTED from all His work”. It means a sabbath keeping. God rested on the seventh day of Creation work; Satan will unwillingly keep sabbath in prison for the sabbath that remains for the children of God is the 1000 year reign of Christ. He will indeed be “stilled”, but who, without access to the original, would have dreamt of such a correspondence or such a teaching. Here is “restraint” indeed covering the whole period.

The remaining terms of Dan. ix.: reconciliation, righteousness and the anointing of the Most Holy, belong to a separate enquiry. We are concerned at the moment with “the bottomless pit”, the chain, the restraint of the Devil and his works that introduce the Millennium into the pages of Scripture, namely at Rev. xx. 1-3. Sin is by no means “finished” or “made an end of” in the evangelical sense of the words, and the A.V. margin reveals that the translators were not quite happy in thus translating the Hebrew words used. This element of restraint is reflected in the “feigned obedience” that will characterize some of the nations in the Millennium, and after the reader has surveyed the evidence given for this marginal translation of Psa. xviii. 44, lxvi. 3 and lxxxi. 15, he may realize that there is no need to attempt to justify the marginal rendering, the problem will be rather to understand why the translators should have departed from their own rendering in so many other places. Had they been consistent, the problem would never have arisen. That there could not have been “a finish” or “an end” to transgression or sin, Rev. xx. 8, 9 will demonstrate to all who have no theory to justify, for the terms Gog and Magog”, “gather to battle”, “sand of the sea”, “went up on the breadth of the earth”, “compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city” together with the judgment of fire which “devoured” them with which the Millennium ends, are all so far removed from any conception of peace and sinlessness as to make a long disquisition unnecessary. We can only say if these are symptoms of “perfect peace”, are words of any use as vehicles of truth?

## THE LITTLE SEASON

After the thousand years during which the overcomers reign with Christ, Satan will be let loose from the abyss, and go out to “deceive” once more. We already know that much that is found in Genesis finds its sequel in the Revelation. Here, may be, is yet another of those illuminating correspondences. We may often have wondered at the sudden entry of the “serpent” into Gen. iii., with his great deception. If, as we have already seen, “the deep” of Gen. i. 2 which is translated “the abyss” or “bottomless pit” by the Septuagint, if that “deep” had been his prison, could he not have been loosed at the close of some definite period (and see the minute exactness of the time in Rev. ix. 15) to test and try the newly-created Adam? However, this is not our theme. What are we to understand by the “little season”? The word that should be translated “season” is the Greek work *kairos*, whereas in Rev. xx. 3 the word is *chronos*, “time”.

## ***Kairos* in Revelation**

“The time is at hand” (i. 3).  
“The time of the dead” (xi. 18).  
“He hath but a short time” (xii. 12).  
“A time, and times, and half a time” (xii. 14).  
“The time is at hand” (xx. 10).

Two references stand out for consideration here.

“Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a SHORT TIME” (xii. 12).

In this chapter Satan is given his full title:

“The great dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan which deceiveth the whole world, was cast out into the earth” (Rev. xii. 9).

“The dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan” shall be loosed out of prison when the thousand years are finished, and shall “go out to deceive the nations”, “for a little season”. He knew that he had “a short time”, he is let loose for “a little season”. The word used in Rev. xx. 3 is *chronos*.

“I gave here SPACE to repent” (Rev. ii. 21).  
“They should rest yet for a LITTLE SEASON” (vi. 11).  
“There should be TIME no longer” (x. 6).  
“He must be loosed a LITTLE SEASON” (xx. 3).

These occurrences seem to explain one another. Thus, the word of the mighty angel, immediately preceding the voice of the seventh angel when the mystery of God should be finished, and the kingdom set up (Rev. x. 7; xi. 15), instead of declaring that time should cease, which is contradicted by the references to time, days, night, months and years that are found later in the book, to say nothing of the explicit statement that there will be “space to repent” no longer, and chapter x. is immediately preceded by the words:

“Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts” (Rev. ix. 21).

Under the fifth seal, where the martyrs are told to rest for a little season, we find similar words to those used in Rev. xx. 4. These were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held. The white robes given to them link them with those that come out of “The Tribulation, the great one” (Rev. vi. 11-17). “He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them . . . . and the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them” (Rev. vii. 14-17). This tribulation is the same as that of Matt. xxiv. 21, 29 which is followed immediately by the Coming of the Son of Man with power and great glory. This Coming must be the same as that of Rev. xix. The reference to the throne shows that these overcomers are linked with the heavenly Jerusalem:

“A throne was set *in heaven* . . . . in the midst of the throne . . . . four living creatures . . . . in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb . . . . the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it (i.e. the New Jerusalem).”

The fact that the Devil will only be loosed a “little season” shows how rapid will be the deception of the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth. These nations will have kept as far from the beloved city as possible and by their attack upon the camp of the saints and the beloved city, they reveal their innate, though covered animosity. This time there will be no further respite, “fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them”. The fact that such a trial should be necessary after the thousand years, declares plainly that the Millennium was no more sinless and perfect and secure than was the garden of Eden in the beginning. Man, tried in the most advantageous conditions, yielded, and man after a thousand years when the Devil shall be under restraint, manifests that no delegated authority, or advantageous environment is enough to bring in that perfect kingdom which the Son will deliver up to God even the Father. That kingdom follows the Millennium, but it is not the purpose of the Apocalypse to do more than lead up to it, which it does in its two closing chapters.

## **No.2. The Rest of the Dead.** **pp. 26 - 32**

We have seen from the testimony of Scripture itself that the only company of the redeemed for whom the Millennial reign is introduced into the pages of Holy Writ, is the overcomer. Rev. xx. 1-10 is the only portion of Scripture that gives positive teaching concerning the Millennium; other Scriptures contain passages that may and do belong to that period, but all other companies of either saved or lost can only be introduced into this kingdom by inference.

The companies mentioned in Rev. xx. 1-10 are the following:

1. The martyrs who withstood the Beast and refused his image. They not only “live” but “reign” with Christ a thousand years.
2. The “rest of the dead” is another company, only mentioned in order to make it clear that they do not live again until the thousand years are finished.
3. The overcomers or martyrs are called “Priests of God and of Christ”.
4. After the thousand years, “nations” are revealed to have been living during that reign, and some of these nations lived “in the four quarters of the earth”.
5. Inasmuch as the “camp of the saints” and the “Beloved City” could be compassed by these rebellious nations, they too must have been on the earth during the Millennium.

We have considered the meaning and bearing of the martyred saints in the article entitled “The Overcomers”. We now round off the study by considering the remaining four items listed above, “the rest of the dead”. The Greek word translated “rest” is

*loipos*. “Peter and the rest of the apostles” (Acts ii. 37). This implies that Peter also was an apostle.

“The election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded” (Rom. xi. 7).

Here the “election” and “the rest” both belong to Israel, as the opening of the verse shows. We could not say “the election” (of Israel) and “the rest” (of the Gentiles) without adding an explanatory clause. *Loipos* occurs in Revelation eight times, thus:

“Unto the *rest* in Thyatira” not unto the rest of the seven churches, or the rest of the world. (Rev. ii. 24).

“Strengthen the things which *remain*” (iii. 2).

“By reason of the *other* voices” (viii. 13).

“The *rest* of the men which were not killed with the plagues.” Plainly not the rest of mankind as a whole. (ix. 20).

“The *remnant* were affrighted” (xi. 13).

“The *remnant* of her seed” (xii. 17).

“The *remnant* were slain” (xix. 21).

“The *rest* of the dead lived not again” (xx. 5).

This last reference which directs us to the judgment of the Great White Throne warns us that a special company is envisaged. It is composed of believers, who together with those who were martyred, formed one company AND NO OTHERS are in view. *The wicked dead of all ages* will have their judgment, but that is not contemplated here. One company and one only are before us, and that company is divided into two portions: (1) the overcomers, (2) those who were not overcomers, or briefly “the rest”. The overcomers live and reign during the thousand years. “The rest” do not live again until the Millennium is over. They do not forfeit “life” necessarily, but they have lost the “crown”, a doctrine not confined to any one dispensational as I Cor. iii. 10-15, Phil. iii. 11-14 and II Tim. ii. 11-13 will show. This is the first resurrection; the “former” of two, as we have seen earlier.

These overcomers are called “priests of God and of Christ”. There seems a need to discriminate once again between the restored *nation*, which will be a priestly nation *on the earth*, and this company of priests which exercise their priesthood in the *Heavenly City*. Let us see. At the foot of mount Sinai, the whole nation were given the terms by which they could become “a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation”. Those terms none have ever kept; with those conditions no one has ever complied (Exod. xix. 5, 6). Isaiah, visualizing not the old covenant, but the “everlasting covenant” (Isa. lxi. 8) looked down the age and beheld Israel restored, having the oil of joy instead of mourning, rebuilt and raised up and repaired (Isa. lxi. 3, 4), and named “The Priests of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God . . . . the seed which the Lord hath blessed” (Isa. lxi. 6-9). Just as the restored earthly Jerusalem will have a resemblance to the Heavenly City, with its foundations of sapphires, and its gates of agates (Isa. liv. 11, 12), so we find at the close of Isa. lxi. this restored priestly nation likened also to a bridegroom or to a bride. This must not lead us to confuse this company with the Bride of the Lamb (Rev. xix. 7), for Isa. liv. 6-8 makes it clear that Israel as a “woman forsaken” and a “wife of youth” who had been refused, is in view, whereas the Bride, the Lamb’s wife, is not the *nation* of Israel, once divorced but now restored, but a company of *overcomers* whose seat of

authority is not the earthly but the heavenly Jerusalem, a company that had never known divorce. When we open the book of the Revelation the first company of the redeemed we meet with are those who say:

“Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, And hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father” (Rev. i. 5, 6).

While all whoever they may be, and whatever their calling, must have been cleansed by the blood of the Lamb, there seems some special reason why it should have been introduced here. The word “washed” is the Greek *lousanti*, but the best texts read *lusanti* which means “loosed”. Again, redemption sets free, and employs a number of words derived from *luo* “I loose”. Nevertheless the way in which the word *luo* is used in the book of the Revelation makes us suspect that something more is intended here in Rev. i. 5, 6, than purely evangelical salvation. Let us assemble the occurrences of *luo* which are seven in number.

### ***Luo* in Revelation.**

“Loosed us from our sins in His own blood.” (i. 5).  
“Loose the seals.” “Loose the seven seals.” (v. 2, 5).  
“Loose the four angels.” “The four angels were loosed.” (ix. 14, 15).  
“He must be loosed.” “Satan shall be loosed.” (xx. 3, 7).

*Haima* “blood” occurs seventeen times in the Revelation. Four references are to the blood of the Lamb. Thirteen to blood shed or sent in judgment. The four that interest us at the moment are:

“Loosed us from our sins in His own blood.” (Rev. i. 5).  
“Redeemed us to God . . . . kings and priests.” (v. 9).  
“Washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” (vii. 14).  
“They overcame by the blood of the Lamb.” (xii. 11).

The references to blood that remain fall into two groups:

#### 1. *The call for vengeance.*

“Avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth.” (Rev. vi. 10).  
“For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy.” (xvi. 6).  
“Drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” (xvii. 6).  
“Avenged the blood of His servants at her hand.” (xix. 2).  
“He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood.” (xix. 13).

#### 2. *The judgment by blood.*

“The moon became as blood.” (Rev. vi. 12).  
“Hail and fire mingled with blood.” (viii. 7).  
“Third part of the sea became blood.” (viii. 8).  
“Power over waters to turn them to blood.” (xi. 6).  
“Blood came out of the winepress.” (xiv. 20).  
“The sea . . . . became as the blood of a dead man.” (xvi. 3).  
“Rivers and fountains . . . . became blood.” (xvi. 4).  
“And in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.” (xviii. 24).

The recording and the reading of this list is nauseating, but the facts that are recorded will be horrible beyond description. And here again we add one more of the many correspondences which these studies are making with the book of Genesis, namely the solemn words of Gen. ix. 6:

“Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed”,

to which is added both the basic reason and another connexion with the Revelation:

“For in the image of God made He man.”

It is a solemn thing to know that it is possible to “blaspheme” our fellow-men who are made in the “image” of God (Titus iii. 2 and Rev. xiii. 6). Idolatry violates that glory conferred upon man as well as the glory of God Himself:

“They . . . . changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man . . . . who changed the truth of God into a lie (or ‘exchanged the glory’ for ‘THE LIE’), and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. i. 21-25).

This abandonment leads straight on with excessive abuse of the gift of sex, even as this same evil is seen to preponderate in the book of the Revelation. The worship of the Beast and of his IMAGE dethrones not only God, but man, and turns the whole direction of life toward “the lie”, Satan’s counterfeit. Because of this we read of “the wrath of God”.

## WRATH

The word *orge* (translated “wrath”) occurs twelve times in Romans, and of these occurrences seven are found in the first great doctrinal division (Rom. i. 1 - v. 11). It is an important word, and seeing that it is placed in distinct relation to righteousness in Rom. i. 17, 18, it demands a prayerful study. We observe in the first place that “wrath” is used in the outer portion of Romans only. The word is not used in Rom. v. 12-viii. 39. The word “wrath” is not used of either Adam or of man seen in Adam. Judgment, condemnation and death there are, but unaccompanied by wrath. There is no wrath either in connexion with the lake of fire, or the great white throne in Rev. xx. All is calm, books are opened, every one is dealt with in pure justice. Wrath, anger, indignation, fury, these words are of a different category.

Many times do we read that the wrath or the anger of the Lord was “kindled”, as in Exod. iv. 14, or of wrath “waxing hot”, as in Exod. xxii. 24, or of His anger “smoking” (Psa. lxxiv. 1), and of it being poured out in “fury” (Isa. xlii. 25). The nature of the wrath of Rom. i. 18, and of the day of wrath with which it is connected (Rom. ii. 5), is discovered in the book of Revelation. Those upon whom this wrath is poured are the “nations”, and the time is the time of the dead that they should be judged and rewarded (Rev. xi. 18; xix. 15). This wrath falls particularly upon Babylon (Rev. xvi. 19), and in direct connexion with its idolatry and uncleanness (Rev. xiv. 8-10); Babylon is in view

in Rom. i. 18-32. There we see that Satanic system in all its naked horror; there we see the domination of darkness and the lie. In this section we read of those who by their deeds are “worthy of death”, and who “have pleasure” in deeds of evil (Rom. i. 32). This section therefore is connected with wrath.

There is much to be learned by comparing I and II Thessalonians with this passage in Romans.

“Wrath *revealed* from *heaven*” (Rom. i. 18).

“The Lord Jesus shall be *revealed* from *heaven*” (II Thess. i. 7).

“When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God . . . . They *did not* like to retain God in their *knowledge*” (Rom. i. 21, 28).

“In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that *know not* God” (II Thess. i. 8).

“They have *pleasure* in them that do them” (Rom. i. 32).

“They had *pleasure* in unrighteousness” (II Thess. ii. 12).

“The changed the *truth* of God into *the lie*” (Rom. i. 25).

“They received not . . . . the *truth* . . . . the believe *the lie*” (II Thess. ii. 10, 11).

“They changed the glory of God into an image made like to *man*” (Rom. i. 23).

“The *man* of sin . . . . showing himself that he is God” (II Thess. ii. 3, 4).

“*Wrath* revealed . . . . *idolatry*” (Rom. i. 18-25).

“Ye turned to God from *idols* . . . . saved from the *wrath* to come” (I Thess. i. 9, 10).

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

“Not in the lust of *concupiscence*, even as the Gentiles which know not God” (I Thess. iv. 5).

If we also bring together the parallels that we find in the book of the Revelation, we shall have a full reference to that Satanic system of iniquity commenced at Babel, dominating the nations of the earth from that time onward until judged at the coming of the Lord in the day of wrath.

The reference in Rom. i. 19, 20 to the evidence of creation finds an echo in the Revelation.

So in the days when Babylon and its system shall be revived and in full power, the “everlasting gospel” will be preached, which gospel is nothing more nor less than a proclamation of the Lord as *Creator*:

“Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen” (Rev. xiv. 7, 8).

There is a slight alteration in the words translated “change” in these verses in the A.V. of Rom. i. We have attempted to indicate the difference by using “change” and “exchange”. First they changed the glory of God without actually giving up God altogether, but this soon led to the next step, for they exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and then worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator. It is not possible for God to take second place. “Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

Into the third item we cannot go. The defiling character of idolatry may be gathered from its annals, and we do not feel that any good purpose would be served by elaborating this revolting subject here. At the same time we know only too well that human nature is not a whit better today than when it openly practiced the sins condemned in Rom. i. We need faithfully to warn the rising generation, speaking very tenderly and lovingly, yet nevertheless plainly, for Babylonianism in all its forms is rising like a flood, and the book of the Revelation reveals Rom. i. in a superlative degree. We need not go so far into the future as the book of Revelation, however, for II Tim. iii. 1-8 uses many of the words of Rom. i. to describe the perilous times at the close of this present dispensation. The sequence of the apostasy and its relation to the development of the mystery of *iniquity*, otherwise called “the lie”, and the mystery of *godliness*, otherwise called “the truth”, can be traced through Paul’s epistles. Taking the statements of Rom. i. we find them worked out in the other epistles.

A comparison of the list of sins in Rom. i. with that of II Tim. iii. 1-7 will show how completely the parallel is recorded. The reader must supply further parallels by studying the intervening epistles.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (1) “As God.” The creature more than the Creator. | “The man of sin . . . <i>as God</i> ” (II Thess. ii. 3, 4).   |
| (2) “The lie.” “The truth.”                       | “They received not the love of <i>the truth</i> . . . they believe <i>the lie</i> ” (II Thess. ii. 10, 11).     |
| (3) “Given up to an undiscerning mind.”           | “God shall send them strong delusion” (II Thess. ii. 11)  |
| (4) “Pleasure in them that do them.”              | “Had pleasure in unrighteousness” (II Thess. ii. 12).   |
| (5) “Neither were thankful.”                      | “God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth” (I Tim. iv. 3, 4). |

Another feature that contributes to the build-up of the actual purpose that runs throughout the Revelation is the use of the title “Lamb”, *arnion*. Apart from the one reference, John xxi. 15, “feed my lambs”, the remaining 29 occurrences are all found in the Revelation. Although the first thought that comes into mind when we think of Christ as “The Lamb of God” is the One Who takes away the sin of the world, no such association is made in the Revelation. We read of “the wrath of the Lamb” and even of those who drink of the wrath of God . . . . in the presence of the Lamb” (Rev. vi. 16; xiv. 10). We read of “the throne of the Lamb” and of “the marriage of the Lamb” and “the book of life of the Lamb” (Rev. xxi. 1; xix. 7; xiii. 8). We read of those who overcome by “the blood of the Lamb”; of those who are “firstfruits” unto God and to the Lamb, and of those who sing the song of Moses . . . . and of the Lamb, with which the seven vials of wrath is associated (Rev. xii. 11; xiv. 4; xv. 3-8). The only time that redemption is associated with the Lamb is in Rev. v. 9 and xiv. 3, 4. At the opening of the sealed book by “the Lamb that had been slain” a new song was sung: “Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us (or them) to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us (or them) unto our God **KINGS and PRIESTS:** and we (they) **SHALL REIGN ON (over) THE EARTH.**” *Epi* is translated “over” in Rev. ii. 26; 6:8; xiii. 7; xvi. 9 and xvii. 18. Another new song is recorded in Rev. xiv. 3, 4, where once more redemption is found.

“The hundred and forty and four thousand which were redeemed *from the earth* . . . . these were redeemed *from among men*, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb.”

These are exclusive and exceptional, but they are the only ones “redeemed” so far as this book is concerned. Redemption in the Evangelical sense, as deliverance from sin and issuing in forgiveness does not enter into the record. We come then once again to Rev. xx. 6. These “priests of God and of Christ” who “reign with Him” are not an earthly priesthood, they are heavenly, and minister and reign from their exalted position in the Heavenly Jerusalem. Heaven has its “Temple” (Rev. xi. 19; xv. 5, 6, 8), its “Ark” (Rev. xi. 19), its “Altar” (Rev. viii. 3), its “Incense” (Rev. viii. 3, 4) and consequently has a heavenly priesthood. The “overcomer” his suffering, his endurance, his deliverance and his reign as a priest with Christ in the heavenly Jerusalem, is *the theme* of the Apocalypse, and limits the use of the word The Millennium so much that every passage from either the Old or New Testament, which is labeled “Millennial” by countless commentators, must be challenged lest by a zeal without knowledge we rob the Millennium of its distinctive character and are found entertaining instead a vision of our own hearts. The “nations”, the “camp” and the “beloved city” are of necessity on the earth during the Millennial reign, but have no such distinct place in it as do these overcomers. We must consider their place in another article. Meanwhile to any who may be disturbed or even angry, we still commend the Berean spirit “search and see”, for you may never “see” if you avoid the “search”.

### **No.3. The Nations and The Camp of the Saints. pp. 64 - 68**

We have postponed an examination of the terms “the nations”, the “camp of the saints” and “the beloved city” which are mentioned in the Millennial chapter (Rev. xx.) until the present article. Psa. lxxii. is the prayer (1) of David for his son Solomon, and (2) in a fuller prophetic sense for His greater Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. Other features that David foresaw concerning this kingdom refer to the nations, as distinct from his own people Israel; His dominion is to be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents, the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts, yea all kings shall fall down before Him; ALL NATIONS shall serve Him, ALL NATIONS shall call Him blessed.

As we have said already, we can only include such a prophetic foreview in the Millennium by inference, but as it is directly connected with the kingdom of David’s Son, the inference appears to be justified. At some time God is to inherit ALL NATIONS (Psa. lxxxii. 8), and at some time ALL NATIONS shall come and worship before the Lord (Psa. lxxxvi. 9). ALL NATIONS will one day “flow unto” the house of the Lord, and He shall judge among the nations, so that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor learn war any more (Isa. ii. 1-4). In the day when the “lion shall eat straw like the ox” an ensign shall be set up for the nations (Isa. xi. 7-12). When the Lord of hosts shall REIGN in mount Zion, the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, for He

will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil spread over all nations, at the time when He will swallow up death in victory, and wipe away tears from off all faces (Isa. xxiv. 23; xxv. 7, 8). Similarly when the Redeemer comes to Zion, the words follow immediately:

“Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people . . . . the Gentiles shall come to thy light . . . . the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish” (Isa. lix. 20; lx. 1-12).

When Israel can be likened to a Bridegroom or a Bride, the Lord will cause His praise to spring forth before ALL the NATIONS (Isa. lxi. 10, 11). This will coincide with Israel becoming “priests of the Lord” (Isa. lxi. 6) and when Jerusalem shall be called *Hephzi-bah* “My delight is in her” (Isa. lxii. 4). ALL NATIONS and tongues shall come and see the glory of the Lord, and the chapter that contains this promise leads up to the “new heavens and the new earth” (Isa. lxvi. 22), which must be read together with Rev. xx. and xxi. At the close of the Revelation we read that the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour unto it, while the leaves of the tree of life shall be for the healing of the nations. “The nations” are mentioned but twice in Rev. xx., and in both references, they are related to the deception of Satan.

In a separate article we have dealt with Gog and Magog, but whether this can be included in this series, or whether it must wait for the publication of the *Alphabetical Analysis*, remains to be seen. Nations are most evidently on the earth during the Millennium, but it is not the purpose of Rev. xx. to develop this aspect of the subject; the ONLY specific passage dealing with the Millennium does not enlarge upon their place in that kingdom. On the contrary, it reserves ALL reference to “nations” to the climax act of rebellion at the close, which discrimination must be accepted as a Divine direction to our thoughts if we accept the inspiration of all Scripture.

### **The Camp of The Saints (Rev. xx. 9).**

Does the word “camp” agree with a state of universal peace?

When we read in Rev. xx. 9 of “the camp of the saints”, most of us have conjured up a vision of peaceful idyllic bliss, an extended “feast of Tabernacles” with all the accompaniments of perfect peace. When, however we put into practice that infallible rule of all true exegesis, speaking in words “which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual” instead of investing the words of Scripture with the colourings of our own theories, the conception that the Millennial kingdom is one of universal unqualified peace is rudely shattered. The Greek word (one of the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth) is *parembole* and in six out of ten occurrences it is translated “castles” (Acts xxi. 34, 37; xxii. 24; xxiii. 10, 16, 32). Here we have no peaceful idyllic camp, but a castle, with “soldiers and centurions”, “captains and chains” and all the associations of military preparedness and iron strength. The word occurs three times in Hebrews. Once it is translated “armies” and twice “camp” (Heb. xi. 34; xiii. 11, 13).

When we turn to the Septuagint we discover that this Greek word is used to translate in the majority of cases the Hebrew *machaneh*, which meets us for the first time in Gen. xxxii. 2 where we read “This is God’s *host*: and he called the name of that place Mahanaim”. Here the LXX uses the Greek word *parembole*. Both Hebrew and Greek words are used in Exod. xiv. 9 and 24 of Pharaoh’s army, with its horses and chariots. The book of Numbers devotes several chapters to the formation of the camp of Israel, and the words of Numb. i. 3 “all that are able to go forth to war in Israel” are repeated thirteen times over in that one chapter. This is “the camp” of Israel, a warlike disciplined company with the tabernacle and the ministering families in the midst (Numb. ii. 17). “Castle”, “camp”, “army”, these are the three words which translate *parembole* in the N.T. The castle of the Romans, the army of aliens, the camp of the saints. The LXX uses the substantive *parembole* and the verb *paremballo* in Exod. xiv. 9 of the Egyptian “army” and of Israel’s “encamping”. The Levites were appointed to take charge over all the tabernacle and its vessels “and shall *encamp* round about the Tabernacle. And the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death” (Numb. i. 50, 51). Special instructions were given in case of war, for the sounding of trumpets that, “when ye blow an alarm, then the *camps* that lie on the east parts shall go forward” (Numb. x. 5-9). When Israel “pitched” (*paremballo*) near Moab, Balak, having seen what this “camp” had done to the Amorites, was sore afraid (Numb. xxii. 1-3). In Psa. xxvii. 3 David uses these words “camp” and “host” in correspondence with the rising up of “war”.

Taking another great stride we find that the minor prophets still retain this warlike meaning.

“And the Lord shall utter His voice before His ARMY: for His CAMP is very great” (Joel ii. 11).

This moreover is in connexion with signs in the heaven that place it in “the day of the Lord” (Joel ii. 20). Amos also knew that a “camp” could be associated with being “slain with the sword” (Amos iv. 10). Zech. xiv. speaks of the investment of Jerusalem “to battle”, and a plague is sent upon all the people that have fought against Jerusalem . . . . in these TENTS (Zech xiv. 1, 12, 15). From one end of the O.T. to the other, and in seven references out of ten in the N.T. “the camp” is associated with war, soldiers and armies.

It is impossible to ignore this for the sake of “private interpretation” when we come to the reference in Rev. xx. The moment we see that this is “so”, our vision is cleared and we are enabled to see something else, for truth is one, and the clarifying of one passage illuminates others. Gog and Magog, the nations deceived by the Devil at the close of the Millennium, have *one object* before them: not conquest of territory but an attack upon the holy things of God. The revolt in Psa. ii. has nothing to do with politics, diplomacy, territory or defence of liberty, it is definitely directed “against the Lord, and against His Anointed”. It is definitely directed against the “restraints” we see will characterize the closing week of Dan. ix. (see Millennial Studies).

“Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us” (Psa. ii. 3).

There is no idea at this stage that any kings had been literally “bound in fetters” (Psa. cv. 22; cxlix. 8), the word translated “bands” means also “to bind” one’s soul by an oath (Numb. xxx. 2), and in the language of the Gentile, it is translated “a decree” made by a king (Dan. vi. 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15). Again, the “cords” against which these rulers and kings revolted, is the Hebrew word *aboth*, used of the “wreathen” work which bound the breastplate upon the heart of Israel’s High Priest (Exod. xxviii. 14, 22, 24, 25). In Psa. cxviii. 27 these “cords” are used to bind the sacrifice to the horns of the altar. In Hos. xi. 4 it is used in the delightful expression “I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love”. The revolt of Psa. ii. was *the revolt against holiness*. These kings are exhorted to “serve the Lord with fear and to rejoice with trembling; to kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and they perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little” (Psa. ii. 10-12).

Look at the wars that are recorded in the Revelation and note the object of their hostility:

- “These (i.e. the ten kings) shall make war with the LAMB” (Rev. xvii. 14).
- “There was war in heaven: Michael . . . . and the dragon fought” (xii. 7).
- “The Dragon . . . . went to make war with the remnant of her seed” (xii. 17).
- “The Beast . . . . shall make war against them (i.e. the two witnesses)” (xi. 7).
- “It was given unto him (the Beast) to make war with the saints” (xiii. 7).

And when Gog and Magog are gathered together “to battle” or “to make war” (same word), the objective is still one and the same, “the camp of the saints”. Thus the “Holy city shall be trodden under foot for forty and two months (i.e. the 3½ years, the midst of the week of Dan. ix.)”. The strange words of Rev. xxii. 11 present a solemn choice in that day, “He that is filthy . . . . he that is holy”, for these are THE issues at stake, headed by the Lamb on the one hand and by the Dragon on the other. The immediate destruction by fire from heaven and the devouring instantly of the enemies of holiness, is but the climax of a series of such exhibitions of Divine wrath. We have already quoted the general statement that any unauthorized person who drew near the sacred tabernacle was punished by death, but there are instances where this death came about by direct fire from heaven. The judgment of fire from heaven and from the Lord, seem to be reserved in the O.T. for sins of sacrilege, false worship or extreme wickedness. The judgment upon Nadab and Abihu is an example of sacrilege:

“And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them” (Lev. x. 2).

The cities of Sodom and Gomorrha are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire (Jude 7). The conflict between the prophets of Baal and the prophet Elijah illustrates the third class.

“Call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord: and the God that answereth by fire, let Him be God” (I Kings xviii. 24).

And examination of Psa. xcvii. is illuminating in this context:

1st. “The Lord reigneth.”

- 2nd. While the earth is called to rejoice.
- 3rd. A fire goeth before Him, and burneth up His enemies round about Him.  
So that there will be such enemies in the Millennium which will be set up at His coming.
- 4th. The hills will melt like wax at His Presence.
- 5th. This fiery judgment is related to the worship of graven images.
- 6th. The words of xcvii. 7 “worship Him, all ye gods” are cited in Heb. i. 6.

“And when He again bringeth (margin) in the firstborn into the world He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him.”

It should be noted here that the “world” here is the Greek *oikoumene* and this leads us to Heb. ii. 5:

“For unto the angels hath He not put in subjection the world (*oikoumene*) to come, whereof we speak.”

Here once more we reach the crucial point. The rebellion at the end of the Millennium which is cut short by fire from heaven is of the same character as those that have preceded it, a definite, idolatrous rejection of the supremacy of “The Lamb”. The first example (Lev. x. 2) and the last (Rev. xx. 10) are much alike in their wording:

Rev. xx. 10 *Pur apo tou theou . . . . kai kataphegen autous.*  
Lev. x. 2 *Pur para kuriou, kai katephagen autous.*

The words “the camp of the saints” are followed by “and the beloved city” but these two descriptions may refer to the same thing, the conjunction *kai* being sometimes translated “even”. “Even he is the eighth” (Rev. xvii. 11); “even as she rewarded” (Rev. xviii. 6); “even so come” (Rev. xxii. 20). The “camp” or “army” of the saints would have defended the beloved city, even as the camp of Israel in the wilderness defended the Tabernacle and its holy vessels. Again we ask, if these things are so, then the Millennium is a period of blessing for Israel, but is by no means a period of universal peace. That comes in the succeeding “Day of God”.

#### No.4. WHITE, its usage in the Apocalypse. pp. 104 - 107

The words of repentant David “Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow” (Psa. li. 7), have seized the mind, and entered into the preaching of the gospel during all times. In the book of the Revelation, the only gospel that is preached (so far as the record goes) contains no reference to Christ, His finished work or to faith (Rev. xiv. 6, 7), and if preached to-day would merit the anathema of Gal. i. 8. The words translated righteousness (*dikaios, dikaiosuen, dikaios* and *dikaioma*), refer either to judgment (Rev. xv. 3,4; xvi. 5, 7; xix. 2), war (Rev. xix. 11), or the personal righteousness of saints (Rev. xix. 8; xxii. 11). The evangelical concept of justification by faith is nowhere seen or spoken of in the book of Revelation.

We have examined every reference to the phrase “the blood of the Lamb”, and to the shedding of blood generally, but out of all the references, the only one that speaks of deliverance from sin is that of Rev. i. 5 and this is discussed in an article yet to be published . . . . where its connexion is seen to be not with the average sinner but with a peculiar company, “kings and priests”, who play so important a part in the outworking of its prophetic import. Two quotations call for insertion in this article:

“They made them WHITE in the blood of the Lamb” (Rev. vii. 14).

“They OVERCAME him by the blood of the Lamb” (Rev. xii. 11).

These two passages are related. Those who wash their robes and make them WHITE are those who come out of great tribulation. Those who OVERCAME, do so by the same blood of the Lamb, and under enormous pressure. Both companies are martyrs. When this company is complete, it is likened to a Bride prepared for her husband:

“And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints” (Rev. xix. 8).

The usage of the word translated “arrayed” links the Bridal company with the overcomers, as will be seen from the following list of occurrences of *periballo*:

“He that overcometh, the same shall be *clothed* in white raiment” (Rev. iii. 5).

“I counsel thee to buy of Me . . . . white raiment, that thou mayest be *clothed*” (Justification is by faith and cannot be “bought”) (Rev. iii. 18).

“A great multitude . . . . *clothed* with white robes, and palms in their hands” (Rev. vii. 9).

“What are these which are *arrayed* in white robes?” (Rev. vii. 13).

“She should be *arrayed* fine linen, clean and white” (Rev. xix. 8).

“And He was *clothed* with a vesture dipped in blood” (Rev. xix. 13).

In the days of the outpouring of the vials, a blessing is pronounced upon him that watcheth “and keepeth his garments” (Rev. xvi. 15), a reference back to Rev. iii. 5 & 18. The same Greek word *himation* is used of the Overcoming King of kings (Rev. xix.16) and His Vesture also was “dipped in blood” even as were those of the suffering

overcomers. The evidence is accumulative and overwhelming, that the OVERCOMER is the key to the Revelation, and to the essential character of the Millennium.

The word mostly translated “white” in the Revelation is the Greek *leukos*, but in two references (Rev. xv. 6 and xix. 8), the word is *lampros* translated elsewhere by “gorgeous”, “bright”, “goodly”, “gay” and “clear” (Luke xxiii. 11; Acts x. 30; James ii. 2, 3; Rev. xxii. 1). The usage of the word “white” in the Revelation suggests a threefold subdivision:

1. The Lord Himself.
2. The Overcomers.
3. Judgment.

(1) *The Lord Himself*. First as King-Priest. Then as King of kings (Rev. i. 14; xix. 11). The three descriptions of the Transfiguration refer to the opening vision of Rev. i.:

“He was transfigured before them; and His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light” (Matt. xvii. 2).

“His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them” (Mark ix. 3).

“The fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistering” (Luke ix. 29).

White as light, white as snow, white as lightning. Peter tells us that on that mountain he, with James and John, were eye-witnesses of His Majesty, and that the prophecy of the Second Coming was made even “more sure”. At the Second Coming, He Who is called Faithful and True is seen coming out of heaven seated upon a white horse, and coming in righteousness to judge and make war. Any interpretation that *evades, ignores* or *minimizes* this express statement of Scripture must necessarily be rejected by all who love and believe the Word.

The words “judge and make war” are expanded in xix. 15 where we have such adjuncts of discipline and extreme severity as “a sharp sword”, “smite the nations”, “rule them with a rod of iron”, “tread the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God”. There is no exegetical necessity or justification in dividing Rev. xix. 21 from Rev. xx. 1. The dealing with the beast and the false prophet, the slaying of the remnant, and the binding of Satan are all leading up to the Millennial reign, which at its conclusion finds enough insubordination to justify the terms “Gog and Magog”, “the sand of the sea” and destruction by “fire” from God out of heaven.

The white horse of Rev. vi. 2 under the opening of the first seal, is Satan’s travesty of Christ. This rider is not followed by the armies of heaven, faithful and true, but by war, famine, pestilence, death, martyrdom and the wrath of the Lamb.

(2) *The Overcomer*.

“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it” (Rev. ii. 17).

The High Priest of Israel, who entered the Holiest of all once a year, never lifted the Mercy Seat or ate from the golden pot of manna that was hidden beneath it. These “Priests” of God and of Christ do. The white stone bears a “new name” which is one of several references to a similar honour. In Rev. iii. 12, the overcomer is honoured by having the name of God, the name of the city, and a “new name” written upon him. All this in direct contrast with Mystery Babylon, that had her awful name written upon her forehead (Rev. xvii. 5) and in contrast with those who had “the name of the beast, or the number of his name” (Rev. xiii. 17). Immediately following this awful branding come the words:

“Lo, a Lamb . . . . with Him an hundred and forty and four thousand, having His Father’s name written in their foreheads” (Rev. xiv. 1).

Just as no one knew the name on the white stone, saving he that received it, so no man could learn the new song sung by this company, but such as had been “redeemed from the earth”. And lastly, Rev. ii. 17 links these overcomers with the Lord in His Coming, for He too “had a name written, that no man knew, but He Himself” (Rev. xix. 12). To the overcomer in Sardis, the Lord promised, that “they shall walk with Me in white: for they are worthy”. “The same shall be clothed in white raiment” (Rev. iii. 4, 5).

How it can possibly be congruous to add to such “And I will not blot out his name out of the book of life” is dealt with in the article entitled “The Book of Life”, which should be consulted. We find that this links up with Rev. xx. 6, where “priests of God and of Christ” are assured that “on such the second death hath no power”, again a subject that has been discussed in the article referred to above. That these “white raiments” are not symbols of salvation by grace through faith, is manifest by the terms of the next reference:

“I counsel thee TO BUY of Me . . . . white raiment” (Rev. iii. 18).

The gold that is offered also is that which has been “tried in the fire” which Peter associates with “manifold temptations” but which will be found with praise and honour at the APOCALYPSE of Jesus Christ” (I Pet. i. 7). Moreover the purpose of Rev. iii. 18 is expanded and explained in verse nineteen “As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten”.

In Rev. vi. 11 “white robes” were given to the martyrs who had been slain for the word of God, and for their testimony. This is a plain indication as to what “white robes” and “white raiment” symbolize in this book. The fellow servants who were yet to suffer must include those described in Rev. xx. 4. The wearers of the white robes in Rev. vii. 13, 14 are those that came out of great tribulation “and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb”. No one can wash robes in blood to make them white. These symbols of overcoming martyrdom are linked with the Great Overcomer, “A Lamb as it had been slain” (Rev. v. 5, 6), and the words of Rev. vii. 14 should never be used in an evangelical sense, or in a gospel hymn; such usage is a negation of the terms of the Gospel, and a beclouding of the meaning of Rev. vii. In like manner, these overcomers are linked with “the armies” of heaven which follow the Lamb upon “white horses”, who are also clothed in fine linen “white and clean”.

### (3) *Judgment and War.*

The vision of the Son of Man upon a white cloud, having in His hand a sharp sickle (Rev. xiv. 14) is no reference to a peaceful and happy harvesting of the redeemed. The grapes thus gathered were “cast into the great winepress of the wrath of God” (Rev. xiv. 19).

Finally, the Throne of Judgment after the close of the Millennium, which is for “the rest” of the dead who were not counted worthy to be numbered with the “first resurrection”, that throne is defined as being “white” (Rev. xx. 11). There are many references to a throne in the Revelation (*thronos* occurs 46 times), but no colour or description is given to forty-five of these references. The fact that the throne of Rev. xx. 11 is defined as “white” definitely links it with the “rest of the dead” who failed to “overcome”. (See other articles under the covering title “Millennial Studies” for further proofs and exposition of this and kindred themes.)

Here again we pause. The testimony of the employment of “white” in the Apocalypse ranges with and supplements a great number of other features that testify with one voice, that the Millennium is pre-eminently the sphere in which the martyrs who suffer during the Antichristian oppression will “live and reign with Christ a thousand years”. All theories concerning the Millennium must line up with the positive teaching of the Apocalypse, all theories that ignore or belittle such testimony must be repudiated by all who love and honour the Scriptures as the Word of Truth. Rev. xx. 1-10 is the only sure starting point for studying the meaning and character of the Millennial kingdom. Many prophecies, hitherto forced into that kingdom, may belong to the succeeding Day of God (II Pet. iii. 12) which is scarcely touched upon in the Apocalypse.

What John said concerning the earthly ministry of the Son of God in his gospel, namely:

“There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written everyone, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written” (John xxi. 25),

could be said of the fulfillment of O.T. prophecy. The visions of the Apocalypse are as much selected, as were the eight signs of the gospel of John.

The prophecies of the O.T. have a focus, a gathering point, and this is sufficiently definite to ensure that the student who observes their limits and the items that converge at the time of the end, will have a sufficient guide and chart to the outworking of prophecy, until faith merges into sight and the day dawns, and shadows flee away.

See article, *The converging lines of Prophecy* either in a future issue, or in the *Alphabetical Analysis*.

## No.5. THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM. pp. 124 - 127

In the epistle to the Galatians “Jerusalem” is mentioned five times. Three of these occurrences refer to Jerusalem, the literal city on earth to which Paul went to see Peter (Gal. i. 17, 18; ii. 1). In the allegory of Gal. iv., Sinai in Arabia answers to Jerusalem “which now is”, but those who form the unity expressed in Gal. iii. 28, 29 belong to “Jerusalem which is above” (Gal. iv. 26). There can be no doubt as to the intention of that word “above” which translates the Greek word *ano*: “filled up to *the brim*” (John ii. 7); “beneath . . . . *above*” (John viii. 23). “In heaven *above* . . . . in earth beneath” (Acts ii. 19), are some examples. When we are exhorted to set our affections on things *above*, we are also told that such things are (1) not on the earth, but that (2) they are where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God (Col. iii. 1, 2). Jerusalem which is “above” therefore is in contrast with Jerusalem which is on the earth. It is not only heavenly in character, it is also heavenly in situation. When this city is mentioned in Revelation, it is called:

“New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God” (Rev. iii. 12).

This feature is repeated in chapter xxi. 2 and 10:

“And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven.”  
“And He carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God.”

For the moment we leave the question as to *when* this city descends, and consider the place that it occupies in the epistle to the Hebrews, the only other portion of the N.T. that speaks of it. This is found in Heb. xii. 22 where we read:

“But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.”

This, as in Gal. iv., is in contrast with Mount Sinai. This city is moreover inhabited by an innumerable company of angels, and angels, while they visited the earth on missions of blessing or judgment, are designated as “the angels of heaven” in the Scriptures. In Heb. xi. we see how the vision of this city influenced Abraham, for it is written:

“These all died in faith . . . . and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth . . . . they seek a country . . . . they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly . . . . God . . . . hath prepared for them a city” (Heb. xi. 13-16).

For this, Abraham was willing to be a tent dweller, “for he looked for a city which hath (the) foundations, whose builder and maker is God” (Heb. xi. 9, 10). We learn from Isaiah that when God calls Israel to Himself as a woman forsaken, as a wife of youth when refused, who for a little time had been under the cloud of wrath, and under the hiding of His face, He declares:

“I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles and all thy borders of pleasant stones” (Isa. liv. 11, 12).

Here, this city is seen to be an earthly reflection of the heavenly Jerusalem, but must not be confused with it. One feature alone shows that the two cities are distinct, the *gates* of the one are of *carbuncles*, the gates of the heavenly Jerusalem were “every several gate of one pearl” (Rev. xxi. 21). Consequently there can be no confusing of these two cities, beautiful as they both will be. The city of Isa. liv. may be invested by an enemy, and the promise is that no weapon that is formed against it shall prosper (Isa. liv. 15-17), but there is no thought in the Apocalypse that the heavenly Jerusalem will ever be, or ever could be thus threatened. The city that Abraham looked for cannot be the city of Isa. liv., it must have been the city of Rev. xxi. and xxii.

Some difficulty may be experienced by the reader when he reads the dimensions of the heavenly Jerusalem, given in Rev. xxi. 16:

“And the city lieth foursquare, and the length is as large as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal.”

Commenting on this verse, and the problem that arises, Dr. Bullinger wrote in his *Apocalypse* “In this case the city will be 1,500 miles high” and, referring to another system of measurement, says “Is 375 miles high easier to believe than 1,500?” We know that great changes will take place not only in the Holy land but in the earth at large, and so a city of these vast proportions, set in the centre of a world in which there was “no more sea”, need not be disproportionate. However, an article in *The Faith* suggested that 12,000 furlongs refer to the area of the square base, and the square root of 12,000 is 109, which, taking the stadium to be 582 feet (see *Twentieth Century Dictionary*), gives about 12 MILES for the length of one of the square sides. By comparing this with Ezek. xlvi. 35, and 18,000 measures or reeds of 6 cubits would give us, with 25 inches to a cubit, a circumference of 46 miles. This, when divided by four, gives 11 miles for one side and so is practically identical with the suggested measurement given above, and means, if it be true, that the heavenly Jerusalem would descend and rest upon the basis formed by the restored Jerusalem on earth. A city 12 miles square is a reasonable proportion, and 12 miles in height could symbolize world-wide dominion, 12 denoting Governmental perfection.

However, we are perfectly sure that when the day of fulfillment comes, there will be perfect harmony between the event and the prophetic record. Whatever the size the city may be, it will perfectly fulfil the purpose for which it was prepared. It will be the jeweled centre of the new earth.

We return now to the question, when will the New Jerusalem descend? When the New Jerusalem descends from heaven, there will be:

“No more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain:  
FOR THE FORMER THINGS ARE PASSED AWAY” (Rev. xxi. 4).  
“He that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make ALL THINGS NEW” (Rev. xxi. 5).

The arrangement of the material of Rev. xxi. 1-5 is as follows:

- A | a | 1. NEW. Heaven and Earth.
- b | 1. FORMER. *He prote.* Pass away.
- c | 1. NO MORE. Sea (ref. to Gen. i. 2).
- B | 2. I SAW. New Jerusalem.
- B | 3. I HEARD. Tabernacle.
- A |     c | 4. NO MORE. Death, sorrow, pain (ref. to Gen. iii.).
- b | 4. FORMER *ta prota.* Pass away.
- a | 5. NEW. All things.

This Tabernacle is the New Jerusalem, and unlike the tabernacle in the wilderness which was limited to “Israel”, this is now “with MEN”, *anthropos*. The resplendent tent, made after the pattern shown to Moses in the mount, foreshadowed this bejeweled city not in a wilderness, nor limited to Israel, nor temporary as a tent, but when all families of the new earth shall ultimately be brought into blessing. The New Jerusalem evidently descends from heaven to rest upon *the New Earth*. During the Millennium therefore it must have been in the heavens. This raises another question. Do those who are destined to walk its golden streets enter into their inheritance:

- (1) At the commencement of the Millennial reign, or
- (2) Do they have to wait until the 1000 years are finished, if so
- (3) Are they not raised from the dead until the 1000 years are finished, or
- (4) Where are they during that time?

The overcomer, among other things, is to be made:

- (1) A pillar in the temple of God.
- (2) He is to have written upon him, the name of God, and the name of the city of God, New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from God.
- (3) The overcomer begins his reign with Christ at *the commencement* of the 1000 years (Rev. xx. 4, 5).

From other Scriptures we gather that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will sit down in the kingdom of heaven, and the reference to the “east and west” shows that this refers to the earth (Matt. viii. 11), yet Abraham looked for a heavenly, not an earthly country or city, and God has prepared for him “a city” (Heb. xi. 16). We also learn that “in the regeneration” the apostles shall sit on *twelve thrones*, judging the *twelve tribes* of Israel, presumably on the earth, while all the time we read that the foundations of the heavenly city were made up of *twelve precious stones*, bearing the names of the *twelve apostles of the Lamb* (Rev. xxi. 14, 19-20). Moreover, the gates are twelve and bear the names of the *twelve tribes* of Israel, yet the twelve tribes as such will inherit *the land* as Ezek. xlvi. reveals, and not the heavenly city, for that is reserved for the overcomer.

It is evident therefore that the overcomer will enter the New Jerusalem while it is still *in heaven*, and will reign and rule over the earth, with *that* city as the seat of authority, even as the Satanic counterfeit reigned over people, multitudes, nations and tongues in the mock Pre-Millennial kingdom of the Beast. When the Millennium closes, and the Day of God succeeds the Day of the Lord, the earth will then receive this resplendent city, and the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory and honour unto it. What Jerusalem on the earth during the Millennium partly accomplished (for feigned obedience, and the rise of Gog and Magog indicate that the influence of Jerusalem was not universally complete), the Heavenly Jerusalem will. It is this kingdom which is envisaged in I Cor. xv. 24-28 which will ultimately be delivered up to God, even the Father, the goal of the ages be attained, and “eternity” (for the want of a better word) begins.

## **No.6. THE EVE OF THE MILLENNIUM.** **pp. 145 - 148**

The intense desire for peace on earth and good will toward men which is one of the deepest yearnings of the individual, but alas is so regularly frustrated by the clash of national interests, leads the mind of the believer to dwell on such a passage as Isa. ii. 4 with great joy, but seems to have made many turn a blind eye to such a passage as Joel iii. 9, 10. Let us place them together and consider their import:

“They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more” (Isa. ii. 4).

“Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up: beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruninghooks into spears” (Joel iii. 9, 10).

The passage from Isaiah speaks of the Millennial day, when the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, but the passage in Joel deals with days that precede “the great and terrible day of the Lord” (Joel ii. 31). In both Joel ii. 30, 31 and iii. 15 the sun shall be turned into darkness, showing that both chapters deal with the same period, namely the very eve of the Millennium. The special feature that calls for fuller consideration is this. The call to beat *plowshares into swords*, suggests that before this there had been a *mock millennium*, where the nations of the earth either by intimidation or deception, or both, had beaten their *swords into plowshares*, and concluded that war had ceased in the earth for ever. Many of those who read these lines have lived through periods of war that were to end war. They have heard of conferences for disarmament and hoped that they would succeed. Such yearnings are natural and right, but they may be ill-timed and if so doomed to failure. Two words sum up the condition aimed at, “peace and safety”. Yet we read that at the very time that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night, sudden destruction overtakes those whose slogan will be these very words “peace and safety”, and they shall not escape (I Thess. v. 2, 3).

This “peace and safety” is therefore spurious; it is not of God, therefore it must be the false travesty of the Devil, there is no other alternative. A false peace can destroy (see Dan. viii. 25). At the rise of the world’s last dictator (Rev. xiii.), war will temporarily cease, not because of the conversion of all mankind by grace, but the paralysis of all nations by fear.

“Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him?” (Rev. xiii. 4).

The figure “beating swords into plowshares” indicates a turn over to the more peaceful employment of labour and resources, which, for a time at least will bring prosperity, “peace and safety”. It should be remembered that the chief aim of Satan is to *dethrone the Son of God*. He, Satan, must deplore that crime and degradation ever follow his efforts to rule this world. If he could have a *Millennium without Christ* it would suit his plan completely. After six thousand years of blood and misery, Satan will appear to have attained his goal, but the record reveals its utter failure, it lasts “one hour” (Rev. xvii. 12; xviii. 10, 17, 19). Some light upon the extraordinary prosperity that shall characterize this pre-millennial travesty of Satan is found in the description of Babylon’s merchandise.

“The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves (Gk. bodies), and souls of men” (Rev. xviii. 12, 13).

Here is a *luxury* trade, mingled with provision for idolatrous practices giving prominence to “costliness” (Rev. xviii. 19), and including not only costly goods but “the bodies and souls of men”. A pre-millennial kingdom *in the absence* of Christ is the dream and the goal of the Enemy of Truth. For a brief period he will attain a superficial semblance to that goal, and then, at a later date, will himself be brought to an ignominious end “and never be any more” (Ezek. xxviii. 19). Satan did not hesitate to attempt a bargain with the Son of God (Matt. iv. 9) and what He, the Blessed One, refused, will prove the bait to catch the Man of Sin (John v. 43). As a travesty of the Mystery of godliness, wherein “God was manifest in the flesh” this son of perdition will oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; “so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God” (II Thess. ii. 4).

To the end his activities are in the realm of religion and worship, but he, Satan, cannot prevent the crimes that are concomitant, though he may deplore them. Worship, not wickedness is ever in the mind of Satan. Preposterous as it sounds “all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them” were offered to the Son of God for ONE ACT OF WORSHIP (Matt. iv. 9), so much does Satan seek it. The immediate effect of the rise of the Beast of Rev. xiii. is the temporary attainment of this very same end:

“And *they worshipped* the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and *they worshipped* the beast . . . . and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein *to worship* the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed . . . . as many as would not *worship* the image of the beast should be killed” (Rev. xiii. 4, 12, 15).

Here is a kingdom and worship which is universal “all that dwell on the earth”. It will be “peace and safety” and a standard of living that can only be described as luxurious. War will have ceased. Swords will have been beaten into plowshares, so that at the end when war is again “prepared” or as the word is literally “sanctified” (Joel iii. 9 margin), the nations of the earth who have lived in this pre-millennial travesty of the Truth, will have to start all over again to “beat” their “plowshares into swords”. The reference in Joel iii. to the valley of Jehoshaphat (Joel iii. 12) turns us back to a typical incident in Israel’s history as recorded in II Chron. xx. Moab, Ammon and others came against Jehoshaphat to battle. Jehoshaphat, all Judah with their little ones, their wives and their children, stood before the Lord in prayer. In answer to their petition a message was sent to them:

“Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God’s” (II Chron. xx. 15).

There was no need to fight in that battle; all that the people had to do was to set themselves or take their stations. “Stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord” (verse 17).

“So the realm of Jehoshaphat was quiet: for his God gave him rest round about” (II Chron. xx. 30).

Jehoshaphat, like David, Solomon and the best of men, was in himself a failure (see II Chron. xx. 31-37) but the type still holds. Just as Edom said concerning Jerusalem “Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof” (Psa. cxxxvii. 7), so will the nations at the time of the end. Indeed, almost identical words have been reported in the Press recently. The presence of Israel in the Devil’s millennium will prove a great disturbance to the false peace that for the time obtains and so all nations will be gathered against Jerusalem to battle. As in the day of Jehoshaphat, so they will gather again. “Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when He fought in the day of battle. And His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives” (Zech. xiv. 3, 4). It is this way upon Jerusalem and Israel that necessitates beating plowshares back again to swords, and which ends with the judgment of all the heathen in the “valley of decision”. In that day “Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence against the children of Judah . . . . but Judah shall DWELL FOR EVER, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. For I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed: even I the Lord that dwelleth in Zion” (Joel iii. 18-21 margin). Here is proof that at *the self same time* that Israel are restored (Joel iii. 1) the nations will be gathered unto this valley of Jehoshaphat (Joel iii. 2), that at *the self same time* when Judah and Jerusalem are safe for ever, Egypt shall be desolation. Yet after all this, Isaiah declares that:

“In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land: whom the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance” (Isa. xix. 24, 25). (*see for a fuller examination of Isa. xix., the booklet “Egypt”.*)

It is an axiom of all rational thought that “a thing cannot both BE, and NOT BE at the same time”. “In that day” includes too many opposite events to allow us to think of the Millennium as a period of unsullied glory and perfect peace from the beginning of the thousand years to the end. What does fit *all that is said*, is that Israel will be a nation “born at once” (Isa. lxvi. 8), whereas gross darkness will still envelop most of the nations. Nevertheless, light and truth shall radiate from Zion as a blessed centre, until at last the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. God’s ordination at the beginning was that “the evening and the morning” should constitute a day. A thousand years in his sight are like a day that is past, and the Millennial day may conform to the same pattern. The Millennial reign begins with an “evening”. When the Lord comes the second time to inaugurate that reign, He comes to MAKE WAR at the first (Rev. xix. 11). There is not a word to warrant the idea that at the stroke of the clock, the moment the thousand years commence, all will be peace. The Lord will reign in Zion *in the midst of enemies*. The nations will learn slowly the law of the Lord from Jerusalem, and only as the thousand years (the day of the Lord) come to their close, and the Day of God succeeds, when *all delegated authority* shall be under the feet of the Son of God, will that kingdom be at length perfected and ready for the Day of the Age, the goal of all purpose and prophecy, that God may be all in all (I Cor. xv. 28).

It is right for us to look eagerly for that blessed consummation, but it is also right to be on our guard, lest over eagerness should lay us open to the deception of the Devil, and we be found pointing the Lord’s people to a travesty of truth, with all its accompanying misery and disillusionment. We make no claim to a complete understanding of the teaching of prophecy, but what we do claim to have done is to insist that *all that is written*, and not selected passages, is the only safe foundation upon which to build whether for our individual salvation, or for a true appreciation of the Millennial reign and the ultimate goal of the ages.

## **No.7. The Lake of Fire, and the Millennium.** **pp. 164 - 173**

Why a “lake” of fire? Of the commentators we have consulted, none make any reference to this particular word, its meaning and the reason for its use. The Greek word translated “lake” is *limne*. Parkhurst says that the word indicates a lake of standing water, as opposed to a running stream, and is so called from *lian menein* “remaining very quiet”; so the Latin, *stagnum*, a pool. Schrevelius reads *limne*, a port, harbour, haven, station, refuge, accusative *limena*; as if *lian menei*, because there the ships rest in safety; hence *limenarches*, a harbour master. *Limne* occurs in the LXX in Psa. cvii. 30 “haven”; Psa. cvii. 35, cxiv. 8 “a standing water”; Song of Sol. “fish pool” (vii. 4). The word occurs in the N.T. ten times and is always translated “lake”. Apart from the five references in the Revelation, the remainder occur in Luke v. 1, 2; viii. 22, 23, 33, the lake of Gennesaret, elsewhere called the Sea of Galilee, and the sea and lake of Tiberias, and in the O.T., the sea of Chinnereth.

In Luke viii. 22, 23 “the lake” is associated (1) with the storm that threatened the lives of the disciples, and which the Saviour “rebuked”, and the place where the swine, possessed of demons, were choked. In every place a lake of water is intended, which makes it strange that a “lake of standing water, a haven, and a harbour” should burn with “fire and brimstone”. There is only one other set of references that may have some bearing, and these are found in the Apocrypha.

Difficult as it may be for us to understand, at the sounding of the sixth trumpet, four angels are let loose, which had been bound in the great river Euphrates (Rev. ix. 14). How could angels be held by a river? In the article entitled “The Bottomless Pit” we show the connexion that exists in Scripture between “The Abyss”, “The Sea” and “The Deep” of Gen. i. 2. That connexion must be kept in mind here. In the 2nd book of the Maccabees, xii. 1-9 we have the following record:

“The men of Joppe also did such an ungodly deed: they prayed the Jews that dwelt among them to go with their wives and children into the boats which they had prepared, as though they meant them no hurt, who accepted of it according to the common decree of the city as being desirous to live in peace, and suspecting nothing: but when they were gone forth into the deep, they drowned no less than two hundred of them.

When Judas heard of this cruelty done unto his countrymen, he commanded those that were with him to make them ready. And calling upon God the righteous Judge, he came against those murderers of his brethren, and burnt the haven (“lake”) by night, and set the boats on fire, and those that fled thither (or from the fire) he slew . . . . But when he heard that the Jamnites were minded to do in like manner . . . . he came . . . . and set fire on the haven and navy, so that the light of the fire was seen at Jerusalem two hundred and forty furlongs off.”

We Gentiles have never had impressed upon our hearts, minds and memory the exploits of the Maccabees. Were we to have had a revelation written especially for English speaking people, it might use a mixture of figures; it might speak of a fat boy carved in stone, a monument built by Sir Christopher Wren, and refer to Pudding, Pie, and the sin of gluttony; but it is very unlikely that a Chinese reader, or come to that, some readers nearer home, would make sense of this oblique reference to the great fire of London! So, the essentially Hebrew atmosphere of the book of the Revelation not only draws freely upon O.T. imagery, but contains allusion to uncanonical or traditional happenings that may never find a place in a respectable commentary written for English readers. It may be that this “lake” of fire, before the judgment of that day, had been a “haven” for those evil beings, the Beast and the False Prophet, and it had been “prepared for the Devil and his angels” as the place of their final destruction. Nothing definite can be adduced from what we have presented, but we have at least given the term employed something more than a casual glance.

We have devoted some attention to the promise to the overcomer, that such would not have their names blotted out of the book of life. We must now devote some attention to the parallel promise given to the overcomer in the church of Smyrna “He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death”, and this second death, together with the book of life and the lake of fire, figures prominently in the judgment of the Great White Throne

(Rev. xx. 11-15). The choice of the word “hurt” by the A.V. translators may have been influenced by such passages as:

“Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt”  
(Dan. iii. 25).

“So Daniel was taken up out of the den, and no manner of hurt was found upon him”  
(Dan. vi. 23).

In contrast with the three who were not “hurt” in the furnace is the fate of the men who stoked the fire (Dan. iii. 22) and in contrast with Daniel, is the fate of those who accused him (Dan. vi. 24). The word translated “hurt” in Rev. ii. 11 is *adikeo*, which is so rendered in eight other passages in the Apocalypse, and twice translated “unjust” in Rev. xxii. 11. The overcomer in Smyrna, being a believer, had no need to be told that he would not be CAST INTO the lake of fire, but that he should not be HURT by it, a different matter altogether. From what we have already seen, it will be recognized that some wider survey of the references to “fire” and its implications is called for. Matt. v. 22 coming in the Sermon on the Mount, has reference to disciples and not to the ungodly outside world. It is set in a form of progression, the penalty keeping pace with the offence thus:

“Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of  
THE JUDGMENT: and  
Whosoever shall say to his brother Raca, shall be in danger of  
THE COUNCIL: but  
Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of  
HELL FIRE.”

The “Council” here is the Sanhedrin. Raca is a word like “empty-head”, “Hell fire” here is Gehenna.

“But what was there more grievous in the word ‘fool’ than in the word ‘Raca’? Let King Solomon be interpreter, who, everywhere, by a “fool” understands a wicked and reprobate person; foolishness being opposed to spiritual wisdom. ‘Raca’ denotes indeed, ‘morosity’ and lightness of manners and life; but ‘fool’ judgeth bitterly of the spiritual and eternal state” (Lightfoot).

While we can recognize a series of degrees in these actions, and that they are accompanied by corresponding degrees of punishment, it still seems to be inexplicable that for saying *raca*, a man was amenable to the Sanhedrin, but for saying *fool*, the offender was in danger of hell fire. Put into modern terms, we could read:

The first offence would be liable to a fine imposed by a magistrate.  
The second offence might lead to assizes, and a term of imprisonment.  
The third offence to a punishment of inconceivable horror, far worse than that of being beheaded or hanged.

If we turn to Matt. xxv. we shall be met with a similar problem. There, at the Second Coming of the Lord, the nations of the earth gather before Him and they are judged on one issue only, namely, the way in which they have treated His “brethren”.

To one section the King says:

“Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world” (Matt. xxv. 34).

To the other, the King says:

“Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt. xxv. 41).

The kindness shown to the Lord’s brethren was not intentionally rendered to the Lord, as the astonished inquiry of verses 37-40 will show, and the lack of kindness was not intentionally withheld from the Lord, yet one group go “into everlasting life” which is equated with the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, and the other group go “into everlasting punishment” which is equated with “everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels”. Let us observe, the inheritance was actually prepared for the one group, but the other enter a punishment not originally “prepared” for them, but for the devil and his angels. If from these verses we are to gather that failure to visit the brethren of the Lord in prison, merits everlasting punishment, and everlasting fire in the sense of a traditional “Hell”, then all argument is at an end. We stand appalled, but helpless, before a power beyond our own, but whether we stand assured of its utter and unquestioned righteousness, each one of us alone can answer. Before we leave these unhappy nations to their awful lot would it not be well if we knew the word used by the Lord for “punishment” here? There is the choice of at least four words:

*Ekdikesis* “the punishment of evildoers” (I Pet. ii. 14).

*Epitimia* “suffered . . . . is this punishment” (II Cor. ii. 6).

*Timoria* “sorer punishment” (Heb. x. 29).

These words are not found in Matt. xxv. The word employed there is *kolasis* “a pruning” (Dr. Bullinger’s Lexicon). The one other occurrence of *kolasis* is in I John iv. 18 “torment”. *Kolazomai* is translated “punish” in Acts iv. 21 & II Pet. ii. 9. The first meaning of *kolazomai* given in Liddell and Scott is “curtail, dock, prune”, and secondly to catigate, keep within bounds, correct, punish. *Kolasis* is used with *dendron* “trees” in the sense of pruning. Turning to the usage of the word *kolasis* in the LXX we read in Ezek. xviii. 30:

“I will judge you O house of Israel, saith the Lord, each one according to his way: be converted, and turn from all your ungodliness, and it shall not become to you the *punishment* of iniquity.”

Again in Ezek. xliv. 12-14, The Levites, because of their departure and ministry of idols, became “a punishment” of iniquity to the house of Israel, with the consequences that these Levites could no longer draw near, nor approach the holy things, but they shall bear their reproach (*atimian* “no honour” see usage in II Tim. ii. 20, 21) and take a lower service. This is understandable, but to translate this word *kolasis* as equivalent to everlasting torment in hell, is here impossible. Before attempting a conclusion of this matter in Matt. xxv., let us get a little light by turning to Heb. vi. It will, we trust, be

conceded that for Israel to “crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame” is a deeper sin than neglecting to visit the Lord’s brethren in prison. Yet while there is reference to “burning” as a consequence, it is remedial.

“For the earth . . . . which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned” (Heb. vi. 7, 8).

The “earth” here is a piece of land under cultivation. The word “rejected” is *adokimos*, “disqualified” having failed the test, and it is not cursed, but “nigh unto” cursing. The burning which is its end, burns up the “thorns and briars”, but *does not destroy* the land itself, but rather benefits it. It is comparable to the “pruning” of a tree. If we can allow the gentler meaning of the term in Matt. xxv., the nations who failed will go away into an age-long pruning, thereby missing the glory of the Millennium, but benefiting by its administration and correction.

Let us examine the Scriptures as to the usage of “fire” to indicate the Holiness and the Presence of God, before we go further in our search.

#### *Fire, and the Holiness of God.*

“Our God is a consuming fire” (Heb. xii. 29).

These words refer back to Deut. iv. 24 and ix. 3. This fire turns both ways. Its flame *scorches* the covenant people who provoke the Lord to jealousy, the flame *destroys* the enemies of His people. The association of fire with the presence of the Lord quite irrespective of sin or wrath, is the burden of many references.

“The sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire” (Exod. xxiv. 17).

This fire devoured Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 2) as it consumed the murmurers in Numb. xi. 1. Deut. v. is full of references to this association of fire with the presence of the Lord, and in Ezek. i.-x. fire is associated with the appearance of the Lord there. “Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?” asks Isaiah (xxxiii. 14). God Himself being a consuming fire, it must follow that saved and lost must, if in that sacred Presence, alike be affected by its searching character, the believer being able to answer the challenge of Isa. xxxiii. 14 “who shall dwell with everlasting burnings” because clothed in the *asbestos* (the Greek word is found in four passages) covering wherein they are accepted in the Beloved. This glorious immunity being theirs, is found “in Christ”, not having their own righteousness as a protection, but the righteousness of God which is by faith. These selfsame believers however who are thus immune from the searching flame of the Divine Presence may have with them and about them “works” which by their very nature cannot stand the test of fire, and so are mercifully shriveled as they draw near. This aspect we must now pursue as it impinges eventually on the interpretation we must put upon the lake of fire in Rev. xx. and elsewhere. We have used the word *asbestos* in its modern meaning; in the N.T. it refers to the fire that is unquenchable, not to the material that is unburnable (Matt. iii. 12; Mark ix. 43, 45 and Luke iii. 17).

*Fire, and the Redeemed* (Their perfect exemption, protection and standing in Christ).

Let us take the illustration found in Dan. iii. The overweening pride of Nebuchadnezzar left the three friends of Daniel no alternative but to disobey his commands, even though the consequence of disobedience was to be cast into a “burning fiery furnace”. To ensure their destruction Nebuchadnezzar commanded that the furnace be heated seven times more than was wont, and so vehement was its flame that the men who took up the faithful three were themselves instantly slain, but Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, though they “fell down bound” in the midst of such a fiery furnace, were seen walking unscathed together with one like unto the Son of God, and, as Nebuchadnezzar admitted, “they have no hurt”. What is meant by having “no hurt” is made clear in Dan. iii. 27:

“These men, upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them.”

That is what we meant when we used the word *asbestos* for the perfect immunity of the believer “in Christ”. They are an anticipation of those who shall not be “hurt” of the second death. Isaiah assured the “redeemed” of this immunity when he wrote:

“When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee” (Isa. xliii. 2).

Just as we find Daniel pondering over the writings of Jeremiah (Dan. ix. 2) so we can readily believe that the three friends found all the encouragement they needed in the precious words of Isa. xliii., when facing the ordeal of fire set by Nebuchadnezzar.

Again, as space is limited, we have no need to “prove” to the Spirit taught believer this blessed position of complete immunity demonstrated by Dan. iii. and prominent in Isa. xliii. as being equally true of all believers. We therefore turn our attention to the second division of this aspect of truth.

*Fire, and the Redeemed* (The test of faith and of works).

“The trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ” (I Pet. i. 7).

Here, it is not salvation that is under the test, it is the “trial of faith”. The Greek word *dokimion* “trial” and *dokimazo* “tried” have reference to the testing of metals; indeed the LXX of Prov. xxvii. 21 uses *dokimion* to translate the word “a fining pot” or “crucible” and Job said “When He has tried me, I shall come forth as gold” (Job xxiii. 10). Peter again speaks of “the fiery trial” that was about to try some of his readers (I Pet. iv. 12). Paul writing to the Corinthians makes it very clear, that those who are building upon the One Foundation, namely Christ, while never in danger of “being lost”, might “suffer loss” as over against “receiving a reward”, and uses the trial by fire to illustrate his teaching:

“Now if any man *build* upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s *work* of what sort it is. If any

man's *work* abide which he hath *built* thereupon, *he shall receive a reward*. 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. 12-15).

Here "works" are in view, and "works" only. When examining the character of the Millennium we drew attention to the words of the Saviour to the seven churches, "I know thy works", and how they were linked with Rev. xx., "The dead were judged . . . . according to their works". First, to every one of the seven churches, the Saviour said "I know thy works", and so dominant is this reference to "works" in these two chapters (Rev. ii. and iii.), that we find the Greek word *ergon* occurring fourteen times. It is to one of these churches made up of the redeemed, that the overcomer is promised "He . . . . shall not be hurt of the second death" (Rev. ii. 11), a promise fulfilled in Rev. xx. 6, for there those who "reign" with Christ for the thousand years are said to be blessed and holy; they are said to be priests of God and of Christ, and "ON SUCH the second death hath no power". Every one of these seven churches is linked with the Millennial kingdom by either the promise to the overcomer, or the warning to the slacker, or by both. Let us see this for ourselves:

|               |          |  |
|---------------|----------|--|
| Ephesus.      | Promise. | Paradise - Rev. ii. 7 and xxii. 2.               |
| Smyrna.       | Promise. | Not hurt of the second death - ii. 11 and xx. 6. |
| Pergamos.     | Promise. | New name . . . . - ii. 17 and xix. 12.           |
|               | Threat.  | Fight, sword, mouth - ii. 16 and xix. 15.        |
| Thyatira.     | Promise. | Rod of Iron - ii. 27 and xii. 5.                 |
|               | Threat.  | Kill with death - ii. 23 and xx. 15.             |
| Sardis.       | Promise. | Not blot out - iii. 5 and xx. 12.                |
| Philadelphia. | Promise. | New Jerusalem - iii. 12 and xxi. 2.              |
| Laodicea.     | Promise. | Sit in Throne - iii. 21 and xx. 4.               |

If "the second death" be the doom that awaits the *wicked dead* what congruity is there between the POSITION "priests of God and of Christ" and the PROMISE "on such the second death hath no power" (Rev. xx. 6)? Anyone with the slightest knowledge of the gospel of grace, knows that "there is . . . . no condemnation" possible for the believer in Christ. Now this second death is equated with "the lake of fire" (Rev. xx. 14, 15) and so falls within the bounds of our present inquiry. This lake of fire is mentioned in five passages in the Revelation, and in several other passages by implication.

"The beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worship his image. These both were cast alive into a **lake of fire** burning with brimstone" (Rev. xix. 20).

"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the **lake of fire** and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are (or were), and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. xx. 10).

"And death and hell was cast into the **lake of fire**. This is the second death" (Rev. xx. 14).

"And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the **lake of fire**" (Rev. xx. 15).

"He that overcometh shall inherit all things . . . . but the fearful . . . . shall have their part in the **lake** which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death" (Rev. xxi. 7, 8).

The first thing we must note is that in Rev. xxi., the doom of those parallel with verse eight is said to be exclusion from the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 27). Let us make sure of this:

| <b>Rev. xxi. 8.</b>   | <b>Rev. xxi. 27.</b>  |
|---|---|
| <p>“But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.”</p> | <p>“And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.”</p> |

Someone who was timid, who had flinched under the dreadful persecution of the time of the Beast and False Prophet—this one who fell and against which sin Paul even warned Timothy (II Tim. i. 7), he has his part in the lake of fire, whereas any one that was defiled was excluded from the heavenly Jerusalem. Yet this, while it sounds odd enough, will be seen more strange for in one verse the abominable and “ALL” liars are destined for the lake of fire, while in the corresponding verse ANYTHING . . . . that worketh abomination, or maketh a *lie*, is excluded from the Heavenly Jerusalem! Surely, if the Scriptures are inspired, this means that the reference to the lake of fire, the reference to the second death, the reference to the book of life, and the reference to the entry into the heavenly city are to be read *together*. This lake of fire is said to have been “prepared” for the devil and his angels (Matt. xxv. 41) in contrast with the kingdom that had been “prepared” for those who received the Lord’s commendation (Matt. xxv. 34); the “Bride” also is prepared for her husband (Rev. xxi. 2). In each case they are exceptional, and cannot be spread wider than the contexts will allow. This dreadful lake of fire had not been “prepared” for any other than the Devil and his angels, but if anyone yielded to the pressure or the temptation of the last days so as to ally himself with the Devil and his emissaries, he could be “hurt” of the second death, he would find that the fire that destroyed the enemy, could also burn up his fleshly “works”, and he could “suffer loss” even the loss of the Heavenly city, yet “he himself could be saved so as by fire”.

Closely connected with all this is the question, to what does the Book of Life refer, does it speak of the redeemed or of a special company from among the redeemed? Let us see. For our present study, we shall attempt no distinction between the Greek words *biblion* a little book, and *biblos* a book. The first reference is found in Phil. iv. 3 where it relates to service. Had the Book of Life appeared in Ephesians and Colossians, we might have thought that it was tantamount to the choice of the believer before the foundation of the world, but Philippians is the epistle of service, it opens with a reference to bishops and deacons, it urges the believer to “work out” his salvation, it holds out a “Prize” and even tells us that the Apostle, who was sure of his salvation and hope, was not at the time as sure of the Prize as he was at the end of his course (Phil. iii. 11, 14 and II Tim. iv. 7, 8).

Earlier in Philippians, Epaphroditus “was nigh unto death, not regarding his life” in service to the Lord, and Paul himself had taken the view of life “Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by LIFE or by DEATH”. It is therefore fitting that those who thus *lost* their lives for Christ’s sake should *find* them in this Book of *Life*, the book of martyred saints who in their several spheres will “reign” with Christ. This passage in Philippians is the only reference in the N.T. to the Book of Life except those found in the book of the Revelation. Now the Revelation traces the career of the overcomer, throughout the great tribulation to the throne, and it is this book that contains all the other references to the Book of Life.

“I will not blot out his name out of the **book of life**” (Rev. iii. 5).

“And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him (the Beast), whose names are not written in the **book of life** of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (Rev. xiii. 8).

“And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the **book of life** from the foundation of the world” (Rev. xvii. 8).

“And I saw the dead (i.e. ‘the rest’, Rev. xx. 5), small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the **book of life**” (Rev. xx. 12).

“And whosoever was not found written in the **book of life** was cast into the lake of fire” (Rev. xx. 15).

“And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb’s **book of life**” (Rev. xxi. 27).

“And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part:

- (1) out of the **book of life**, and
- (2) out of the Holy City, and
- (3) out from the things written in this book” (Rev. xxii. 19).

Some authorities read “the tree of life” here. While the margin of the R.V. reads at Rev. xiii. 8 “written from the foundation of the world in the book . . . . slain” it still retains in the text the order “in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world”, and this should give us pause, lest in sweeping aside a difficulty, we also remove an index of its meaning. By referring to Luke xi. 50, 51 we shall see that “the blood of Abel” was the first to be “shed from the foundation of the world”, and this suggests that the “Lamb’s book of life” contains the names of all those who have suffered martyrdom for the faith since the first martyrdom of Abel. Incidentally, this reference disposes of the suggestion that “before the foundation of the world” refers to the future, for if we go back as far as Gen. iv., for the period “from” the foundation of the world, the period indicated in Eph. i. 4 MUST be earlier still. Abel especially sets forth the conditions we find ruling in the Revelation, for it was Cain, who was of “that wicked one” the seed of the serpent (Gen. iii. 15), that shed the first martyr’s blood and it is the Dragon “that old Serpent”, the Beast, the False Prophet and their follower who shed the blood of the overcomers in the time of the end.

“And they overcame him

- (1) by the blood of the Lamb,
- (2) and by the word of their testimony;
- (3) and they love not their lives unto the death” (Rev. xii. 11),

and at the end of the chapter we see the Dragon makes war with the remnant of the woman's seed which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ (Rev. xii. 17).

We have already referred to those who apostatize in the day of Tribulation who draw back unto perdition, who "fall away" and crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, who are likened to the earth which produces thorns and briars, and is (1) "rejected", is (2) "nigh unto" cursing, (3) whose end is to be "burned" (Heb. vi. 6-8). Now "rejected" is the Greek word *adokimos*, derived from a word which means to test or to try a metal. It is used by Peter for the "trial" of faith, and of the unashamed workman "approved" by Paul. *Adokimos* is the word translated "castaway" in I Cor. ix. 27, meaning "disqualified" so far as the "crown" is concerned. "Nigh" unto cursing is not the same as being actually cursed, even as Bethany was "nigh" unto Jerusalem, but actually two miles distant. When a field that is full of weeds is "burned" the weeds are destroyed, but the field abides, and is the better for it.

Enough we believe has been brought before the reader to enable him to see that the book of the Revelation deals with *a particular class and calling*, its terms of judgment although awful, are limited by their contexts, and taken with the alternative of reigning and overcoming, cannot be lifted out of these contexts and applied to the believer of the present dispensation, or to the ungodly and unevangelized world of all ages. To be "nigh" unto cursing, to be "hurt" of the second death, to have one's name "removed" from the book of life, which apparently contains the names of all overcomers since the death of Abel, to be "excluded" from the heavenly city, all pertain to the people of God who find themselves in the dreadful three years and a half of the domination of the beast, and which give us a picture of the Millennial reign, that must be retained. Let us rejoice that there will be some who will endure that time of terror and who will consequently:

"Live and reign with Christ a thousand years."

## **No.8. The Converging Lines of Prophetic Truth. pp. 184 - 191**

While it is true that a Prophet in the Scriptural record ministered to the immediate needs of his own time, the outstanding character of his office was the God-given ability to speak of things to come. Horne says of prophecy:

"It is a miracle of knowledge, a declaration, or description, or representation of something future, beyond the power of human sagacity to foresee, discern or conjecture, and it is the highest evidence that can be given of supernatural communion with the Deity, and of the truth of revelation."

Bishop Hurd has written of Messianic prophecy:

“That prophecy is of a prodigious extent; that it commenced from the fall of man, and reaches to the consummation of all things; that for many ages it was delivered darkly, to a few persons, and with large intervals from the date of one prophecy to that of another, but at length became more clear, more frequent, and was uniformly carried on in the line of one people, separated from the rest of the world, among other reasons assigned for this principally to be the repository of the divine oracles . . . . even to the end of time, or, in St. John’s expression, to that period *when the mystery of God shall be finished*” (Rev. x. 7).

When Peter wrote his second epistle, the testimony of prophecy was being discounted by scoffers who said “Where is the promise of His coming?” This he countered by saying “No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation”, or as Moffatt has it “came by human impulse” (II Pet. i. 20). The Greek words are *idias epiluseos*, and generally speaking bear the translation given in the A.V. But Peter does not appear to be dealing with how to *interpret* prophecy, but how *prophecy* came—for he continues:

“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.”

If we retain the rendering “private interpretation”, its first meaning must be that the prophecies found in the Scriptures are not the private solutions by the prophets of the enigmas confronting them, and secondly, that those of us who read and use those prophecies, must be on our guard that no one “uses” any prophecy merely as a bolster to support some pre-conceived theory—which alas has become the dreadful fate of many of these sublime utterances. The completely impersonal character of prophecy is moreover suggested by I Pet. i. 10, 11, where we learn that those prophets who spoke beforehand of salvation, afterwards searched their own writings to discover “what, or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify”.

One simple yet most valuable office of prophecy is to act as “a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn” (II Pet. i. 19). Another is that the “spirit of prophecy” is “the testimony of Jesus” (Rev. xix. 10). Within bounds, we believe we are not far wrong when we say that the door of prophecy swings on two hinges:

- (1) The Return of Christ
- and
- (2) The Return of Israel.

Associated with these two great issues is the history and destiny of two cities, Babylon and Jerusalem, and with these two cities, two kingdoms, namely the kingdom of the Beast, and the kingdom of the Lord. Before proceeding with our studies, the present moment seems to be the time to pause and consider this term “kingdom”. It has been maintained that our word *government* comes nearest to expressing the word *basileia*. First of all let us consider the classical usage of *basileia* as set out in Liddell and Scott, where we shall discover the way in which the ordinary Greek used the term.

*Basileia*, a kingdom, dominion, hereditary monarchy opposed to *tyrranis* and secondly a diadem.

*Basileion*, a kingly dwelling, palace. The seat of empire, royal city, the royal treasury, a tiara, diadem.

*Basileios*, kingly, royal.

*Basileus*, a king, prince, lord. Frequently with collateral sense of Captain or Judge, later, an hereditary king, then the king's son, prince or any one sharing in the government, and at Athens, the second of the nine archons. After the Persian war the king of Persia was called *Basileus*, so afterward the Roman Emperors.

*Basileutos*, under monarchial government.

*Basileuo*, to be king, to rule, to be made king, to rule over a people, to be governed or administered, to be of the king's party.

*Basilikos*, royal, kingly, like a king, kingly, princely.

It will be seen that the primary meaning of all these allied words is king, kingly and kingdom and this is how a Greek, reading the N.T., would interpret them. The secondary meanings of rule or government, are the rule or government of such as are kings or kingly persons. If the word "government" be a truer rendering than the word "kingdom" it is somewhat strange to find that there are two Hebrew and two Greek words translated "government", eleven Hebrew and five Greek words translated "governor"; one Chaldee word, and three different Hebrew words for "to govern", and yet not one uses the Hebrew word for king or kingdom! When we turn to the Hebrew word *melek*, we find it translated KING 2,518 times and ROYAL twice, while the corresponding Chaldee word is translated KING 164 times and ROYAL once AND IN NO OTHER WAY.

When we examine the Hebrew *melukah*, *malekuth*, *mamlakah* and *mamlakuth*, we find that *melukah* is translated kingdom 18, king 2, royal 4; *malekuth* empire 1, kingdom 49, realm 4, reign 21, royal 14; *malekuth* (Chaldee) kingdom 46, realm 3, reign 4, kingly 1; *mamlakah* kingdom 108, reign 2, kings 1, royal 4; *mamlakuth* kingdom 8, reign 1, and these words are translated *in no other way!* Not once is "government" ever used. We have not bothered to count these occurrences. The evidence is overwhelming, and the idea that all this can be set aside by the stroke of the pen, seems too monstrous to need refutation.

The reader, who is not already predisposed to any particular theory, may wonder what the driving motive must be that so desperately needs a new translation. This is not all however. The words king and kingdom do not stand alone. They are most intimately associated with the insignia of royalty. Throne, Crown, Sceptre are continual adjuncts. Britain has a Government. The United States has a Government, but we have yet to hear of the President's Coronation, that he occupies a throne, wields a sceptre, or is royal. We therefore most earnestly ask every reader to pause and re-consider should they have been carried away by this novel idea that is refuted by the entire range of Scripture and consider this, that such a translation actually robs the Saviour of His CROWN RIGHTS.

The church of the One Body is not a kingdom. But the church of the One Body has the honour to be translated *into* the kingdom of God's dear Son. The corporation of the City of London or of Birmingham is a "body", but that does not place these "bodies" outside of the Kingdom of Great Britain. Let us at least be logical.

When Israel wanted to be like the nations they demanded a *king*. When God transferred earthly rule to Nebuchadnezzar, he transferred it to a *king*. When at last the Saviour returns, He returns “to reign”, and the words of Psa. ii. are definite. “Yet have I set my *King* upon my holy hill of Zion.” What conspiracy is this then that has seduced the Lord’s believing people to trifle with the crown rights of Him Who comes “to reign” and to sit upon a “throne”? However much kingly rule has failed, God’s conception of rule is still as it always has been, a KINGDOM. The Saviour died with the title over His Head, and that sacred Head was *crowned*, even in derision. When He comes, He is seen wearing many *crowns*. He will be King of kings, and the kingdom of this world will cease, while the kingdom of the Lord shall be established by God Himself.

If we have entertained the idea that there will be a pre-millennial kingdom WITHOUT THE PERSONAL PRESENCE OF THE KING we may be disposed to look with favour on the substituted word “government” but we may be after all but acting in the spirit condemned by the Lord in no uncertain terms in Mark vii. 9. How many of those who have rendered lip-service to the doctrine of inspiration, even to its individual words and echoed that they were “convinced”, have taken trouble to verify their references? What must be the attitude of mind when faced with the overwhelming evidence just tabulated, which desires the truth of God uncoloured by theories of the best of men? To quote the words of the writer whose views we have contested, we too say with all our hearts, with just one necessary personal alteration:

“Real conviction concerning great truths can come only when we have made our own personal studies and come to our own independent conclusion. My own convictions that *basileia* means kingdom (‘government’, in our friend’s statement) are the result of my own studies in the Word. I believe the reader will come to the same conclusion if he makes his own study of the subject.”

There speaks the true Berean—may the truth prevail.

Returning to our introductory notes on Prophecy, we continue to assemble our key passages.

“When the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory” (Psa. cii. 16).

A great crisis is awaiting the world, but it is a Jewish crisis wherein the Holy One of Israel is to be placed in exaltation with His people.

“There are three great eras of visitation, wherein God has as many times appointed a term to His controversy with mankind. The first was the deluge . . . . the second is to be at the coming of the Lord Jesus in the power of His dominion, when the Antichrist and those with him will be destroyed . . . . the last controversy is at the end of the millennium, when sentence is carried out upon the revel nations of that period” (T. L. Strange).

To observe and record these converging crises, will form a part of our immediate inquiry.

“The converging crises.” To attain to some fairly comprehensive understanding of the converging lines of prophecy, will enable us to see with some measure of clarity the place, that less pronounced and problematic portions occupy.

Ecclesiastes says:

“Better is the END of a thing than the beginning thereof” (Eccles. vii. 8).

Asaph attained to peace and a solution of his problems when he went within the sanctuary of God, for then he “understood their END”, and understanding the end of the wicked, he no longer envied them their transient exemption from “trouble”. Daniel was intensely interested to discover “the end” of the things revealed to him:

“O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?” (Dan. xii. 8),

and speaks too of “the time of the end”. Let us pause therefore in our pursuit of the great goal of prophecy to consider more carefully the import of this phrase THE TIME OF THE END. Take for example, this terrible statement of Ezekiel:

“Remove the mitre, and take off the crown: this shall be no more the same: exalt that which is low, and abase that which is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: this also shall be no more, until He come Whose right it is; and I will give it Him” (Ezek. xxi. 26, 27 R.V.).

“Until He come.” This can refer to none but Christ Himself and His Second Coming. Until that takes place chaos abides, neither priest (mitre) nor king (crown) remains, and we are in the atmosphere of Hosea iii., Israel’s *lo-ammi* condition. If there is to be a kingdom in the absence of Christ before the millennium, Ezekiel evidently had no knowledge of it. A person can be excused if he fails to see the possibility of about 500 years of enlightenment anywhere in these two verses. There is no ambiguity about the word “until”, Hebrew *ad*. No interval can be permitted in such a sentence “Thou shalt eat bread till thou return unto the dust”, neither can one be interpolated here.

We find that Daniel was very concerned to know more about the fourth beast of chapter vii. We learn from the vision in that chapter the sequence of events up to the Coming of the Son of Man with the clouds of heaven. They can be epitomized as follows:

- (1) Four diverse beasts are to arise up from the sea.
- (2) The description is that the:
  - 1st is like a lion,
  - 2nd is like a bear,
  - 3rd is like a leopard,
  - 4th is indescribable.

Now it is obvious that the beast from the sea in Rev. xiii., is none other than this fourth beast of Dan. vii., and combines in itself the preceding symbols.

“And the beast which I saw was like unto a *leopard*, and his feet were as the feet of a *bear*, and his mouth as the mouth of a *lion*: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat (throne), and great authority” (xiii. 2).

- (3) Thrones were set (cast down as cushions, not overthrown), and the Ancient of Days did sit, a fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him, and
- (4) The beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame. In Rev. xix., at the Apocalypse of Christ, John says:

“The beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone” (Rev. xix. 20).

By comparing these words with Rev. xiii. 12-15 we are in no doubt but that the Coming of Christ comes *immediately after* the period allowed by God for the reign of this antichristian beast, namely, at the close of a period of forty-two months, of which more, presently.

- (5) This beast developed ten horns, and one in particular had “a mouth that spake great things”.

“He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High . . . . and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time” (Dan. vii. 25).

In Rev. xiii. we read:

“And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months . . . . and it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them” (Rev. xiii. 5-7).

We have noted the period denominated forty and two months, and time, times and the dividing of time. In Rev. xi. 2, 3 we have a similar period, here given as forty and two months and 1,260 days. In Rev. xii. 6 this number of days is repeated, and is equated in verse fourteen with the cryptic enumeration “for a time, and times, and half a time”. Now this period of time is 3½ years, and the peculiar mode of reckoning links these chapter once more with the book of Daniel, namely in Dan. vii. 25 and in xii. 7. The prophecy of Dan. ix. speaks of a period of time as “the midst of the week” (Dan. ix. 27), and if in this prophecy a week or heptad, is a period of seven years, then here, in Dan. ix. 27, we reach the same period that we have found in Rev. xii. and xiii. and so by the other links with Rev. xix.

The image that formed the basis of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and Daniel’s great prophecy of Gentile dominion extends *to the time of the end*. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to whether Rome was the fourth in the list, or whether, owing to the rejector of Christ, the fourth kingdom is the one at the end does not for the moment alter the fact that the END of Gentile dominion, and the BEGINNING of the kingdom of God upon earth *synchronize*, there is no possible room for an interval of 5 MINUTES let

alone 500 YEARS between the impact of the Stone cut without hands, and the filling of the whole earth. Here are the inspired words:

“Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. THEN was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces TOGETHER, and become like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king . . . . And *in the days of these kings* shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever” (Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44).

Another feature that demands attention is “the time of Jacob’s trouble” or “the great tribulation”; that too must find its place in the Divine scheme, and its Scriptural association must be noted.

“I will bring again the captivity of My people Israel and Judah, saith the Lord: and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it . . . . alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob’s trouble; but he shall be saved out of it. For it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, that I will break his yoke from off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him: But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them . . . . And ye shall be My people, and I will be your God” (Jer. xxx. 3, 7-9, 22).

The context of this time of Jacob’s trouble is the time when both Israel and Judah shall be saved “from the land of their captivity” and they have the assurance, that “though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished” (Jer. xxx. 10, 11). Jer. xxx. reads straight on to Jer. xxxi. where the Lord announces the bringing in of the New Covenant and the return and settlement of Israel as a nation for ever. This time of tribulation is spoken of by Daniel:

“And at that time (note the connexion with the preceding antichristian events, with no interval possible) shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to the same time: and at that time (the time note repeated) thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever” (Dan. xii. 1-3).

The closing words of this reference are referred to by our Lord in Matt. xiii. 40-43 in the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares:

“Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father”,

and link the days in which Heaven’s King was rejected and the “Mystery” form of the kingdom took the place of positive prophecy, with the days yet to come when the

Mystery of God shall be finished. An examination of these parables may be included in our survey presently.

This unprecedented and unrepeatable time of tribulation is referred to by the Saviour in Matt. xxiv., and is related by Him with two epoch making events:

- (1) To the abomination of desolation standing in the Holy Place as foretold by Daniel in Dan. ix. 27 (Matt. xxiv. 15).
- (2) To the Second Coming of the Lord (Matt. xxiv. 29, 30).
- (3) To the day when the tribes of the land (Zech. xii. 12) shall mourn when they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.
- (4) This is the moment when Israel shall look on Him Whom they have pierced, and when a fountain shall be opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness, and when in all the land two parts shall be cut off and die, but the third shall be left and brought through the refining fire, and will become once more "My people" (Zech. xii. 9, 10; xiii. 1, 8, 9).
- (5) This is the *sunteleia*, the harvest gathering at the end of the age, as foreshadowed in the feast of the ingathering in Exod. xxiii. 16, where the LXX reads *sunteleia*, the word used in Matt. xxiv. 3.

All these prophecies synchronize at the Time of the End, the time when the Stone strikes the feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, when Gentile dominion is destroyed and the Kingdom that shall never pass away is set up. This we now set out as a diagram so that the reader may be able to visualize these converging lines.

## - - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - - (BE-XXXIX.190).

We have to consider many other aspects of prophetic truth, but as honest Bereans before God, and as desiring to know and believe all that God has spoken, we must bear witness, that so far, we cannot and dare not introduce any other kingdom, than that of "the Beast" before the Millennial Reign of Christ, and if because we see this, we are obliged as before God to speak of this subject many times in this study, we do so because we desire to be "pure from the blood of all men".

Among the many subjects that act as pointers in our search are the following: The Remnant. Captivity. The prophecy of Dan. ix. The parables of Matt. xiii. Israel's re-gathering, Babylon and other related subjects.

## **No.9. THE THOUSAND GENERATIONS.**

**pp. 225 - 227**

It is only possible to speak of the Millennium if we believe that the term “a thousand years” means what it says, and is to be taken literally. This being so, what are we to understand by the statement in Deut. vii. 9?

“The Lord thy God, He is the God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love Him and keep His commandments TO A THOUSAND GENERATIONS.”

How are we to understand the language of David recorded in I Chron. xvi. 15?

“Be ye mindful always of His covenant; the word which He commanded TO A THOUSAND GENERATIONS.”

And yet once more, what did the Psalmist mean in Psa. cv. 8?

“He hath remembered His covenant for ever, the word which He commanded TO A THOUSAND GENERATIONS.”

The usage of the word “generation” in the Scriptures falls into three groups or shades of meaning:

(1) The primary meaning is that of offspring. This is its meaning in the genealogies that abound in the O.T. In Hebrew “The book of the generations” is *sepher toledoth*, and in the Greek *biblios geneseos* (Gen. v. 1; Matt. i. 1).

(2) Arising out of this primary meaning comes a secondary sense, namely a period of time. This would not have been used rigidly, especially when we observe that the natural length of human life has changed since the days of the patriarchs. Herodotus, the Greek historian, says “Three generations of men make an hundred years” and Clement of Alexandria citing Homer says “two generations” cover the period of “above sixty years old”.

It will be remembered that our Saviour’s earthly life was just about a “generation”, He commencing His ministry at about thirty years of age (Luke iii. 23).

(3) The word subsequently came to indicate some specific characteristics such as “an adulterous and sinful generation”. When the three O.T. writers quoted above speak of “a thousand generations” they can mean nothing more or less than an exceedingly long period of time, not necessarily 33,000 years, but sufficiently long to overlap the Millennium to such an extent as to show that the thousand-year reign is but the threshold to a period very much longer than the present history of man multiplied several times. If this has even any element of truth in it, then the Day of God, which follows the Day of the Lord (see article *Day of the Lord*) must be of great importance, and it is highly probable that many a passage of the O.T. that has been indiscriminately labeled

“Millennial” belongs to this subsequent period, which will become at length the kingdom which the Son of God will deliver up to the Father, after all rule, authority and power have been put down (I Cor. xv. 24-28).

Most certain it is that the Millennial kingdom, ending as it does (Rev. xx. 8-10), was not ready to be *thus* delivered up to the Father. The words “For He must reign” (I Cor. xv. 25) extend far beyond the limits of the thousand *years*; it may be that it is to extend to the end of a thousand *generations*. One or two other terms should be examined while we have this question before us. What is meant by the words of Eph. iii. 21?

Eis pasas tas geneas tou aionos ton aionon.

-----  
Unto all the generations of the age of the ages.

To what period of time, and to which part of the Divine purpose does Peter refer in II Pet. iii. 18 *eis hemera aionos* “Unto (the) day (of the) age”. For one thing, we know that this reaches out to the extreme limits of the time periods mentioned in II Pet. iii.:

- (1) The Day of the Lord (II Pet. iii. 10), that ends in dissolution.
- (2) The Day of God (II Pet. iii. 12), for which the believer is to look.
- (3) The Day of the Age (II Pet. iii. 8) which appears to be the goal of all time.

In Isa. xlv. 7 Israel are called “the ancient people” which however is translated by some, including *The Companion Bible* “the everlasting nation”. *The Companion Bible* note reads “The nation of Israel is everlasting, like the Covenant”. The nations which oppressed Israel (Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Rome) have passed away; and compare the nine everlasting things in Isaiah (1) Covenant (lv. 3; lxi. 8; cp. note on Gen. ix. 16); (2) kindness (liv. 8); (3) salvation (xlv. 17); (4) excellency (lx. 15); (5) joy (li. 11); (6) name (lvi. 5); (7) light (lx. 19, 20); (8) sign (lv. 13); and (9) as the pledge of all “the everlasting God” (xl. 28; lxiii. 12).

Providing that we realize that the Hebrew word *olam* and the Greek *aion*, mean literally an age of undefined extent and not necessarily that which is eternal in the fullest sense, the repetition of this term as indicated in the quotation given above, demands something more than a millennium of a thousand years to justify or exhaust. There are evident correspondencies between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem, which while necessary to keep distinct throw light upon several features. The promise of Ezek. xxxvii. 26-28 is echoed in Rev. xxi. 3:

“Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set My sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when My sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.”

The other blessed reference to the wiping away of all tears, is an echo of prophecy of Isaiah:

“He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of His people shall He take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it” (Isa. xxv. 8).

Again the description of the city given in Ezek. xlvi. 30-35 with its twelve gates, each bearing the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel, establishes another link with the restored Jerusalem which shall be on the earth, and the heavenly city which is to descend out of heaven after the Millennium has run its course.

“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” (Rev. xxi. 24).

In strong contrast with the constitution of the Church, “where there is neither Greek nor Jew” (Col. iii. 11), the distinction between Israel and the nations will be maintained throughout the whole period. It is not within our present intention or ability to attempt to fit O.T. prophecies into (1) The Millennium or (2) into the succeeding Day of God; all we know is that many Scriptures hitherto labeled “Millennial” have been so indicated without sufficient justification. Patient and accurate study is demanded of any who will attempt to extend the suggestions offered in this brief article; patient accumulation and tabulation of many prophecies that deal with the hope and destiny of Israel will have to be made before it can be said with any degree of certainty “here Israel’s kingdom ends” or “this is Millennial”, but we can only express our conviction that Israel’s Kingdom will continue until the day of which I Cor. xv. 28 speaks, when it will be swallowed up in “the perfect day” (Prov. iv. 18), “the day of the age” (II Pet. iii. 18) when what we loosely call “eternity” takes the place of time.

## Reckoning and Reality

(A sequel to the series entitled “Emmanuel, God with us”)

### No.8. The Fifth Reckoning, “Raised with Christ”.

pp. 10 - 13

These mortal bodies have received a “quickening”. We live a life *now* in the flesh, by the faith of the Son of God. This does not confer upon us here and now the gift of immortality; that awaits the glorious day of resurrection, but it is the first of these “reckonings” that partakes of some measure of reality. We now proceed. Following the words of Eph. ii. 5 which formed the theme of the preceding article, come the words that must occupy our attention during the present, “and hath raised us up together” (Eph. ii. 6). Before we can attempt any exposition or application of this passage, one most serious consequence of the indiscriminate use of the English translation must be exposed and rectified.

Some time ago an article appeared which informed the reader that the Greek word for resurrection was *anastasis*, a word derived from *anistemi*, and then went on to expound the wonder of being “raised with Christ”, instructing the reader that the preposition translated “with” is *sun*. It was only logical that the reader would assume that, just as there was the compound *exanastasis* “out-resurrection”, so *sun* was found in combination with either *anastasis* or *anistemi* “proving” by the association of the “out-resurrection” with the doctrine of being “raised together with Christ”, that such took place immediately at death, because as the writer put it, “the believer had been ALREADY RAISED with Christ”, and so could not but be with Him, even now, in resurrection life.

The answer to his high-sounding yet false doctrine is that it is built upon a foundation of sand. There is not one single occurrence of the words *sunanastasis*, or *sunanistemi* in the N.T. Yet the reader may glance back to our quotation from Eph. ii. 6, and read again the words “*raised together* with Christ”, and wonder whether we have introduced a contradiction into our studies. To supply the answer and to provide positive truth, we shall be obliged to defer our examination of Eph. ii. 6, until we are in possession of some essential facts.

Let us first of all quote one or two passages which use the words “raise” or “risen with”.

“Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are *risen with* Him through the faith of the operation of God, Who hath raised Him out from dead ones” (Col. ii. 12).

“If ye then *be risen with* Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God” (Col. iii. 1).

“And *hath raised us up together*, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 6).

In neither of these passages does the word *anistemi* or *anastasis* occur, even though *anistemi* is translated elsewhere “to raise up” (John vi. 40; Acts ii. 24); and *anastasis* IS translated elsewhere “resurrection” (John v. 29; Acts ii. 31). The preposition *sun*

“with” or “together” is *never found* in combination with either of these Greek words; another word, bearing a slightly different meaning is employed, and it is the imperative duty of all who teach to recognize the Spirit’s choice, and refrain from building upon inadequate translations. The word translated “raise together” or “to raise with” is *sunegeiro*, a compound of *sun* “with” and *egeiro* “to rouse”. This word occur in eight different forms in the N.T. and an examination of them must be undertaken before we can safely proceed.

*Egeiro*. There are three occasions where the A.V. translates the word in its primary sense:

“His disciples . . . . AWOKE Him” (Matt. viii. 25).  
 “It is high time to AWAKE out of sleep” (Rom. xiii. 11).  
 “AWAKE thou that sleepest” (Eph. v. 14).

In the passage quoted from Eph. v. 14 we shall discover that the word *anistemi* is used in correspondence. Let us set the verse out fully:

|   |  |  |   |                  |
|---|--|--|---|------------------|
| A |  | Awake ( <i>egeiro</i> )                | \ | subject “sleep”. |
| B |  | Thou that SLEEPEST ( <i>katheudo</i> ) | / |                  |
| A |  | Arise ( <i>anistemi</i> )              | \ | subject “death”. |
| B |  | From the DEAD ( <i>nekros</i> )        | / |                  |

It will be observed that the awakening is from sleep, and that sleep is not the sleep of death, but of drowsiness, insobriety, unwatchfulness (I Thess. v. 6, 7, 10) in contrast with the sleep of death, which is *koimaomai* (I Thess. iv. 14) and those subsequently referred to as “the dead in Christ” (I Thess. iv. 16).

The distinction between *katheudo* and *koimaiomai* may be observed in the two following passages.

*Katheudo* “She is NOT dead, but SLEEPETH” (Luke viii. 52).  
*Koimaiomai* “Our friend Lazarus sleepth . . . plainly, Lazarus IS dead” (John xi. 11, 14).

Even in this passage which speaks of death, under the figure of sleep, the Saviour avoids the use of *egeiro* and employs instead *exhypnizo*. In some of the places where *egeiro* is translated “arise” it could well be render “awake” as in Matt. ii. 13, for it was spoken to Joseph while he slept. In the majority of cases the word is associated with resurrection and is translated rightly “to raise” (Acts iii. 15; Rom. iv. 24), because of the recognized figure of Scripture whereby death was spoken of as sleep and resurrection of necessity spoken of as being awakened.

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <i>Egersis</i> .   | “And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose ( <i>egeiro</i> ), and came out of their graves after His resurrection ( <i>egersis</i> ) (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53). |
| <i>Diergeiro</i> . | “Then Joseph being raised from sleep” (Matt. i. 24).<br>“They came to Him, and awoke Him” (Luke viii. 24).<br>“I stir up your pure minds” (II Pet. iii. 1 also i. 13).                        |
| <i>Epegeiro</i> .  | “Raised persecution” (Acts xiii. 50).   |

*Exegeiro.* “Stirred up” (Acts xiv. 2).  
 “I raised thee up” (Rom. ix. 17),  
 “and will also raise up us by His own power” (I Cor. vi. 14).  
*Gregoreo.* “Watch therefore” (Matt. xxiv. 42).  
 “Watch ye, stand fast” (I Cor. xvi. 13).  
 “Let us watch and be sober” (I Thess. v. 6);  
 “whether we wake or sleep” (I Thess. v. 10);  
 “be vigilant” (I Pet. v. 8).

In this word *gregoreo*, the idea of being “roused” is dominant, there being no occasion in any of its twenty-three occurrences where the idea of “raising” is even implied.

*Diagregoreo* “when they were awake, they saw His glory” (Luke ix. 32).

The Scriptures teach that in the glorious future the believer will be RAISED, but the Scriptures never use the word *anistemi* or *anastasis* with the preposition *sun*, they always use the word *egeiro* for the idea of being “raised with Christ”.

Just as we are “quickenened with” Christ now, but have not yet put on immortality, so we are ROUSED with Him, even though we are still mortal, and with a very limited exception must all pass into the state of death; yet having the earnest, we know that this *rousing* is a blessed anticipation of the *raising*, actually and literally, from the dead. While therefore both Greek words are used of the resurrection, it is evident that we must use them with discretion. The primary meaning of the root that provides *anastasis* and *anistemi* is “to stand”.

“Stand upright on thy feet” (Acts xiv. 10).

We also have the words *ex . . . . anistemi* in Acts xx. 30, where Paul says “also of your own selves shall men arise”, and *anastas . . . . ex* “and there stood up one of them” (Acts xi. 28) which throws light upon the “out-resurrection” of Phil. iii. 11. While therefore both Greek words are used of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and while both Greek words are used of the believer’s future and literal resurrection from the dead, only one of them is used in the “reckoning” stage, namely *egeiro* “to rouse”; the believer is reckoned to have been “roused together with Christ” but no such reckoning is used of the glorious literal future.

*Sunegeiro* occurs but three times in the N.T., namely in Eph. ii. 6; Col. ii. 12 and iii. 1. In Eph. ii., it is used as a step to the unique privilege that attaches to the Church of the Mystery, namely that it is viewed as “seated together” in heavenly places, a theme that must occupy our attention in the next article. In Colossians the fact that the believer is not only “buried” with Christ, but “risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, Who hath raised Him from the dead” leads the apostle on to elaborate the complete emancipation of the believer who is thus “reckoned” by grace. We can but summarize here, but a wealth of teaching awaits the sanctified searcher in this chapter of Colossians.

As a result, the believer who is thus raised together with Christ is seen to be not only “dead to sins and the uncircumcision of the flesh” but “quickenened together with Him”, all

trespasses being fully and for ever forgiven. Not only so, but all ordinances that were contrary to us have been taken out of the way, nailed to His cross, spiritual foes have been subdued, and the bondage of religious observances, which at best were but “shadows of things to come” gives place to the complete emancipation of the believer. So real is this “reckoning” to be in the believer’s experience, that he can be addressed thus:

“Wherefore if ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, *why as though living in the world*, are ye subject to ordinances?”

The argument is rounded off by the positive attitude introduced by Col. iii. 1:

“If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above where Christ sitteth . . . . set your mind on things above . . . . for your life is hid with Christ in God”,

which in its turn leads to the seventh and final rung in this ladder of reckoning and reality, the manifestation of the believer “with Him” in glory.

The two steps therefore that await our consideration, are (1) “seated together” and (2) “manifested with Him in glory” which must now receive the attention of our wondering hearts.

## **No.9. The Sixth Reckoning, “Made to sit together”. pp. 73 - 77**

If we look at the opening of the Epistle to the Ephesians, we shall see that it is addressed to the saints which are at Ephesus, and although these saints are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, they are nevertheless upon the earth surrounded by sin and darkness, needing the exhortation to walk worthy of their calling, and to avoid complicity with the unfruitful works of darkness. They are still conceived of as being members of a human society, which consists of the sixfold association of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, and in connexion with the child there is a special promise which speaks of living “long on the earth”. Moreover, armour is provided against a yet future “evil day”. All this must be remembered when we read in Eph. ii. 6:

“And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.”

We have recently had occasion to combat the idea that the calling of Hebrews is much the same, if not identical with that of Ephesians. If occasion should demand it, we should be quite prepared to meet such a teaching with one passage, and that the one before us. To be seated together *there* where Christ sits at the right hand of God, is not only *absent* from the teaching of Hebrews, but, as we shall show, *contrary* to its central conception.

It may be well to draw attention of all readers to the following facts:

- (1) These wondrous “reckonings”, “crucified with”, “dead with”, “buried with”, “quickenened with”, “raised with”, and “seated with”, are found only in Paul’s epistles to the churches, and are entirely absent from the Epistle to the Hebrews.
- (2) The preposition *sun* “with” enters so little into any doctrine that the Apostle taught the Hebrews, that it does not once occur as a separate preposition.
- (3) In combination *sun* occurs in twelve forms in Hebrews, but not one approximates in any way to the blessed teaching we are now considering. In order that every reader may have full liberty of research we give these twelve combinations of *sun* before passing on.

|                                     |                        |                       |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| “To suffer affliction with”         | <i>sugkakoucheomai</i> | (Heb. xi. 25).        |
| “To be mixed with”                  | <i>sugkerannumi</i>    | (Heb. iv. 2).         |
| “To be heirs with”*                 | <i>sugkleronomos</i>   | (Heb. xi. 9).         |
| “To be touched with”                | <i>sumpatheo</i>       | (Heb. iv. 15; x. 34). |
| “To bring together” (profit)        | <i>sumphero</i>        | (Heb. xii. 10).       |
| “To meet together”                  | <i>sunantao</i>        | (Heb. vii. 1, 10).    |
| “To perish together”                | <i>sunapollumai</i>    | (Heb. xi. 31).        |
| “To be bound with”                  | <i>sundeomai</i>       | (Heb. xiii. 3).       |
| “To perceive together” (conscience) | <i>suneidesis</i>      | (Heb. ix. 9, 14).     |
| “To bear witness with”              | <i>sunepimartureo</i>  | (Heb. ii. 4).         |
| “To end together”                   | <i>sunteleia</i>       | (Heb. ix. 26).        |
| “To end together” (complete)        | <i>sunteleo</i>        | (Heb. viii. 8).       |

[\* - The only word of this list that is found also in Ephesians. It has a perfectly association however, which we will consider in its right place.]

In this list we have positive evidence that the Apostle freely used compounds of *sun*, yet the absence of the very key words of Ephesians is eloquent testimony to the fact that the Apostle was not dealing with the same calling. For completeness sake, therefore, we must give another list, namely of the compounds of *sun*, that are peculiar to the calling of Ephesians.

|  |                        |                        |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| “To sit together”                          | <i>sunkathizo</i>      | (Eph. ii. 6).          |
| “To be heirs with”*                        | <i>sugkleronomos</i>   | (Eph. iii. 6).         |
| “To have in common with”                   | <i>sugkoinoneo</i>     | (Eph. v. 11).          |
| “To quicken together”                      | <i>suzoopoieo</i>      | (Eph. ii. 5).          |
| “To be compacted together”                 | <i>sumbibazo</i>       | (Eph. iv. 16).         |
| “To be partakers together”                 | <i>summetochos</i>     | (Eph. iii. 6).         |
| “To be citizens together”                  | <i>sumpolites</i>      | (Eph. ii. 19).         |
| “To be joined together”                    | <i>sunarmologeomai</i> | (Eph. ii. 21; iv. 16). |
| “That which binds together”                | <i>sundesmos</i>       | (Eph. iv. 3).          |
| “To be roused together”                    | <i>sunegeiro</i>       | (Eph. ii. 6).          |
| “To run together” (knowledge)              | <i>sunesis</i>         | (Eph. iii. 4).         |
| “That which runs together” (understanding) | <i>sunieni</i>         | (Eph. v. 17).          |
| “To built together”                        | <i>sunoikodomeomai</i> | (Eph. ii. 22).         |
| “A joint body”                             | <i>sussoma</i>         | (Eph. iii. 6).         |

[\* - As indicated above.]

Here are fourteen compounds of *sun* employed in making known the truth of the Mystery, which the Apostle felt *no call to use when expounding the calling of the Hebrews*. These are facts, whatever the deduction may be that are drawn from them, and such facts we ignore at our peril. The word in which we are specially interested at the moment is *sugkathizo* “to sit together”. This word occurs but once elsewhere, and in a non-doctrinal context.

“And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and *were set down together*, Peter sat down among them” (Luke xxii. 55).

Our inquiry must at least embrace the following points:

- (1) The ordinary usage of *kathizo* “to sit”.
- (2) The special usage of *kathizo* in the Epistle to the Hebrews.
- (3) The effect of the combination *sun* with *kathizo*.
- (4) The extraordinary nature of the calling thus indicated in Eph. ii. 6

*The ordinary usage of kathizo.* There are comparatively few occurrences of this word where the meaning is just “to sit” in the sense of taking a rest. In most of the references, the word is associated with the exercise of authority.

- (1) *As a Teacher.* “When He was set” (Matt. v. 1)  
 “The Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat” (Matt. xxiii. 2).  
 “He sat down and taught” (Luke v. 3; John viii. 2)
- (2) *As a Judge.* “Pilate . . . . sat down in the judgment seat” (John xix. 13).  
 “I sat on the judgment seat” (Acts xxv. 17).  
 “Set them to judge” (I Cor. vi. 4).
- (3) *On a Throne.* (This includes references to “judging” as well as “kingship”)  
 “When the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Matt. xix. 28 also see xxv. 31).  
 “Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on Thy right hand, and the other on the left, in Thy kingdom” (Matt. xx. 21, 23).  
 See also Rev. iii. 21 and xx. 4.
- (4) *At or on the Right Hand of God.*  
 “He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God” (Mark xvi. 19).  
 “And set (Him) at His own right hand” (Eph. i. 20).

Out of the forty-eight occurrences of *kathizo*, those listed under the headings 1, 2, 3 and 4 account for thirty, which indicates fairly clearly the special association which this idea of being seated has with the exercise of authority.

*The special usage of kathizo in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

There are four occurrences of this word in Hebrews, namely at Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12 and xii. 2, and they speak of one act, namely the seating of Christ in resurrection at the right hand of God. Both the word *sugkathizo* and the *idea* involved in such a compound are absent from this epistle; indeed, the very theme of the epistle forbids its use. Even though the Hebrews were bidden to “draw near” with “boldness of entry” into

the holiest of all, the very idea that anyone should “sit together” there in that holy place is foreign to the whole conception of the epistle. It is not that the epistle does not stress the act of being “seated” or the position at the “right hand”, it does, for it contains more references to this position, than the whole of Paul’s remaining writings. If it had been within the range of revealed truth to have uttered the climax doctrine of Eph. ii. 6 to the Hebrews, Paul would have done so. He was urging them on to “Perfection”. He pointed them away to the seated Christ, and it is obvious that the calling of the Hebrews could not have included the high dignity of being “made to sit together” in the heavenlies, for if it had, Paul must have said so. Therefore any who dare to add to the words of inspiration for whatever reason, do so to their loss.

*The effect of the combination “sun” with “kathizo”.*

In ordinary use, the effect of the addition of *sun* to either *kathizo* or *kathemai* is seen in the two occurrences of the words:

“He sat with the servants” (Mark xiv. 54).

“And were set down together” (Luke xxii. 55).

*The extraordinary nature of the calling thus indicated in Eph. ii. 6*

“Hath quickened us together with Christ . . . . and made us sit together in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 5, 6).

Removed from its context, the expression “made us sit together” would mean no more than what we have already seen in Mark xiv. 54. The context however is a vital part of every word whether in the Bible or in everyday conversation. The three verbs must be read together. “He hath quickened us together with Christ.” There is no possible doubt as to the fact that the word “together” here refers to the believer’s close union with Christ, it *says so*. This is implied, though not repeated, in the next sentence, “He hath raised us up together (with Christ)”, for there is no meaning in the idea that the believer today has been raised together with all other believers; that can only take place at the coming of the Lord, it still retains the significance of the first verb “raised up together *with Christ*”. By all the laws of language and of common sense the same must be true of the third verb “He hath made us sit together *with Christ*”. Two additional statements follow, both indicating sphere:

“In heavenly places”, “In Christ Jesus”.

At the close of the first chapter of Ephesians we learn that the Lord Jesus Christ was “raised” and “seated” at the Father’s right hand in the heavenly places, which are further defined as being “far above all”. Here in the sequel, the church is seen “seated together with Christ, where He sits”, namely at the right hand of the Father, far above all. This is such a stupendous revelation, that the reader may be conscious of a momentary hesitation in accepting this as truth, for if it be not truth in excelsis, it approaches blasphemy. Not only is the poor outcast Gentile “saved by grace” and “made nigh”. He advances with boldness to take his place, not only far above every name that is named, but to find a seat “with Christ” where He sits in heavenly places.

This high glory is so exceedingly above all that the Scriptures written beforehand either taught or foreshadowed, that the complete distinctiveness of the dispensation of the Mystery can be hung upon this one passage, without fear of challenge or contradiction. There is nothing in the Epistle to the Hebrews like it. The second term “in Christ Jesus” does not belong exclusively to any one of these three verbs, but to the three together.

|   |   |                    |
|---|---|--------------------|
| The quickening together with Christ                 | \ | is all             |
| The raising together with Christ                    | } | “in Christ Jesus”. |
| The seating together with Christ in heavenly places | / |                    |

The title “Christ Jesus” is exclusive to the ministry of Paul, but is never used in the Epistle to the Hebrews. A consultation of the R.V. will show this, and the reader will find the R.V. alterations set out in Volume XXX, page 153, of the *Berean Expositor*.

Those who have this high privilege are spoken of as being faithful “in Christ Jesus” Eph. i. 1, and the seven occurrences of this phrase should be pondered by every reader. We give the references only (Eph. i. 1; ii. 6, 7, 10, 13; iii. 11 and 21). The two other occurrences where the title “Christ Jesus” appears are Eph. i. 1 and iii. 1 where Paul, either as the Apostle or the Prisoner “of Christ Jesus”, rounds off the number of occurrences. It will be seen that every passage in Ephesians that uses this exclusive title of the Lord refers to something distinctive of the dispensation of the Mystery.

There is a title of the church that prepares the mind for the stupendous revelation of Eph. ii. 6, if only we ponder its wording and intention. The Church of the Mystery has more than one title.

It is “the Church which is His Body” (Eph. i. 22, 23); but it is also “the fullness of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23). If we will but observe the way in which this word “fullness” associates the Saviour with the Invisible God (Col. i. and ii.; John i.), we may be the better prepared for the revelation that such a title brings of the high glory of the church which is His Body.

**No.10. The Seventh Step, Reality.**  
**“Manifested with Him in glory.”**  
**pp. 112 - 116**

We now arrive at the topmost rung of the sevenfold ladder that, commencing with the Cross, ends with Glory. We have been pursuing in these studies, the upward movement which commences with “crucifixion with Christ”. Before we commence our study in the passage that contains our text, namely Col. iii., let us see for ourselves that “life” which is there said to be “hid with Christ in God” and is yet to be enjoyed in reality when the believer is “manifested with Him in glory”, “life” is indicated as the goal at every step that we have traversed.

“Crucified with” (Gal. ii. 20). This has life in view.

“I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I LIVE; yet not I, but Christ LIVETH in me: and the LIFE I now LIVE in the flesh I LIVE by the faith of the Son of God, Who love me, and gave Himself for me.”

“Dead with” (II Tim. ii. 11). This has life in view.

“It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with Him, we shall also LIVE with Him.”

“Buried with” (Rom. vi. 4). This has life in view.

“Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into 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.”

“Quickened with” (Eph. ii. 5). As this contains the very word “life” *zao*, nothing need be added to it.

“Raised with” (Col. ii. 12). This too necessitates the gift of life.

“Seated with” (Eph. ii. 6). This is the last of three verbs used in the context that necessarily imply life, the first being “quickened with”, the second “raised with”. Every step has dealt with some obstacle to the entering in of abundant life, but here, in Col. iii., that blessed moment is brought before us.

“For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, Who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory” (Col. iii. 3, 4).

Three divisions of this passage present themselves for review:

- A | Your life is HID WITH Christ IN God
- B | Christ, Who IS our life
- A | Ye shall APPEAR WITH Him IN Glory.

The Colossians could be “warned” or called upon to “beware” that no man beguile them of their “reward”, but no warning is uttered about the possibility of losing their

“life”. That is untouchable, it is hid with Christ in God. The Apostle has said something in the first chapter of Colossians that prepares the way for this great truth:

“For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven” (Col. i. 5).

This same expression is used in II Tim. iv. 8, where it speaks of the “crown of righteousness” that was “laid up” for the Apostle, and for all who have loved “His appearing”. While therefore, we must keep the Hope and the Prize distinct, we observe that they are both “laid up” and both connected with “His appearing”, the hope being “the appearing” itself (Col. iii. 1-4), the crown being awarded to those who *love* that appearing.

It is natural that in connexion with a “mystery” certain essential elements should have been “hid”, otherwise the word mystery would be emptied of meaning:

“And to make all men see what is the fellowship (dispensation R.V.) of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been HID IN GOD” (Eph. iii. 9).

“Even the mystery which hath been HID from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints” (Col. i. 26).

“To the acknowledgment of the mystery of God—Christ (Revised texts) in Whom are HID all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col. ii. 2, 3).

“Your life is HID with Christ IN GOD” (Col. iii. 3).

These four passages which use the word “hid” fall into a simple form of introverted parallelism:

A | Eph. iii. 9. Dispensation. Hid in God.  
B | Col. i. 26. Mystery. Christ in you. Riches.  
B | Col. ii. 3. Mystery. Christ in Whom hid treasures.  
A | Col. iii. 3. Life. Hid in God.

It will be seen that the words that relate to the hope of the church of the Mystery are in line with the peculiar nature of the dispensation with which this hope closes. We shall see how this contrasts with the hope that is entertained by other callings presently. Our second consideration however is what is intended by the words “Christ Who is our Life”.

Our life is hid “with Christ in God”, that is one aspect of truth and a very comforting aspect it is too.

Yet however great the assurance implied in the words “with Christ” or “in God”, the next statement is even fuller and deeper. Christ Himself IS our life.

The coming of the dispensation of the Mystery completely broke down the middle wall of partition, making both far off and nigh One new man. In this unity Christ is our peace (Eph. ii. 14). The very fact that the riches of the glory of the Mystery could now be proclaimed among the Gentiles, was another indication that a dispensational change had come, and the outstanding warrant for such is once again Christ, among you, the hope of glory (Col. i. 27). In addition I Tim. i. 1 declares that Christ is our hope. Full partition,

full assurance and full comprehension of the will of God for any dispensation may be beyond the attainment of the holiest here below, but most certainly in connexion with the innermost shrine of Revelation, the acknowledgment of Christ as “all in all” brings us near to the heart of the mystery.

“To the acknowledging of the mystery of God—Christ” (Col. ii. 2).

It is therefore perfectly in harmony with this great revelation, that it should now be revealed that Christ is our life. If He is our life, it necessarily follows that while He awaits the day of manifestation, we cannot expect to be in full possession of life, the realization of our hope must coincide with His appearing.

It is time therefore to turn to the third aspect of this truth indicated earlier, namely “the appearing with Him in glory”. The English words “appear” and “make manifest” are used in the Authorized Version as synonymous, and there are doubtless good reasons for the choice of first one and then the other word that we meet in the N.T. It will however simplify our present study if we decide to use one or the other in this article, even though the decision may be exceeding difficult for us to make, and should not be extended beyond our present quest.

First let us note the different words that are translated “appear” and “manifest”.

APPEAR *phainomai* and the derivatives *anaphainomai*, *emphanizo*, *epiphaino*, *phaneros* and *phaneroo*. These all partake of the primitive meaning of “shining by means of light”, leading us via the word *phao*, to *phos*, the ordinary word for “light”.

Other words used in the N.T. and translated “appear” are *erchomai* “to come”, and *optomai* “to be seen”.

MANIFEST *phaneroo*, *emphanizo*, *emphanes* and *phanerosis*. And *delos* and *ekdelos* in the sense of being “evident”, *prodelos* in the sense of being evident beforehand.

It will be seen by reference to Col. iii. 4, that the only words that are our immediate concern are *phaino* and its derivatives, and of these one only demands a more extended examination namely the word *phaneroo*, which is translated in the A.V. “make manifest” nineteen times, “manifest” nine times, “manifest forth” once, and “be manifest” twice (or thirty-one times taken together) as over against “declare manifestly” once, “shew” three times, and “shew oneself” twice (or six times taken together), and “appear” twelve times. It will be seen that the choice lies between “manifest” and “appear” with the balance in favour of “manifest”. This word is placed over against the conception of being “hid” either expressed or implied in Mark iv. 22; John iii. 20, 21; II Cor. iv. 2, 3; Col. i. 26; iii. 3, 4.

*Phaneroo* occurs in Colossians itself as follows: In connexion with the distinctive ministry of the Apostle Paul, as the steward of the dispensation of the Mystery. Up to the

time of his commission as the prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles this mystery had been hid from ages and from generations, but “now” when the dispensational change took place consequent upon Israel’s blindness, this Mystery and its calling were “made manifest to His saints”. It was in view of this trust that the Apostle asked for the prayers of the Colossians on his behalf, that God would open a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which, said he, “I am also in bonds, that I may *make it manifest*, as I ought to speak” (Col. i. 25, 26; iv. 3, 4). These references are limited to the initial revelation of the truth of the Mystery, but a future manifestation must yet be made before those who are blessed under its terms can enter into their inheritance. This time, it is not the Mystery that was “hid” but the life of the believer, and that life will not be manifested until Christ Himself, and His Church with Him, shall be manifested in glory.

Other dispensations and other callings have other phases of the One great hope in harmony with their respective callings. Some shall inherit the earth, and the word *parousia* “coming” is constantly employed to designate this phase of the hope. Some partake of the heavenly calling, and look for that city which hath foundations, the words *parousia* and *apocalypse* are employed to describe their hope. Some will meet the Lord “in the air”, some will see Him when He descends upon the Mount of Olives, but the church of the Mystery, in keeping with their high calling, will find their sphere of blessing to be “heavenly places” “far above all” and so will be “manifested with Him IN GLORY”.

How far the distinctions of present callings will be perpetuated into what we call “eternity” is not revealed, and it is idle for us to speculate. It cannot be conceived that “life” so abundant, so glorious, provided at such cost, and manifested in such a sphere, is not destined for high and holy service. Let us, as we cast our mind back over the “reckonings” that started with the Cross and now by faith contemplate the consummating “reality” in the glory, realize that all life’s experiences may be sanctified and blessed as we press on to that wondrous day when we shall be WITH Him and LIKE Him, and that for ever.

## **Acts Thirteen or Acts Twenty-eight?**

*or*

### **When did the present dispensation of the Mystery begin? pp. 81 - 100**

“When does a dispensation begin?” The question is important because of its bearing upon the claims of Acts xxviii., or of Acts xiii., to be the beginning of the dispensation of the Mystery, and of the Church which is the One Body. From one angle we may say that, inasmuch as “known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world” (Acts xv. 18), every dispensation and every movement in the great outworking of the purpose of the ages must have begun in the mind of God before time. This however scarcely answers the intention of “When does a dispensation begin?” Again, every dispensation of grace and mercy is founded in the cross of Christ, and inasmuch as the middle wall of partition and the enmity contained in ordinances were abolished at Calvary, one could say that the dispensation of the Mystery, even as the dispensation of the kingdom of Israel, began at one and the same time, namely when Christ was crucified. This again does not meet the intention of the question “when does a dispensation begin?”

There are certain features foretold that must synchronize before a dispensation can begin, and these features are of such a unique character that they cannot be missed or ignored. What these features are in connection with the dispensation of the Mystery, most readers know. To lift two out of the many:

- (1) Israel will become *lo-ammi*, not My people, and God will cease (temporarily) to be their God (Hos. i. 3). Did this take place at Acts xiii.?
- (2) Paul received the dispensation of the grace of God by revelation when he became the Prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles (Eph. iii. 1-13). Did this take place at Acts xiii.?

There can be but one answer to these questions. They did not take place until the events recorded in Acts xxviii. became history. A dispensation is a “stewardship” (see “The Key of Knowledge”). A stewardship implies a steward who receives a commission, and a dispensation “begins” when that steward receives the command “Go . . . . tell this people” (Isa. vi. 9), even as Paul waited until words of the Lord were recorded, “unto whom now I SEND thee” (Acts xxvi. 17).

For the moment it is immaterial whether Paul himself knew wholly or in part, the contents of this new dispensation before the time came for its announcement; what is material is to discover when he and his message were “sent”, and this can be discovered by reading Acts xxvi. 16-18 and Acts xxviii. 28. While we must therefore stress the dispensational importance of Acts xxviii., that does not mean that Acts xiii. is of no or of little importance to us, for to ignore Acts xiii. while emphasizing Acts xxviii., would be as foolish as being indifferent to the foundations of a skyscraper in New York, simply because one occupied a suite of offices hundreds of feet above ground! What however is

obvious, is that there must be all the difference in the world between the foundations of any building, and the top storey. Without the separate ministry initiated at Acts xiii. Paul would hardly have been prepared for the great ministry associated with his imprisonment. Acts xiii. not only sets the Apostle apart, it provides at least four outstanding features which make its contribution vital:

- (1) The foreshadowing of the blindness of Israel and the sending of the salvation of God to the Gentiles is obvious in the ministry recorded in Acts xiii. 6-12.
- (2) The foreshadowing of the *lo-ammi* period of uncounted time that characterizes the present parenthetical dispensation of the Mystery (Acts xiii. 17-22). This must be demonstrated presently.
- (3) The introduction into the record of that fundamental doctrine, namely Justification by faith (Acts xiii. 38, 39).
- (4) The anticipatory turning from Israel to the Gentile (Acts xiii. 46-48).

Before examining Acts xiii. 6-12, let us observe that in Acts iii. and iv. Peter's ministry was also foreshadowed by a typical miracle. Perhaps it is not quite right to single out the healing of the lame man and call it a "dispensational miracle" for the miracles performed by the Lord and His apostles in almost every case foreshadow spiritual truths. The miracle of the death of Ananias and Sapphira, for instance, was a dispensational anticipation; and also the judgment of blindness that fell upon Elymas. Nevertheless, while all miracles are called "the powers of the age to come" (Heb. vi. 5), this initial miracle of the Acts in a special way follows on the day of Pentecost and illuminates its prophetic character.

**Peter's miracle of healing (Acts iii. 1 - iv. 22).  
The miracle of restoration.**

- A | iii. 1-11. The miracle. Its performance.
- B | a | iii. 12-16. Explanation. "The Name."
- b | iii. 17-24. Prophetic application.
- B | a | iii. 25 - iv. 10. Explanation. "The Name."
- b | iv. 11, 12. Prophetic application.
- A | iv. 13-22. The miracle. Its acknowledgment.

Two corresponding passages in this record indicate the way in which the healing of the lame man foreshadowed Peter's ministry to Israel:

- B | b | iii. 17-24.
  - b | J1 | 17, 18. Fulfillment. Mouth of prophets. Suffering.
  - K1 | 19-21. Repent; Refreshing; Restitution.
  - J2 | 21. Fulfillment. Mouth of prophets. Glory.
  - K2 | 22-24. Hear . . . . if not . . . . destroyed.
  - \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*
- B | b | iv. 11, 12.
  - b | J1 | 11. Rejected Stone becomes Head.
  - K1 | 12. Neither is there THE HEALING in any other.
  - J2 | 12. None other name under heaven.
  - K2 | 12. Whereby saved (healing of nation).

We must first discover the general disposition of subject-matter so that we may realize what are the salient features of the narrative, and not omit any step that is essential to the carrying forward of the theme.

Peter's words in Acts iii. 19-26 are a direct prophetic exposition of the meaning of this miracle. He urges repentance with a view to the time of refreshing and restoration that will be brought in by the return of the Lord from heaven. This coming of Christ, and the blessings that will flow from it, are in perfect harmony with the testimony of Moses and all the prophets (Acts iii. 22-24), and with the covenant made with Abraham and his seeds (Acts iii. 25, 26). It is impossible to read "the Church", meaning the Church of the Mystery, into this passage, especially when we read the concluding words:

"YE are the children of the prophets . . . . Unto YOU first God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless YOU, in turning away every one of YOU from his iniquities."

The point of Peter's explanation lies in the word translated "salvation" (Acts iv. 12). We read that the lame man had been more than forty years a cripple, which makes us think at once of Israel in their unbelief. The words "perfect soundness" (Acts iii. 16) refer back to Israel's condition as described in Isa. i. 6 where the LXX uses the same word with the negative, "no *soundness*". The word "whole" in Acts iv. 9, "by what means he is made *whole*", is *sesostai*, from *sozo*, "to save". The word "salvation" in Acts iv. 12 is *he soteria*, literally "the healing". "Neither is there *salvation* in any other."

This then, is Peter's explanation. The lame man who had been healed, and who was seen walking and leaping and praising God (Acts iii. 8), was a picture of the day when "the lame man shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing" (Isa. xxxv. 6). Bringing the healed man forward, Peter says in effect:

"Look at this man. He has been healed by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, and stands before you as a prophetic anticipation of Israel's restoration; neither is there THE HEALING (that is, the healing and restoration of Israel) in any other. None but this despised and rejected Messiah can ever avail."

Alas, Israel did not repent. The next outstanding typical miracle is that of a Jew *stricken with blindness*, while a Gentile believes (Acts xiii.). That type is fulfilled in Acts xxviii., when blindness falls upon the whole nation and "the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles" (Acts xxviii. 28).

The gist of the typical miracle of Acts xiii. 6-12 can be expressed as follows:

I. *A Jew withstands the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentile.*

This was the climax sin of Israel, and brought about their dispersion and present blindness, as may be gathered from the following passage:

"Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (I Thess. ii. 16).

This is the charge laid against those in Judæa. It may sound incredible but something of the same antagonism must be perceived in Peter's attitude to Cornelius, for he himself uses the same word "forbid" in Acts x. 47 and in Acts xi. 17 "withstand". True, Peter altered his attitude, but the attitude must have been there for him to alter. This word "forbid" awaits us in the last verse of the Acts. With Israel dismissed and no longer a factor, Paul's preaching to the Gentiles was at last "unforbidden" (Acts xxviii. 31).

## II. *A Gentile is saved who bears the same name as the Apostle.*

Recently a coin was dug up in Cyprus bearing the inscription "In the Pro-consulship of Paullus". The inscriptions spell *Paullus* with a double "l". The Acts spell it with one "l". There was a freedom in the spelling of names in early days (Shakespeare is spelled about seven or more ways) and the Holy Ghost has adopted the present spelling evidently to make the link with the Apostle complete. It was, and still is, the custom for a Jew to have a Hebrew and a Gentile name. In our own Whitechapel it would be easy to find someone known familiarly in the street as "Bill" or "Tom", who within the family circle would be "Isaac" or "Moses". The custom has indeed provided a joke in an illustrated Yiddish paper. Moreover, the names adopted by the Jew are contemporaneous with his times. In *Persian* and *Babylonian* times we have "Nehemiah" and "Belteshazzar": under *Greek* influence we have such a name as "Philip". In *Roman* times we have "Justus", "Niger" and "Priscilla". In the *Middle Ages* we find the Jews bearing the name "Basil" or "Leo". (For a fuller treatment of the subject see Zunz' *Namen der Juden*). Jerome refers to the Roman custom of adopting the name of a country that had been conquered, as did Scipio, who, having conquered Africa, took the name Africanus. Certainly there is intentional emphasis upon the Gentile convert's name here. There is every likelihood, that, as Paul was a freeman, his family took the name of some Roman family immediately associated with this freedom. So, from this time onward, the Apostle is known as Paul; never again is he called by the old Hebrew name, which, with his old self and past, was dead and buried. There can be no doubt that the introduction of Saul's Gentile name at this particular juncture is intentional. Paul is here definitely linked with (1) The salvation of a Gentile; (2) The blinding of a Jew, a clear foreshadowing of the close of the Acts.

## III. *The foreshadowing of a lo-ammi period.*

In Acts xiii. 16-41 Paul bases his teaching upon *selected* incidents in Israel's history, and in this he was but adopting the same method that was employed by Stephen. In Acts vii., Stephen's resumé of Israel's history impinges upon two most characteristic events:

- (1) The rejection of Joseph by his brethren, and the making of himself known "the second time" (Acts vii. 9-13).
- (2) The rejection of Moses, and the acceptance of him after his rejection and forty years absence in Midian (Acts vii. 20-35).

In his application of these historic facts Stephen accused his people saying "ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: *as your fathers did*, so do ye" (Acts vii. 51).

Paul's employment of Israel's history does not yield its peculiar purpose without some close consideration. This, however, we hope to demonstrate. In Acts xiii. 17-22 Paul starting from the Exodus traverses Israel's history up to the time of David. And the following will be clear to all:

|                                     |           |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Wilderness wandering about          | 40 years  |
| Period of Judges until Samuel about | 450 "     |
| Reign of Saul                       | 40 "      |
| Reign of David (II Sam. v. 4)       | 40 "      |
|                                     | -----     |
|                                     | 570 years |
|                                     | =====     |

The total length covered by Paul's computation being 570 years. So far all is clear, but if we compare this computation with that of I Kings vi. 1 we come against a difficulty. From the Exodus to the third year of Solomon, according to this computation is 480 years. We must add the 3 years of Solomon's reign to the 570 given above, to bring both totals level, and this reveals a discrepancy of 93 years (480 from 573 = 93). How is this to be accounted for? It is accounted for by the application of a principle, that whenever Israel become *Lo-ammi* "not My people" the prophetic clock stops and time is unrecorded. In the time of the Judges, Israel, for their sins were "sold" to outside nations, and the number of years thus "lost" is exactly 93—thus:

|        |         |   |          |                  |
|--------|---------|---|----------|------------------|
| Judges | iii. 8  | - | 8 years  |                  |
|        | iii. 14 | - | 18       |                  |
|        | iv. 3   | - | 20       |                  |
|        | vi. 1   | - | 7        |                  |
|        | xiii. 1 | - | 40 years | = 93 years lost. |

Whether wittingly or unwittingly, Paul introduced into this great typical chapter of Acts xiii. the need to recognize that a tremendous dispensational change involving even the computation of time, hinged upon Israel's *lo-ammi* state. That state was entered in Acts xxviii. and since that day, from about the years 63-70A.D., prophetic time has ceased to run, we live in a parenthesis, and a period of about 2,000 years, not merely 93, drops out of the Divine calendar.

#### IV. *The basic doctrine of Justification by faith.*

It is the testimony of the Prophets, that the redeemed must be covered with a robe of righteousness (Isa. lxi. 10) and that Israel's natural righteousness, or their attempt at justification under the law, was an absolute failure (Isa. lxiv. 6). "The Lord our Righteousness" of Jer. xxiii. 6 and xxxiii. 16 is a clear anticipation of Justification by grace. The work of Christ and the exposition of that work, but revealed what was incipient in the law and the prophets (Rom. iii. 21, 22), and was the only ground for the forgiveness of sins committed before Christ came and for all time subsequently (Rom. iii. 25).

Fundamental to the ministry of Paul, whether during the Acts and while free, or after Acts xxviii., as “the Prisoner of Jesus Christ” for us Gentiles is this glorious doctrine. This he enunciated for the first time in this great anticipatory chapter, Acts xiii.

“Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses” (Acts xiii. 38, 39).

Phil. iii. 9 sums up Paul’s teaching on Justification, even as Eph. ii. 8-10 sums up his teaching on Salvation, or Col. ii. 11-17 sums up his teaching concerning ceremonies, rites and observances. In the Prison epistles where the great theme is the “Mystery”, Paul had no need to repeat the terms which constituted the foundation upon which *all callings*, whether Kingdom or Church, whether Earthly, Heavenly or Far above all, must ultimately rest.

#### V. *The anticipatory turning from Israel to the Gentile.*

The Jews at Antioch maintained their antagonistic attitude against the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, and this led to a *local* turning from the Jew, a foreshadowing of its universal aspect which awaited Acts xxviii.

“Lo we turn to the Gentiles” (Acts xiii. 46).

Three reasons are provided by the Scripture which should prevent anyone from misinterpreting this action of the Apostle.

(a) It was according to the prophetic utterance of Isa. xlix. 6 and had been quoted by Simeon as recorded in Luke ii. 32. If Acts xiii. 47 proves that the dispensation of the Mystery had then begun, it proves too much, for it also proves that it began when old Simeon blessed the infant Christ in the temple! Does anyone teach that?

(b) We are assured that the dispensation of the Mystery was not a subject of O.T. prophecy, but had been hid in God, only to be revealed when Paul became the Prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles (Eph. iii. 1-13; Col. i. 24-27), and this being so, the reference in Acts xiii. 46-47 to the prophecy of Isaiah can have no reference to the Mystery. Neither faith nor reason can believe a contradiction of terms.

(c) That this turning to the Gentile was *local*, the opening verse of Acts xiv. makes sufficiently clear, as also the references to his ministry in the synagogues in Acts xvii. 1, 10-17; xviii. 4, 19, 26 and xix. 8. An illustration at this juncture may prove of service.

In days of old, two armoured knights approached each other along a road that led by a castle, from which hung a large shield. The first knight exclaimed “what a splendid GOLEDN shield!” The second knight countered with “what a splendid SILVER shield!” and these were gentlemen of brawn rather than of brain, they immediately battered one another with sword and mace, until they both sank exhausted on the opposite bank, to draw breath. From this position they saw what they might have seen earlier, that the shield was golden on one side and silver on the other. Acts xiii. is the silver shield of *doctrinal preparation*, Acts xxviii. the golden shield of *dispensational realization*. Both

passages are necessary, but it is a mistake to transfer the offices of the one passage to the other. Some of the people of God who maintain that Acts xiii. not Acts xxviii. is the dispensational boundary, appear by their “proofs” to confuse similarities with identity. As this is the stone of stumbling here, let us attempt to clear the ground.

## **Similarities do not constitute Identity.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As we have seen, the believer may put into a parallel columns words found in Hebrews or passages from I Corinthians and Ephesians, and say, in effect, “These prove identity”, “This is the same calling”, but, happily, the police do not mistake similarities

for identity. One clear statement of fact that introduces a contrary, sets aside columns of similarities in the matter of identity. The editor of *The Berean Expositor* would have had not the slightest qualm in going up for examination, for he was in possession of one essential fact which disproved his identity with the criminal concerned: the wanted man was *born in New York*, whereas the editor was *born in London*. We cannot conceive that any official would interpose and say, “We are not concerned with where this man was born, we are more concerned with the many items of similarity. *He must be the man!*” Yet that is the attitude of mind of those who claim Acts xiii., as the dispensational frontier.

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

In Ephesians we discover a revelation never before made known; a choice from “before the foundation of the world”; a calling “far above all”; a unique position, “seated together in heavenly places”. Any one of these is a “contrary” to the revelation, the choice, the calling, or the position revealed in Paul’s earlier epistles or indicated in Acts xiii.

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

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

**(Berean Volume34)**

This short article, reprinted from Volume XXXIV of *The Berean Expositor*, was written to meet the argument brought forward by a correspondent, that because certain terms found in Ephesians were also found in Hebrews, that Hebrews presents what he called “Ephesian Truth”. We do not believe that those who insist on Acts xiii. as the dispensational boundary, would fall for *that* specious argument so far as Hebrews is concerned, but they appear to have done so in their attempt to prove their case concerning this chapter.

The terms found in Hebrews, were Heb. vi. 17 “heirs”; Heb. xiii. 3 “body”; Heb. iii. 1 “partakers” and these were supposed to be all sufficient proof that Hebrews taught the same truth as Ephesians.

Those who believe the thirteenth chapter of Acts constitutes the dispensational dividing line instead of Acts xxviii., draw attention to:

- (1) A mystery before the world (I Cor. ii. 7).
- (2) “One Body” (I Cor. xii. 12, 27).
- (3) The seal and earnest (II Cor. i. 22), and these are supposed to establish their claim.

They are similarities, but do not establish identity. Let us “open the book”. When we adopt this salutary principle of never conducting an argument with a closed Bible, we observe that while we have “seal” and “earnest” before and after Acts xxviii., II Cor. i. 21 is a four-fold not a two-fold confirmation. “Establishing” and “anointing” are there also. This establishing was, said the Apostle of “us with you”, the Greek word establish being *bebaio*. This same word is found in I Cor. i. 6 “even as the testimony was confirmed in you” and adds “so that you come behind in no *gift*”. With this we should read Heb. ii. 3, 4 “*confirmed* unto us by them that heard Him, God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and *gifts* of the Holy Ghost”. This word “anointing” (*chrio*) is to be read in the light of I John ii. 27:

“But the anointing (*chrisma*) which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing (*chrisma*) teacheth you of all things . . . .”

Here we have confirmation or establishing together with anointing, which things are absent from Ephesians, even as all such “spiritual gifts” are absent from the dispensation of the Mystery.

We turn next to I Cor. xii. This chapter is concerned with “spiritual gifts” as verse one informs us, their variety yet their unity, and these gifts include miracles and supernatural knowledge, gifts not in the possession of the Church of the Mystery. I Cor. xii. first of all distinguishes between spiritual gifts that emanate from evil sources and those spiritual gifts which come from the Lord. Looking at the second part we observe that it is subdivided into three groups:

- (1) There are diversities of gifts, but the same SPIRIT.
- (2) There are differences of administrations, but the same LORD.
- (3) There are diversities of operations, but the same GOD (xii. 4-6).

Here we notice that while there are differences, there is also an all-pervading unity. In verses 7-11 the diversity of gifts (No.1 above) is considered at length. First the manifestation of the Spirit is given to profit withal. Secondly, this manifestation is a “diversity in unity”:

|                  |                |   |
|------------------|----------------|---|
| “To one . . .    | is given . . . | the word of wisdom . . . by the Spirit.                   |
| To another . . . | is given . . . | the word of knowledge . . . by the same Spirit.           |
| To another . . . | is given . . . | faith . . . by the same Spirit.                           |
| To another . . . | is given . . . | the gifts of healing . . . by the one Spirit. (Vaticanus) |
| To another . . . | is given . . . | the working of miracles.                                  |
| To another . . . | is given . . . | prophecy.   |
| To another . . . | is given . . . | the discerning of spirits.                                |

To another . . . is given . . . divers kind of tongues.  
To another . . . is given . . . the interpretation of tongues.

but ALL these worketh that ONE and the SELF SAME SPIRIT, dividing to every man severally as He will” (xii. 8-11).

This expansion of the subject is followed by the reference to the body, being introduced by the words *kathaper gar* (“for just as”); the references to the body, therefore, are logically connected with the teaching of the chapter “concerning spiritual gifts”. This is taught by the word “for”. The references to the body are given and must be taken as an illustration of the diversity in unity of these spiritual gifts. This is taught by the words “just as”. “For just as the body is ONE, and hath MANY members yet all the members of that body, being many, are one body, so also is the Christ” (*Ho Christos*). This is the title of the Lord pre-eminently, yet not exclusively. Any who were *anointed* by God come under that title.

Here we have the “diversities” of I Cor. xii. The confirmation and the anointing by means of these supernatural gifts have been withdrawn, but the seal and the earnest remain and belong to the present dispensation. “The anointed” therefore of I Cor. xii. or of II Cor. i. 21 is NOT THE CHURCH OF THE ONE BODY (which is characterized by *the absence* of all signs and evidential miracles), but that church which was composed of supernaturally-gifted believers. The argument of the Apostle is therefore, that the gifts are to be looked upon as so many different members of one body, and that each gift is necessary to the perfect functioning of the whole, the more ostentatious gifts, such as speaking with tongues, being no more important than the less obtrusive ones. Whatever gift had been given to any individual was to be held and used for the edifying of the whole company.

This unity is brought about by the baptism of the one Spirit, Who baptized all these believers into one body (I Cor. xii. 13), and the remaining verses take up the thought of the diversity of gifts and the unity of their origin by a more detailed reference to a human body. Following on therefore from the teaching of verse twelve the Apostle says:

“For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Greeks, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many” (I Cor. xii. 13, 14).

Many seize upon these words as though they were a revelation of the Mystery of the One Body, which had been hidden since the ages. Such have only to read chapter x. 1-4 which precedes this section of the epistle to see the reference back to Exodus:

“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; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink.”

This being so, the only logical thing to do, by any who claim I Cor. xii. for “The Mystery” is to abandon the whole matter, for if Exodus and Isaiah teach us our calling, the exclusive character of the Mystery is nullified.

Returning to I Cor. xii., let us notice the “one body” as the Apostle details it. “If the *foot* shall say, because I am not the *hand*, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?” Here is clearly a resumption of the argument of verses 7-12, “if the *ear* shall say, because I am not the *eye*, I am not of the body; is it not therefore of the body?” Here, members of the head are introduced which cannot possibly be true of the Church of the One Body, for the Head of that Body is Christ Himself. The next verse is directed against the spiritual pride of those who possessed some more apparent gift than others, “if the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing?” “but now God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him.” With this verse read verses 27, 28:

“Now ye are a body of Christ, and members in part, and God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers (these are the members like the eye or the ear), after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversity of tongues.”

Coming back to verse nineteen we observe the continuation of the argument, “and if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet one body”. The argument is pursued even to speaking of “uncomely parts”, which certainly can find no place in “the Church which is His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all”. Chapter xiii. is the more excellent way, and chapter xiv. resumes the theme of the gifts. Here the Apostle dwells upon the useful gifts, and “edifying” is a key word, “forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church” (verse twelve).

The endeavour to read into I Cor. xii. that which is declared to be a mystery unrevealed until *the imprisonment* of Paul robs both sets of teaching of their point and purpose. In Corinthians the Church in connection with the supernatural gifts is likened to a body, the Church of the Mystery is spoken of as being dispensationally THE body. Let us try the things that differ.

Finally, with reference to the presence of a mystery in I Cor. ii. 7 we find that both Paul and his fellow labourers were to be accounted “stewards of the *mysteriēs* (plural) of God” (I Cor. iv. 1) yet one has only to read Eph. iii. 1-13 or Col. i. 24-26 to realize that here we have a mystery and a dispensation that differs essentially from all that has gone before. Why these good folk do not go back to Matt. xiii. and make the dispensation of the Mystery start there as some do, we do not know, for “mystery” is the key word to that chapter of parables.

We find therefore, that:

- (1) The dispensation of the Mystery (Eph. iii. 9 R.V.) was entrusted to one, and to one only, namely the Apostle Paul.
- (2) That this dispensation is intimately associated with Paul as “the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles” a condition that Acts xiii. cannot fulfil.
- (3) That this dispensation was a matter of revelation, and unsearchable, and had been “hid in God” since the ages.
- (4) That this dispensation was made known at a point of time, which when Ephesians was written could be called “now”.

These features make this dispensation of the Mystery unique. No one has any warrant to say that other mysteries were not in the mind of God “since the ages” or if they were that this must all refer to the same event, even as Acts xv. 18 suggests.

One other most important item must be referred to in connection with the claim that Acts xiii. is the commencement of the dispensation of the Mystery, and that is the position of *the people of Israel* at the time. When the ministry of this chapter was initiated, Israel was still a people recognized by God. Both in the record of the Acts, and in the epistles of the period the hope of Israel runs through the record from end to end (cf. Acts xxvi. 6,7; xxviii. 20; Rom. xv. 12, 13), and while the hope of Israel remained, the Mystery could not obtain. We must find some place in the history of the times where Israel become *lo-ammi* “not My people” (Hos. i. 9; iii. 3, 4) and that cannot be found anywhere in the N.T. except at Acts xxviii. 28, 29.

For a fuller analysis of this feature, see the booklet *Acts xxviii: the Dispensational Frontier*.

While much can be learned by comparing the circumstances that produced the thirteenth or twenty-eighth chapter of the Acts, we shall miss the most important lessons unless we consider Acts xiii. positively, and see for ourselves what it is designed to teach.

The Acts of the Apostles is mainly the record of two ministries:

- (1) THE MINISTRY OF PETER (i. 15 - xii. 23).
- (2) THE MINISTRY OF PAUL (xii. 24 - xxviii. 31).

When we compare what happened at Antioch (Acts xiii.) and at Rome (Acts xxviii.) we perceive that the one was a forecast of the other thus:

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| At Antioch. | A Jew withstands the gospel. Stricken with blindness.              |
| At Rome.    | The Jews believe not and blindness falls on the nation.            |
| At Antioch. | A Gentile ( <i>Paulus</i> ) believes.                              |
| At Rome.    | The Gentiles the chief care of the Apostle.                        |
| At Antioch. | <i>A warning.</i> “Beware lest that come upon you.”                |
| At Rome.    | <i>A fulfillment.</i> “Lest they should see with their eyes, etc.” |
| At Antioch. | The door of faith opened to the Gentiles.                          |
| At Rome.    | The salvation of God sent unto the Gentiles.                       |

At Antioch occurs the separation of Barnabas and Paul, and several features of this opening ministry foreshadow the close of the Acts. For example: Paul’s first miracle contrasts with Peter’s first miracle. Peter *heals* a Jew; Paul *blinds* a Jew. This Jew withstands the truth, and a Gentile, who bears the same name as the Apostle, believes. Resulting from the opposition of the Jews at Antioch, there is a local turning from the Jew to the Gentile and Paul utters that word of warning which anticipates the dreadful

quotation of Isa. vi., with which the Jew was set aside in the last chapter of the Acts. At the close of chapter xiii. we read:

“And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region” (Acts xiii. 49).

And at the close of chapter xiv. we read:

“And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles” (Acts xiv. 27).

There is a very remarkable contrast found in Acts xiii. and Acts xxviii.

“But the Jews stirred up the *devout* and *honourable* women, and the *chief men* of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas and expelled them out of their coasts” (Acts xiii. 50).

In contrast with this action of the devout, the honourable, and the chief men, we have:

“And the *barbarous* people shewed us no little kindness: for they kindled a fire, and received us every one, because of the present rain, and because of the cold . . . . In the same quarters were possessions of the *chief man* of the island, whose name was Publius; who received us, and lodged us three days courteously” (Acts xxviii. 2 and 7).

It is encouraging to observe the record of the Holy Spirit in these matters; the names of the “devout”, the “honourable” and the “chief”, who expelled Paul, have gone down into oblivion, but wherever the Scriptures are read, the name of Publius is recorded with gratitude.

The thirteenth chapter of the Acts, while most important, is necessarily a part only of a larger context, and this is clearly indicated by the structure of the whole section which we now set before the reader.

## Acts xii. 24 - xvi. 5.

- A | xii. 24. “But the word of God grew and multiplied.”
- B | xii. 25. | a | Barnabas and Saul.
  - b | John Mark taken with them.
- C | xiii. 1-3. Barnabas and Saul “separated” by the Holy Ghost.
- D | xiii. 4 - xiv. 28. |
  - c1 | Departure from Antioch.
    - d1 | *Justification by faith apart from law of Moses.*
    - c1 | Return to Antioch.
  - D | xv. 1-35. |
    - c2 | Men from Judæa raise the question.
      - d2 | *Except ye be circumcised after the manner Moses, ye cannot be saved.*
      - c2 | Men that had hazarded their lives for the Lord Jesus bring the answer.
- B | xv. 36-39. | a | Barnabas and Paul.
  - b | John Mark taken to Cyprus.
- C | xv. 40 - xvi. 4. Saul and Timothy approved by the brethren (xv. 26, 27 and xvi. 2).
- A | xvi. 5. “And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily.”

At its opening Paul’s ministry circled round a statement of truth and a conflict for that truth. The statement was the glorious doctrine of justification by faith (xiii. 39): the conflict was the fight against the Judaism which imposed law and circumcision as necessary to salvation. We are therefore to become witnesses of one of the most important controversies that the world has known; a controversy ever fresh in its applications; a fight for the faith in which we are called upon to engage to this day.

Two acts of separation in Acts mark two steps toward a goal. First, the separation of Barnabas and Saul, Acts xiii. 1-3. Secondly, the separation of the disciples and the end of Paul’s synagogue witness (Acts xix. 9), which leads on to the close of one ministry (Acts xx. 17-21) and the prospect of another, and a future ministry associated with “bonds” (Acts xx. 22-25). This “prison ministry” was entered when Israel were dismissed and occupied the “two whole years” of Acts xxviii. 30, balancing as it does “the space of two years” which followed the separation of Acts xix. 9, 10. The significance of these “two years” may be seen by reading Hos. vi. 1, 2 “Come, and let us return unto the Lord”. This is the fulfillment of Hos. iii. 5 “Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God” and which brings an end to the *lo-ammi* period, during which Israel were not be called “My people” (Hos. ii. 23; iii. 3, 4). “He hath torn and He will heal us”; Acts xxviii. 27 the words occur “lest . . . . I should heal them”.

If the words of Hos. vi. 2 “after two days will He revive us” refer to two literal days of twenty-four hours, a Monday or a Tuesday for example, one wonders why such a detail should be recorded, but if they are used prophetically, they, together with the

two years of Acts xxviii., may foreshadow the length of time during which Israel's blindness will last, and the length of time during which the dispensation of the Mystery will fill the gap. Israel's blindness has lasted nineteen hundred years, and there is every reason from Scripture and from history to believe that the two days of Hos. vi. indicate two days of 1,000 years each, harmonizing with the Day that must come, the Millennium which Rev. xx. affirms will last 1,000 years.

It is a healthy sign when men of God submit all teaching and all theories to the touchstone of all Scripture, but with human nature as it is, we must be prepared to submit their objections to the same test.

We have considered the question "Acts thirteen or Acts twenty-eight", and now briefly consider two other propositions that infringed upon the teaching of the epistles to the Ephesians.

### **Was Paul a prisoner, in Acts xxviii. 30, 31?**

A serious and reverent examination of the teaching that Acts xxviii. 28 is the Dispensational Boundary, has included in its objections, two terms used in Acts xxviii. 30 and 31, which it is incumbent upon us to examine. This objection has been expressed as follows:

"The direct evidence of Scripture indicates that Paul was neither in prison nor in bonds during the time covered by Acts xxviii. 30, 31."

The first objection is based upon the words "his own hired house", the second on the words "no man forbidding him". There is "direct evidence" that Paul was a prisoner when he reached Rome. Scripture says so: "I was delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans . . . . I appeal(ed) unto Caesar . . . . for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain" (Acts xxviii. 17-20). While Paul was in this condition, he received a deputation of Jews to his "lodging". It has been put forward that there is a difference intended between a "lodging" and a "hired house" which should lead us to deny that Paul was a prisoner.

What essential difference we may well ask is there between a "lodging" and "an hired house"? Is it outside the realm of possibility that Acts xxviii. 23 and 30 are two ways of speaking of the same place? How is it possible to argue that Paul could be a prisoner and bound with a chain in his "lodging", but that he must, of necessity be conceived of as being free, if he receives visitors in his own "hired house"? The lodging *xenia*, means a place for the accommodation of strangers, and *xenizo* is used in Acts xxviii. 7 where we read that Paul was "lodged" for three days courteously. It seems that if an "hired house" makes prison impossible then most certainly Paul was never a prisoner in Rome at all. But if a Roman prisoner could have a "lodging" then he could also have a "hired house", the two passages stand or fall together. It will be observed in Acts xxviii. 16 that:

"Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him",

“which” Lewin comments “indicates a private residence; and accordingly *after this* mention is made of the *xenia* (verse 23), and again of *idion misthoma*, which express only what had before been less precisely expressed”. Further there is no “house” mentioned, but merely a suite of apartments; see *Wetstein* on Acts xxviii. 30.

It will be seen that the attempt to “prove” from the words “in his own hired house” that Paul was no longer a prisoner is invalid, dwelling by himself (Acts xxviii. 16, 23) as well.

The second ground of objection is the word translated “no man forbidding him”, the Greek *akolutos*. It is amazing that a writer, who in the examination of the Greek terms used, shows such acumen and industry, should have *passed over in silence*, the way in which this term “unhindered” is used. We do not imply by this remark that this silence was willful. Alas we are only too conscious that we all have our “blind spots”.

The following extract from *The Alphabetical Analysis* page 35/36 will show that “unhindered” has no bearing upon whether Paul was or was not a prisoner at the time, but that it indicates that with the dismissal of Israel, the hindrance offered by the people to the preaching to the Gentiles had ceased.

“Acts xxviii. ends with the Apostle dwelling for two years in his own hired house preaching and teaching, no man forbidding him.”

During Paul’s early ministry, the Jew had consistently opposed the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, and this, said the Apostle, was their climax sin.

They “killed the Lord Jesus” but forgiveness was given and a new opportunity to believe and repent was granted. They had earlier “killed their own prophets” and had more recently “persecuted” the Apostle and his helpers “forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved”, reaching however a climax “TO FILL UP their sins away; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost” (I Thess. ii. 15, 16).

“To the bitter end”, reads Moffatt. “In its severest form”, reads Weymouth. The same word “forbidding” found in I Thess. ii. 16 is the word used of Paul, “no man forbidding him”—Israel the opposer had gone. They had filled up their measure of sin to the brim, and the very Gentiles that they had “forbidden” now entered into blessings hitherto unrevealed (*See THREE SPHERES OF BLESSING*).

Peter’s ministry in the Acts concluded with the words “forbidding” and “withstand”, both translations of the Greek word *koluo*. Paul’s ministry concludes with the words “no man forbidding” (Acts xxviii. 31) where the Greek word is *akolutos*. Peter maintained this attitude up to the tenth chapter of the Acts, he would have “forbidden” both Cornelius and God, for the word “withstand” in Acts xi. 17 is *koluo*.

The upshot of this work at Caesarea was that even Peter was called upon to give an account of himself.

“The apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and *didst eat with them*” (Acts xi. 1-3).

We find no remonstrance from Peter to the effect that seeing that the Church began at Pentecost, the conversion of Cornelius should have been anticipated and be a matter for rejoicing. No, Peter patiently, and humbly, and apologizingly, rehearsed the matter, even to the pathetic conclusion: “what was I, that I could withstand *God?*” or literally “forbid God?” Why should Peter ever think of withstanding God or “forbidding” God if he knew that the Church began at Pentecost? It is abundantly evident that neither Peter, the other Apostles, nor the brethren at Jerusalem had the remotest idea of any such thing.

“When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, THEN HATH GOD ALSO to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life” (Acts xi. 18).

As the testimony stands, much clearer and complete evidence must be brought before we can feel justified in believing that there is any ground whatever to indicate that “Paul was neither in prison nor in bonds during the time covered by Acts xxviii. 30, 31”.

### **How de we understand the word “GENTILE”?**

It has been suggested that the word *ethnos*, translated Gentile, refers in many instances to the dispersed of Israel, who had so long lived among the heathen as to have become in the eyes of their more orthodox fellows “uncircumcision” and “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel”, terms that we have generally accepted as a description of the Gentiles before their conversion. As this new interpretation impinges upon the teaching of Ephesians and does not allow the normal meaning of the word Gentile to appear until Eph. iii., no one can object if this interpretation be suspect; or that it should be subjected to criticism, so long as the enquiry be conducted in the interests of Truth and with Christian courtesy.

The treatise we have in mind provides a concordance of all the references to *ethnos* in the N.T. from which we extract the following from the Acts of the Apostles: Acts ii. 5; iv. 25; vii. 7, 45; xi. 1, 18; xiii. 19, 46, 47. Acts ii. 5 speaks of the nations among which the “Jews” who came to Pentecost lived. Some of them, namely Parthians, Medes and Elamites (Acts ii. 9-11) are undoubtedly Gentiles in the accepted sense. Acts iv. 25 quotes from Psa. ii., “why did the heathen rage?” and in verse 27 these “heathen” or “Gentiles” are differentiated from Israel, and linked with Herod and Pontius Pilate. Acts vii. 7 uses the word *ethnos* to indicate the Egyptians and vii. 45 like xiii. 19 refer to the “Canaanites” as indicated in Gen. xv. 19-21. Acts x. 1 and 18 refers to Cornelius who was a centurion of the Italian band, and called by Peter “one of another nation” (Acts x. 28).

The word Peter employed is *allophulos*, and is found in the Septuagint of Isa. ii. 6; and lxi. 5 as well as six times in Judges as the equivalent of Philistine. It is impossible, therefore, to believe that the acknowledgment of Acts xi. 18 “then hath God also to *the Gentiles* granted repentance unto life” can refer to Gentiles as such, but that similar

testimony in Acts xiv. 27 may not. Acts xiii. 42, 46 and 47 are associated with Isa. xlix. 6 which can only mean Gentiles as such.

While we must encourage every believer to exercise the Berean spirit (Acts xvii. 11) we must not close our eyes to the disposition equally mentioned in Acts xvii., namely of the Athenian spirit of ever telling or hearing “something newer” (*kainoteron*) (Acts xvii. 21). Let us ever observe the Berean attitude, let us ever be on our guard against the Athenian attitude. The one is a key, the other a snare.

If we survey the Acts of the Apostles, with Acts xiii. as a possible dispensational boundary in mind, we should find that if the Church of the Mystery really came into existence when Acts xiii. is reached, a change would be introduced into the record which would include a change of the Lord’s dealing with Israel. Quite naturally, Peter immediately after Pentecost could say to his hearers:

“The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus” (Acts iii. 13).

It is most obvious that Israel had not become *lo-ammi* at Pentecost, God had not ceased to be called their God at that point of time, and Peter gives Him His full title. No change can have taken place at Acts v. 30, 31 for God is still the God of “our fathers”, and “repentance to Israel” is still believed to be within the realm of possibility.

Passing from Peter, we find Stephen adopting the same attitude:

“Men, brethren and fathers”; “Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness”; “As your fathers did so do ye” (Acts vii. 2, 44, 51).

Paul, in Acts xiii., said:

“Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience. The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers” (Acts xiii. 16, 17),

words which do not conform to the condition foreseen by Hosea. Even after his apprehension by the Romans, Paul still spoke of Israel as existing as a nation before God, saying:

“And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night hope to come” (Acts xxvi. 7).

Here the persistence of Israel is insisted on by the Apostle, otherwise he would not have used the word translated “instantly”, for such a term cannot be used to describe the service and expectations of a non-existent people. Right to the last chapter of the Acts, the people of Israel, or their hope, are in evidence. Had Israel become *lo-ammi* earlier than Acts xxviii., Paul would not have said “For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain” (Acts xxviii. 20). That “chain” is still in evidence in the “Prison Epistles” (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and II Timothy), but would anyone have the temerity to teach that in those epistles, where the Mystery is revealed, Paul was still

bound “for the hope of Israel”? Can we import the hope of Israel into Eph. i. 18 and iv. 4? Is the hope of Israel entertained by the “twelve tribes”, the hope of the Church of the Mystery?

Again, Pentecostal conditions as defined in Mark xvi. 17, 18, including both healing and the taking up of serpents, find a place in Acts xxviii. 1-8, and the issue cannot be evaded, that if Acts xiii. saw the beginning of the Church of the Mystery, these Pentecostal evidences that one is “saved” should apply today. Which one of those who advocate Acts xiii. as the inception of the Church of the Mystery, has ever put into practice either Mark xvi. 17, 18 or emulated Paul in Acts xxviii. 1-8?

When we come to Paul’s epistles written Acts xiii., Israel still occupy their appointed place. The Apostle must have had an Israelitish audience for him to have written:

“All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea” (I Cor. x. 1, 2).

If we find the reference to “spiritual drink” in I Cor. x. 3 introduced into the subsequent chapter on spiritual gifts, as we do in I Cor. xii. 13, how is it possible to deal honestly with the Apostle’s letter if we admit that Israel is present in the one passage but excluded from the other? When we see such items as healing, miracles, prophecy, tongues, etc., as the normal experience and possession of the Church of the Mystery, or even of those who believe they are that company, it will be time to consider with any seriousness the claim of Acts xiii. We could, however, leave all these evidences and concentrate upon one epistle written by Paul, namely, Romans, to show that long after his separation at Acts xiii., the people of Israel held an important place in the outworking of the purposes of God.

First, it is accepted by all recognized commentators, that the epistle to the Romans, was the last epistle written by Paul before his imprisonment, which started in Jerusalem and ended at Rome. Consequently, as this is the last word, and the farthest point from the supposed boundary of Acts xiii., we shall expect to find that Israel have indeed passed into their *lo-ammi* condition, and that God has ceased, temporarily, to be called their God. If the dispensation of the Mystery had really commenced, could Paul have written concerning the gospel:

“It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth: to THE JEW FIRST, and also to the Greek” (Rom. i. 16).

If the Church of the Mystery already existed, could Paul have said:

“Is He the God of the JEWS only, is He not also of the Gentiles?” (Rom. iii. 29).

If the Church of the Mystery began at Acts xiii., what sense or point could there be in such a question? The Jew must have had a very dominating influence in the church for such a question to be reasonable. In Rom. ix. 15 Israel’s prerogatives are expressed and admitted, but Israel today enjoy none of those things which are there credited to them.

“My kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. ix. 3-5).

The Apostle could still pray that Israel might be saved, and spoke of the attitude of the Lord towards them throughout the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles, as:

“To Israel, He saith, All day long I have stretched forth My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people” (Rom. x. 21).

The time for their rejection was drawing near, “blindness in part” had already happened unto Israel (Rom. xi. 25), and into the place forfeited by the unbelieving of Israel, the Gentile believer was grafted, like a wild olive contrary to nature, with the intention that Israel may be provoked to jealousy, if that were possible. For the moment our only comment on this passage is, how could the Apostle use such an illustration, if at the self-same time, the Gentiles were:

“Fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel” (Eph. iii. 6).

One cannot be, at the same time, a wild olive graft contrary to nature into an olive tree, and also a fellow member of One Body on absolutely equal terms with every other fellow member. Not only must Rom. xi. be circumvented if Acts xiii. is to be held as the beginning of the Mystery, the hope of the church as defined by the Apostle in Rom. xv. 12, 13 must also be ignored. Let it be observed that the word “trust” in Rom. xv. 12 is the Greek *elpizo*, and the word “hope” of verse 13 is the word *elpis*. Is *this* the “one hope of our calling”?

“There shall be a root of Jesse, and He that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in Him shall the Gentiles HOPE. Now the God of THAT HOPE (*tes elpidos*) fill you with all joy and peace in believing.”

This Millennial hope is indeed blessed, but is it the hope of the Church of the Mystery? If Acts xiii. be the inception of that Church, then Paul’s last word here in Romans must comprise the hope of that Church, but this is not believed even by those who advocate the position of Acts xiii. which we reject. The Apostle makes it clear that the dispensation of the Mystery was revealed and entrusted to him when he became the prisoner of the Lord. This, coinciding with the dismissal of Israel at Acts xxviii., and followed in a few years by the destruction of Jerusalem, shows that nowhere else in the N.T. can be found a moment that so fully fulfils all the Scriptural conditions as Acts xxviii. as the dispensational boundary.

#### THE DOCTRINAL FOUNDATION AND THE DISPENSATIONAL SUPER-STRUCTURE.

In conclusion, we draw attention to the need to distinguish between Doctrine, which is the Foundation and does not change with the advent of Dispensational alterations. The

words “For all have sinned” are as true after Acts xxviii. as before, but the calling and sphere of blessing has changed.

This difference is clearly observed in Rom. iii. and a consideration of this will be a fit conclusion to this study.

**ROMANS iii. 1 - 9.**

(1) DISPENSATIONAL ADVANTAGE

“What *advantage* then hath the Jew?”

“What *profit* is there of circumcision?”

**MUCH EVERY WAY.**

Remember this question and answer was written by Paul a long time after Acts xiii.

(2) DOCTRINAL EQUALITY

“What then, are we *better* than they?”

**NO, IN NO WISE.**

To oppose the distinctive dispensational teaching of Ephesians by calling attention to the similarity of basic doctrine is just muddled thinking. We have repeatedly declared that the doctrine of the epistle to the Romans underlies the calling of Ephesians. It is the superstructure erected since the defection of Israel that contains the revelation of things entirely new. We need BOTH Acts xiii., the silver side of the shield to give us our initial standing as sinners saved by grace, and the golden side of the shield, Acts xxviii., to show us the unique calling made known by the Lord’s prisoner under the terms of the dispensation of the Mystery.

## EGYPT

pp. 41 - 60

At the time of writing these lines the word SUEZ is on everyone's lips, and the peace of the world seems to be balanced upon the attitude of Egypt, the Arab world of the Middle East, and the nations whose welfare is very intimately linked with the free use of the Suez Canal.

Egypt is mentioned some 480 times in the Scriptures, the references being distributed thus:

The Law = about 70 times; the Prophets = 270 times; the Psalms = 16 times; the Gospels 4; the Acts 14; the Epistles 4; and the Revelation one reference.

In an analysis devoted to prophecy, it is obvious that the many references made to Egypt by Moses must be omitted. The common name for Egypt in the Scriptures is "Mitzraim" or "the land of Mitzraim". The dual form of this name indicates the natural division of the country with an upper and a lower region. At times the singular *Matsor* is used, and this appears to refer to lower Egypt only. In the genealogy of the nations, given in Gen. x., we read:

"And the sons of Ham, Cush and Mizraim, and Phut and Canaan" (Gen. x. 6).

Gen. xiii. 10 gives some idea of the fertility of Egypt, saying that Lot beheld all the plain of Jordan "that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, *like the land of Egypt*, as thou comest to Zoar".

Two great rivers form the boundaries of the land of promise, the Euphrates and the Nile (Gen. xv.18). The attitude of Pharaoh, and the plagues that fell on Egypt, together with the song of Moses after the crossing of the Red Sea, and the two witnesses Moses and Aaron, have a prophetic interest, foreshadowing much that is recorded in the book of the Revelation. One outstanding title of Egypt is "the house of bondage" which occurs seven times in the law, once in Joshua and once in Judges.

Leaving these aspects of the subject, let us note what is said prophetically of Egypt and first let us consider Psa. lxxviii. 31:

"Princes shall come out of Egypt."

Rotherham translates this "ambassadors" and the Hebrew word *chashmannim* occurs nowhere else. The LXX renders this word *presbeis*, and in the absence of anything more definite, "ambassadors" seems to be the intention here. While we may not subscribe to some of the opinions of Moffatt, we must recognize his mastery of the languages of the Bible, and submit to the reader his translation of Psa. lxxviii. 29-31:

“From Thy temple high above Jerusalem,  
display Thy strength, O God.  
Who hast so mightily prevailed for us.  
There kings must offer Thee tribute.  
Check that Brute of a Nile-power,  
the bullocks and steers of pagans;  
Trample down crafty policy,  
rout all races that rejoice in war,  
till Egypt sends ambassadors,  
and Ethiopia hurries to submit to God.”

The sending of ambassadors suggests that Egypt will sue for peace (Isa. xxx. 4; xxxiii. 7), and when we consider Isa. xix., “the burden of Egypt”, and the remarkable words of its closing verses, the translation will become even more suggestive. The prophet Isaiah rebukes Israel for trusting in the shadow of Egypt, and one passage, which is a warning, is often quoted with favour and as a message of comfort, but this is a mistake. The words are “their strength is to sit still” (Isa. xxx. 7), but the R.V. reads “therefore have I called her Rahab that sitteth still”. The Companion Bible comments:

“Heb. Egypt—sitting still (and thus not giving the help that was sought).  
Rehab = pride or strength, is put by Fig. Metonymy (of Adjunct) for Egypt, the proud strong one. Note the wrong but common use of this verse, through not heeding the context.”

Moffatt’s vigorous translation here is “hence My name for it ‘Dragon-do-Nothing’.” After a desolation that lasts forty years, the Lord reveals that He will gather the Egyptians and bring again the captivity of Egypt and will cause them to return “and they shall be a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations” (Ezek. xxix. 13-15).

Because the Hebrew word translated “base” is sometimes translated “humble”, some commentators have thought that this word “base” does not refer to Egypt’s degradation, but to a lowly submission, and where the A.V. of Ezek. xvii. 14 reads “that the kingdom might be base”, Moffatt reads “that the realm might be submissive and not ambitious”. At first, the words of Dan. iv. 17 addressed to Nebuchadnezzar “and setteth up over it the basest of men” would appear to nullify this view, but it must not be forgotten that at the end of Dan. iv. Nebuchadnezzar was extremely humbled and acknowledged the sovereignty of the Most High. While therefore this possibility must be admitted, our knowledge is too limited for more than an expression of the opinion that it may be so. On the other hand the added words “neither shall it exalt itself any more” seems to look back to the reduction of Egypt to “a base kingdom”.

Another passage of prophetic interest is Isa. xix., denominated “the burden of Egypt”. After a series of prophetic utterances concerning the judgments that shall fall upon Egypt, comes a most wonderful and unexpected denouement (Isa. xix. 23-25), but before we ponder this most marvelous manifestation of grace, let us note a few items that are of prophetic importance. The chapter opens with terms that appear to speak of the second advent of Someone riding “upon a swift cloud”; One Who “shall come”, and “His presence” be manifest. The effect upon Egypt is that “the heart of Egypt shall

melt”. In the Burden of Babylon (Isa. xiii.) we have a similar consequence: “every man’s heart shall melt” (Isa. xiii. 7). These words are followed by a reminiscence of Matt. xxiv.:

“Pangs and sorrows shall take hold of them; they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth . . . . Behold the day of the Lord cometh” (Isa. xiii. 7-10).

Psa. lxxviii., which we have already considered so far as the reference to Egypt in verse thirty-one is concerned, speaks of the Lord riding upon the heavens of heavens which were of old (33) and at His arising depicts the enemies of the Lord melting as wax before the fire, and perishing at the presence of God. This link of Isa. xiii. with Matt. xxiv. is emphasized by a similar link in Isa. xix. 2, for the fighting of every one against his brother, “city against city, and kingdom against kingdom” is very nearly quoted by the Saviour in Matt. xxiv. 7 and 8 where the use of nation against nation and kingdom against kingdom is said to be “the beginning of sorrows, or birth pangs” and where the same Greek word *odin* is used of birth pangs both in Isa. xiii. 8 in the LXX, and in the Greek of Matt. xxiv. 8.

The reference to idols, charmers, familiar spirits and wizards in Isa. xix. 3 finds a counterpart in the Book of the Revelation where these evils reach their zenith. In verse sixteen fear will come upon Egypt “because of the shaking of the hand of the Lord of hosts which He shaketh over it”; and a variety of words are employed to speak of the day when God will shake the heavens and the earth and will shake all nations (Hag. ii. 6, 7, 21). Matt. xxiv. 7 speaks also of “famines and earthquakes”, and Isa. xix. 5-10 shows the effect upon the whole economy of Egypt at the drying up of their river “and everything sown by the brooks shall wither, be driven away (as stubble because dried up, Isa. xli. 2) and be no more”. At verse sixteen, a series of references commencing with prophetic term “In that day” opens a new vista.

|              |             |   |
|--------------|-------------|---|
| Isa. xix. 16 | In that day | the shaking of the land of Egypt.               |
| Isa. xix. 18 | In that day | five cities speak the language of Canaan.       |
| Isa. xix. 19 | In that day | there shall be an altar to the Lord.            |
| Isa. xix. 21 | In that day | Egyptians shall do sacrifice.                   |
| Isa. xix. 23 | In that day | there shall be a highway.                       |
| Isa. xix. 24 | In that day | Israel shall be a third with Egypt and Assyria. |

Here are six prophetic items. The central reference declaring that “there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord”. The word translated “altar” is the Hebrew *mizbeach* “a place of sacrifice”. It is the same word that is used of the altar built by Noah, by Abraham and by Moses (Gen. viii. 20; xxii. 9 and Exod. xvii. 15). It is the same word used of the altar of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii. 1) and the altar of the temple (I Kings viii. 22). The word occurs eight times in Isaiah, every reference being to an altar in the Scriptural sense of the word. We have rather laboured this point, because of the fantastic and misleading suggestion made by some, that the altar of Isa. xix. 19 refers to the Great Pyramid at Gizeh. There is also to be a “pillar” at the frontier. We read in Exod. xxiv. 4 that Moses built an “altar” and erected “twelve pillars” according to the number of the children of Israel. The same word is used of the pillar set up by Jacob at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18 and xxxi. 45).

This last reference was called *mizpah* by Jacob, a beacon and watch-tower, for he said “The Lord watch between me and thee . . . . I will not pass over . . . . thou shalt not pass over this heap and this pillar unto me, for harm” (Gen. xxxi. 44-52). Something of the same intent seems to be implied by the pillar set up at Egypt’s frontier “in that day”, a respect for the sovereignty of both Israel and of Egypt in their own allotted lands. The reader should note the paranomasia of the two Hebrew words translated “altar” and “pillar”. The former is made up of M,Z,B,CH, the latter of M,TS,B,H, as though the link between them was intentional and important.

It appears from Isa. xix. 18 that there will be a number of cities in Egypt that will have become converts to the teaching of the Bible,

“Five cities in the land of Egypt shall speak the language of Canaan.”

The following passages will indicate the attitude of Israel and their conception of truth with a “language”.

“When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language” (Psa. cxiv. 1).

“He went out through the land of Egypt: where I heard a language that I understood not” (Psa. lxxxi.5).

“The Jews . . . . had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon and of Moab, and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language” (Neh. xiii. 23, 24).

“For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent” (Zeph. iii. 9).

One of these cities that speak the language of Canaan and who are loyal to the Lord will be “The City of the Sun” (Isa. xix. 18). The Hebrew words for “sun” is *cheres*, and for destruction is *heres*, hence the different renderings (see margin of R.V. and note in Companion Bible). Heliopolis, “the city of the sun”, is the Greek name for the Egyptian city named “On” at the apex of the delta of the Nile. It will be remembered that Joseph married a daughter of a priest of On (Gen. xli. 45). *Helios* is Greek for the sun, *polis* for city. In the Hebrew this would be represented by *beth*, a house, and *shemesh*, the sun, hence the city called Bethshemesh in Jer. xliii. 13 is this same city of Isa. xix. 18, even as the “images” which are to be broken there are the same as the “pillar” of Isa. xix. 19. In the former reference, the sanctity of frontiers found no respect from Nebuchadnezzar.

Returning to Isa. xix., we find that associated with this altar and pillar is the sending of a “Saviour, a great one” who shall deliver such as cry unto the Lord, and as a consequence “the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day” (verse 21). If these events take place at the time of the end “The Saviour, a great One” could refer to the Lord Himself, particularly as the word translated “Saviour”, which occurs nine times in Isaiah, in every reference apart from Isa. xix. 20, refers to God beside Whom, he declares, “is no Saviour”. Egypt is to be smitten, but is to be healed, they shall return unto the Lord and He shall heal them. Every one of these words is said in like manner of Israel. Once the Lord smote the Egyptians in the day of Israel’s exodus, and no healing followed (Exod. xii. 23, 27), but at long last healing is now near, not only for Israel but for her hereditary foe and seducer, Egypt!

“In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrians shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians” (Isa. xix. 23).

Here intercommunication will be established, fear of invasion and harm shall be removed, and both nations, once Israel’s oppressors, shall serve the Lord together. If this were all, it would be a state of affairs that would be wonderful to behold. But this is not all by any means.

“In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land (or earth)” (Isa. xix. 24).

This unheard of exhibition of grace and mercy is followed by the words that close this chapter as a great “Amen”.

“Whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying  
Blessed be EGYPT MY PEOPLE, and  
ASSYRIA the WORK OF MY HANDS, and  
ISRAEL MINE INHERITANCE.”

No word that we can add to such superlative grace can do anything but spoil this gracious witness. Let us leave it to shine in all its unsullied glory, while we remember that when we, too, were enemies Christ died for us (Rom. v. 6-10).

Another prophecy concerning Egypt is found in Dan. xi. Before examining this chapter we quote from *Daniel’s Great Prophecy* by Nathaniel West, D.D., and let it be noted the following words were written in 1897, and not in December, 1956, when the problem of Suez and the Middle East is in everyone’s mind:

“It is the ‘*Eastern Question*’ that is here, a question not limited or local, but ubiquitous, affecting today the deepest interests of Russia, England, France, Austria, Germany, Egypt, Greece, Turkey and Palestine, in their relations to each other, to India, China and Japan, and to Africa, affecting the whole world; an age-long contention between conflicting civilizations, with creeds and forms of government, and prejudices of race and traditions diverse and opposed as the poles; that ‘*mache athanatos*’ of Plato, the ‘immortal conflict’ between truth and error, right and wrong, which endures until a ‘new cycle’ of time shall bring its close. What statesman in any cabinet or chamber of modern legislation has ever lifted his voice to tell the world that as in Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zephaniah and Zechariah, so here Daniel has exhibited, in chapters viii. and xi. the ‘*Eastern Question*’ in terms impossible to be misunderstood, or that the waters of the Hellespont, the Ægean and Mediterranean seas, with the isles of Greece and Asia Minor, and the mainlands washed by them—the storm-centre of the Eastern question in every age—form for the prophet the geographical theatre of his vision of the ‘*Warfare Great*’? or that here the fleets of the nations must meet to sink and sail no more, in that final crisis when ‘heaven, earth, sea, dry land, and all nations’ are ‘shaken’? It is the light of prophecy that enables us to see and understand the immense significance of the recent acts of the ‘Powers’ in reference to Crete, Greece, Turkey, Armenia, and what the parallel Jewish movements forebode. In the words of a great and deep writer in our day, internal politics, the world over, are resolvable into some form of the Eastern Question. It haunts the history of civilized mankind.”

We now approach what is perhaps the most difficult and intricate chapter in prophecy, viz., Dan. xi. One of the chief elements of difficulty is due to the blending together of type and antitype and of history and prophecy. The problem is to determine the point at which the division occurs, to find the verse at which we may say, Here history ceases and prophecy begins. Chapter xi. contains a number of sections which we set out below for the clearer understanding of our problem:--

- (1) 2-4. Persian and Greek kings, ending in the "mighty king" Alexander the Great.
- (2) 5-9. The division of Alexander's empire among his generals. The introduction of two kings named the "king of the north" and the "king of the south".
- (3) 10-20. The alternating histories and policies of these kings of the north and south.
- (4) 21-45. The vile person and the willful king.  
The antichrist and the beast.  
The little horn of Dan. viii. 9.

The first section of this prophecy (verses 2-4) establishes a link with the earlier visions, and particularly with that of chapter viii. So that, although we have already considered this chapter, we must go back to it here, in order to establish the close association that is intended between the history of Persia and Greece and the future antichristian king:--

The RAM of Dan. viii. 3 is interpreted as being Media and Persia (viii. 20).  
The HE-GOAT of Dan. viii. 5 is interpreted as being the king of Greece (viii. 21).  
The GREAT HORN between the eyes of the he-goat represents the first king of Greece, and the FOUR NOTABLE ONES that arose toward the four winds of heaven, are interpreted as four kingdoms that shall stand up in his stead (viii. 21, 22).

The angelic interpreter of Dan. xi. makes a fuller reference to these two great powers. We now learn that there were to stand up three kings in Persia, and that the fourth, richer than they all, would by his strength through his riches stir up all against the realm of Greece. Alexander is spoken of as a mighty king who shall rule with great dominion, and do according to His will, whose kingdom shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven. So far, the chapters are parallel. Returning, however, to Dan. viii. we find that here we immediately leave the fourfold sub-division of Alexander's kingdom for a consideration of the yet future dominion of the beast of the Apocalypse:--

"And out of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land" (viii. 9).

This passage is interpreted in viii. 23-25 as follows:--

"And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify

himself in his heart; and by peace shall destroy many: he shall stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.”

It will be seen that in Dan. viii. no record is given of the history that intervenes between the break-up of the kingdom of Alexander and the advent of the antichristian king. This has an important bearing upon the interpretation of Dan. xi., for the prophecies concerning the kings of the south and north in xi. 10-20 are usually interpreted as being fulfilled in the doings of Ptolemy I, II, III, IV, V and VI, of Seleucus I, II, III and IV, and of Antiochus II, III and IV. Instead of commencing future prophecy at xi. 21, however, we follow the lead of Dan. viii. 23 and the explicit statement of Dan. x. 14 (viz., that the revelation of Dan. xi. and xii. concerns Israel “in the latter days”), and commence the prophetic and future section of Dan. xi. at verse 5, seeing in the activities of Ptolemy and Antiochus *foreshadowings* only and not fulfillments of the earlier verses.

Before proceeding further, it will be helpful to see the whole prophecy set out before us. The subject-matter is, of course, too vast and too involved for us to attempt to include every member, or to account for every detail. All we can do is to point out the most obvious features, leaving the reader the difficult but joyous task of seeking fuller details for himself.

### Daniel xi. 3 - xii. 3.

- A1 | xi. 3. A king. He shall do according to his will.
- B1 | xi. 6. The king's daughter.
  - C1 | xi. 7-10. In his estate.
    - D1 | xi. 14. They shall fall.
- A2 | xi. 16. A king. He shall do according to his will.
- B2 | xi. 17. The daughter of women.
  - C2 | xi. 20. In his estate.
    - D2 | xi. 35. Some shall fall.
      - E | xi. 21-34. The vile Person.—In his estate.
        - a | 21. Flattery.
          - b | 22-32. | c1 | Heart against holy covenant.
            - d1 | He shall do (*exploits*).
            - c2 | Indignation against holy covenant.
              - d2 | So shall he do.
              - c3 | Forsake the holy covenant.
                - d3 | Place the abomination.
                - c4 | Against the holy covenant.
                  - d4 | They shall do (*exploits*).
          - a | 33, 34. Flatteries.
  - A3 | xi. 36. A king. He shall do according to his will.
  - B3 | xi. 37. The desire of women.
    - C3 | xi. 38. In his estate.
      - D3 | xii. 1-3. Many shall awake.

We have only to look at this outline to perceive the unity of the prophecy, despite its involved character. At the time of the end there shall be a king who shall do according to

his will. And not only is this king foreshadowed by Alexander the Great (xi. 3), but the doings of Alexander's successors also foreshadow yet future history leading up to the manifestation of the man of sin. Moreover, the strange break in the structure, occasioned by the introduction of the vile person and the setting up of the "abomination that maketh desolate", warns us to keep distinct the two important figures of prophecy, the beast and the false prophet.

We must go back to ancient history to discover the kingdoms associated with the rise of the man of sin. At Alexander's death, his kingdom was divided among his four generals as follows:--

- (1) PTOLEMY took EGYPT and PLESTINE.
- (2) SELEUCUS took NORTHERN SYRIA.
- (3) CASSANDER took MACEDONIA and THRACE.
- (4) LYSIMACHUS took ASIA MINOR.

It will be noticed that Dan. xi. 5 assumes that we shall recognize the identity of the king of the south, and verse 6 speaks familiarly of the king of the north. We have been prepared for some such terms as these by Dan. viii. 8, where the fourfold division of Alexander's kingdom is said to be towards the four winds of heaven. In agreement with this, we find in Dan. vii. 2, 3:--

"Four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse from one another."

It is impossible for us at the present time to say which of the four successors of Dan. vii. 4-8 is the lion with eagle's wings, or which is the bear or the leopard or the monster. But that they speak of the future resuscitation of these four kingdoms is a matter beyond doubt. Taking everything into account we learn from scriptural prophecy to watch closely the "north" and the "south" kingdoms, the north, Syria, the south, Egypt. The wars and the policies that have been connected with these two powers in the past but foreshadow the "Eastern Question" of the time of the end. The endeavour to promote alliances by marriages such as that of Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II to Antiochus II; or of Cleopatra to Ptolemy V, will again be attempted but prove futile. In this connection the structure proves of great value, for it reveals the fact that the final antichristian king will be proof against such allurements. This may, at first, seem strange, but it is in keeping with the doctrines of demons exposed in I Tim. iv., which will include "forbidding to marry".

It will be seen from the structure that the words, "in his estate" occurs four times. The Hebrew word *ken* means a base (as in I Kings vii. 31), and in the first three references of Dan. xi. in the LXX is translated by the word *etoimasia*, "a preparation". The latter is used in the N.T. of the work of a forerunner. Does this not seem to indicate that Satan, ignorant of the "times and seasons" which the Father has kept in His own power, is perpetually "prepared" with his man. Here, in Dan. xi., we have several kings in readiness, should the end have come. To this principle may be ascribed the close likeness which some outstanding characters in history have had to the prophetic picture. Quite a

number of prophetic students believed that Napoleon was the man of sin. More recently Mussolini has been named. There may be many more, but at the end, Satan will be prepared with his man, “in his estate”; the man and the moment will adhere.

It would appear from Dan. xi. that towards the time of the end, and arising out of either Syria or Egypt, there will be several very marked anticipations of the man of sin. The description of the first abortive attempt is given in Dan. xi. 7-19, where we read of war between the kings of the north and south, and of an unsuccessful attempt to make Judaea independent, and so to “establish the vision”. The words, “the robbers of thy people” (Dan. xi. 14) may mean “the violent ones among thy people”. These would be revolutionists who would league themselves with an apostate power to gain their own ends. They shall fail, however, for God alone is able to restore Israel to their land.

While Babylon and Nineveh have passed away, Egypt, Greece and Persia remain to this day, and it is from among these kingdoms that the last great oppressor shall arise.

Time would fail us in the attempt to deal with the details of this chapter, but perhaps the following analysis may be of help.

### **Main features of the future.**

#### **Daniel xi. 5.**

A prince originating in Egypt possesses a great dominion. When this development in the near east takes shape—“Know that summer is nigh.”

#### **Daniel xi. 6.**

A marriage alliance between Egypt and Syria for the purpose of making “an agreement” proves a failure.

#### **Daniel xi. 7-19.**

Conflicts between these two kingdoms will result in dire trouble in the “glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed” (xi. 16) and end in a “staggering” defeat (xi. 19).

#### **Daniel xi. 20.**

Satan’s attempt proving abortive, “in his estate” a raiser of taxes arises, who shall exact heavy tribute from Israel and the land of Palestine. His end shall be sudden and mysterious: “within a few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.”

#### **Daniel xi. 21-35.**

Still undismayed, Satan causes to stand up “in his estate” one who is described as a “vile person”. This one, instead of devastating the land, “comes in peaceably”, and “obtains the kingdom by flatteries”. “After the league made with him he shall work deceitfully with a small people; he shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places.” After stirring up strife against the king of the south, and apparently involving more than one king (xi. 27), he returns to his land with great riches, and at length manifests his true

intent: “His heart shall be against the holy covenant” (xi. 28). This covenant is referred to in Dan. ix. 27: “He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.”\* In the midst of the seven years he breaks the covenant, causing sacrifice and offering to cease, and in its stead (*see note of The Companion Bible on Dan. ix. 27*) brings in the abomination that maketh desolate.

[NOTE: \* - The time that elapses from the making of the covenant to verse 31 is 3½ years of the last seven of Dan. ix.]

*(Daniel 22, p.103-up)*

Such is the analysis of the place that Egypt occupies in the Prophetic Scriptures. At the moment of writing, the dispensation of the Mystery still runs its course, and Israel are still *Lo-ammi*, “not My People”. The re-shuffle of the nations in Middle East is a preparation for the day fast approaching when the prophetic clock will begin once more to tick and the Day of the Lord will dawn. While, therefore, our own blessed hope must be realized before these things come to pass, their proximity but reminds us that “now is our salvation nearer than when we believed”.

### **THE GATHERED PEOPLE**

*A survey of the scattering and the gathering of Israel,  
and their association with the land and the city of their fathers,  
their repentance and the coming of the Lord.*

When we endeavour to compute the time of the end, without of course attempting “the day and the hour” which is forbidden, there are certain features which are key events which, if seen in their right relationship with other prophetic features, will lead us to an approximation of the character of the time of the end, even though many details can only be understood in the light of their fulfillment. Prominent among such subjects, is the future gathering of Israel by the Lord to the land of promise. It will be observed that we have said “the future gathering” and “by the Lord”, the present occupation of the land by Israel being rather in line with Abraham’s mistake which led to the birth of Ishmael. A future “gathering” of Israel presupposes a past “scattering”, and we believe an examination of the Scripture closely dealing with these related events will be profitable in more ways than one.

In the N.T., the Greek word *diaspora* “the scattered” has become, practically, a title of Israel. *Diaspora* occurs three times:

“Then said the Jews among themselves, whither will He go, that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the *dispersed* among the Gentiles (Greeks) and teach the Gentiles (Greeks)?” (John vii. 35).

“James (literally Jacob), a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes, which are *scattered* abroad, greeting” (James i. 1).

“Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers *scattered* throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia” (I Pet. i. 1).

There are six references to the *diaspora* in the LXX, namely, in Deut. xxviii. 25; xxx. 4; Neh. i. 9; Psa. cxlvi. 2 (cxlvii. 2 A.V.); Isa. xlix. 6; Jer. xli. 17. The first reference is a consequence of the curse pronounced from Mount Ebal upon disobedience to the commandments of the Lord.

“The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them: and shalt be removed (thou shalt be a dispersion, LXX) into all the kingdoms of the earth.”

Here, in this first occurrence, we have the root cause of all the dispersions of Israel that follow, and in the next reference we find the germ of all the promises of their final restoration; we quote direct from the LXX of Deut. xxx. 4:

“If thy dispersion (*diaspora*) be from one end of heaven to the other, thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and thence will the Lord thy God take thee” (Deut. xxx. 4).

This passage from Deut. xxx. 4 is remembered by Nehemiah in his prayer, as recorded in Neh. i. 9:

“But if ye turn unto Me, and keep My commandments, and do them; though there were of you cast out unto the uttermost part of heaven, yet will I gather them from thence, and will bring them unto the place that I have chosen to set My name there” (Neh. i. 9).

Here the words “cast out” are *diaspora* in the LXX. Psa. cxlvi. 2 (LXX) cxlvii. 2 (A.V.) reads:

“The Lord doth built up Jerusalem: He gathereth together the outcasts (the *diaspora*) of Israel.”

Where the A.V. of Isa. xlix. 6 reads:

“It is a light thing that thou shouldest be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and restore the preserved (margin or desolations) of Israel.”

“It is a great thing for thee to be called My servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob, and recover the dispersion (*diaspora*) of Israel.” (Isa. xlix. 6 LXX).

Jer. xli. 17 in the LXX is Jer. xxxiv. 17 in the A.V. It would take too long to explain the reason for this, and it has not bearing upon the present study. So we proceed with our quotations:

“Therefore thus saith the Lord; Ye have not hearkened unto Me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbour: behold, I will proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine, and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth” (Jer. xxxiv. 17 A.V.). Here once again the LXX reads “I will give you up to dispersion”.

We must return to these references to discover their testimony concerning Israel’s defection, but before we do so, we must consider the use of the verb “to scatter”, namely the Greek word *diaspeiro*. The word occurs three times in the N.T., namely in Acts viii. 1, 4 and xi. 19, where we read of the “scattering” that followed the

persecution of the church which reached as far as Phenice, Cyprus and Antioch. The note that is of interest is that the “scattering” resulted in a preaching of the Word in these parts. The word *diaspeiro* comes some sixty times in the O.T., and while we do not propose to exhibit that number of references here, we will give a fairly typical exhibition of the teaching associated with its usage.

In the first occurrences of this word “scatter”, blessing, not judgment, is in view:

“These are the three sons of Noah; and of them was the whole earth overspread.”  
(LXX, scattered) (Gen. ix. 19; x. 18, 32).

In line with this must be read Deut. xxxii. 8:

“When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated  
(LXX, scattered) the sons of Adam, he sets the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.”

This beneficent purpose was resisted by the sons of Noah, and they said:

“Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven;  
and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth”  
(Gen. xi. 4).

This resistance turned a blessing into a curse, for we read:

“So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence” (Gen. xi. 8, 9),

and instead of being united by a common language, their speech was confounded, their city called Babel, and the seed sown for all the confusion and conflict among nations that has since arisen, and which will only be remedied when Jerusalem is the acknowledged centre, when the nations accept their appointed relationship with Israel and their land, and when the prophecy of Zephaniah shall be fulfilled.

“For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent” (Zeph. iii. 9).

This is the reversal of the state of affairs described in Gen. xi. An important lesson is here, which if observed will illuminate much that is said concerning the “scattering” and the “gathering” of Israel. The prophet Hosea reveals that Israel were to go into a condition named “Lo-ammi”, not My people (Hos. i. 9), but this was preceded by two causes: (1) They should be “scattered”, for such is one of the meanings of the word *Jezreel* (Hos. i. 4); (2) they should have mercy withholden from them, the meaning of *Lo-ruhamah* being “not compassionated” (Hos. i. 6). In Hosea ii. 23, all this is blessedly reversed:

“I will sow her unto Me in the earth” (*Jezreel*).  
“I will have mercy” (*Ruhamah*).  
“Thou art My people” (*Ammi*).

The Hebrew word *Jezreel* is a *homonym*, i.e. a word having two related meanings: (1) SCATTER (Jer. xxxi. 10); (2) SOW (Jer. xxxi. 27; Zech. x. 9). Had the nations

obeyed the Divine mandate, and “spread abroad” with Israel’s land as their centre, and with one common language to unite them both in worship and in service, a great step forward would have been accomplished. This would have fulfilled one meaning of the word Jezreel, i.e. “sowing”, with a harvest of peace in view. This, however, was antagonized by Satan the “Resister” (Zech. iii. 1, 2), and the “sowing” was transformed into a “scattering” and a confusion, and will not be remedied until He Who scattered both the nation and the nations, gathers them once again, with Jerusalem in their midst, but when that blessed event will take place we do not here stay to consider; it will emerge as we examine the usage of the word “gather” which is to follow.

To be scattered, consequently became a sign of a curse (Gen. xlix. 7). Lev. xxvi. is a series of alternating references to disobedience and its punishment.

Lev. xxvi. 14, 15. Commandments, statutes, judgments, despised, covenant broken.  
Lev. xxvi. 16, 17. The consequent punishment.

This alternation occurs five times, and in the last pair, namely in Lev. xxvi. 27-39 we read:

“And I will scatter you among the heathen (or nations) and will draw out a sword after you: and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste” (Lev. xxvi. 33).

“The dispersed of Judah” are said to be “in the four corners of the earth” (Isa. xi. 12), and the prophetic import of this scattering is crystallized in the opprobrious epithets “the Ubiquitous Jew” and “the Wandering Jew”. Passages could be multiplied to show that God Himself scattered Israel as a punishment for their sins, as it is written “He that scattered Israel, will gather him” (Jer. xxxi. 10). Nevertheless, just as in the preaching of the gospel the Lord stoops to use human instruments (Rom. x. 14), so the animosity of the nations against Israel often furthered, unwittingly, the Divine purpose.

“For behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for My people and for My heritage Israel, whom *they have scattered* among the nations, and parted My land” (Joel iii. 1, 2).

From N.T. and from O.T. alike we find sufficient evidence to refer to Israel as “the Scattered People”, but whether Isa. xviii. 7 refers to Israel is a moot point.

Let us now turn to the other side of the picture, and see whether we are justified in calling Israel “the Gathered People” as we look to the end of prophecy and the day of restoration spoken of by all the holy prophets since the world began (Acts iii. 19-21). Whether Israel will be gathered by the consent and help of the nations of the earth, whether they will be gathered by miraculous intervention, or a combination of both, it stands written: “He that scattered Israel, will gather him”, and justifies our closest attention to the terms used in the associations revealed. The Hebrew word that must occupy our attention is the word *qabats*, and *Brown, Driver, and Briggs’s Lexicon* tells us that in the Sabean the word means a “harvest”, and in many if not in all references, the

harvest of either the wheat or the tares, a gathering either for blessing or for judgment is implied.

Again, it will be necessary to make a selection from the great amount of references that are found in the O.T. to the gathering of Israel. One of the fullest promises, and supplying us with some of the necessary conditions associated with this gathering is found in Deut. xxx. 1-6. If in their captivity Israel “call to mind” the threat of cursing and the promise of blessing, if they “return unto the Lord” and obey His voice, then said God, I will turn their captivity and have compassion upon them “and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee”, even though they were driven to the outmost parts of heaven. These the Lord promises He will bring into the land which their father possessed, and they shall possess it.

From this initial prophecy, several important features emerge:

- (1) The gathering of scattered Israel will be contingent upon their repentance. If Israel and Judah return to the land in unbelief that will not be the gathering of the Lord, but a human attempt to bring about the restoration by evil means, which will end in disaster, and such an abortive movement has taken place, with disastrous consequences in our own time.
- (2) All Israel is in view in Deut. xxx. The subdivision of the Ten Tribes and the Two Tribes is not envisaged. It matters not where the dispersion of Israel may have taken them, even though it be to the utmost parts of heaven.
- (3) This gathering will take scattered Israel back to the land which their fathers possessed, and they shall possess it. That land is Palestine, and cannot possibly be Great Britain or any other country on earth. This prophecy is explicit, it is basic, it is definite; it cannot be made to mean anything other than what it actually says.

The reference to the “outmost parts of heaven” seems to have been in mind when that typical anticipatory “gathering” took place on the day of Pentecost, for we read:

“And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven” (Acts ii. 5).

Leaving this testimony of Moses, let us acquaint ourselves with the witness of the Prophets. Isa. xi. is one of the passages which seems to be rightly called Millennial. It is linked with the presence of the Lord (Isa. xi. 1, 4 and 10).

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of His people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth” (Isa. xi. 11, 12).

Let us once again pause to consider this prophecy:

- (1) This gathering of Israel takes place at the Second Coming of Christ for He shall not only fulfil Psa. lxxii., and judge the poor, but shall “smite the earth (*eretz*, or with some codices *ariz* ‘the oppressor’, verse 4) with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked or the lawless one” (Isa. xi. 4). (See II Thess. ii. 1-8).

- (2) The countries of the dispersed remnant are named, but the full quota of Israel and Judah will come from the four quarters of the earth.
- (3) When this gathering takes place, the whole house of Israel, including the ten tribes, and Judah will become one nation again, as Ezek. xxxvii. 16-22 declares.
- (4) This gathering will be “the second time” of Acts vii. 13 and Heb. ix. 28.

Isa. xliii. contains a glowing prophecy of Israel’s re-gathering:

“For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Since thou wast precious in My sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee: therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life. Fear not: for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth; even every one that is called by My Name: for I have created him for My glory, I have formed him; yea I have made him” (Isa. xliii. 3-7).

Like the Apostle, who esteemed his life of suffering “light” while he kept in mind the “eternal weight” of glory that would be his at the end, the Lord said to Israel:

“For a *small moment* (one period at least has lasted nineteen hundred years!) have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee” (Isa. liv. 7).

The contexts leads us to the glory of restored Jerusalem, a faint adumbration on earth of the splendour of the heavenly city (Isa. liv. 11, 12). The testimony of Jeremiah and of Ezekiel is in entire harmony with what we have already seen. The reader may appreciate the references for his own meditation: Jer. xxix. 14; xxxi. 8, 10 and xxxii. 37; Ezek. xx. 34, 41; xxviii. 25; xxxiv. 13; xxxvi. 24 and xxxix. 27. Hosea, who uses the symbolic words of Jezreel or Lo-ammi, says:

“Then (see verse 10) shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel” (Hosea i. 10, 11).

Micah has a word to say concerning the gathering of Israel:

“I will surely assemble, O Jacob, all of thee; I will surely gather the remnant of Israel . . . . and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.”

“In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever” (Micah ii. 12, 13; iv. 6, 7).

It is possible that the gathering of ii. 12 will be for Israel’s cleansing and purging, the figure “the sheep of Bosrah” rather suggesting this than immediate blessing, but one thing is certain, the Lord is their “king” and He is not an absent King reigning from heaven. He “reigns” over them “in Mount Zion” and so fixes this gathering as taking place at the Lord’s coming and reign.

This refining and purifying is referred to in Mal. iii. 1-3 and iv. 5, 6, where the words “I will send My messenger” and “I will send Elijah” reveal that just as

John the Baptist came in the spirit and power of Elijah, and whose ministry overlapped the advent of the King the first time, so Mal. iii. and iv. show a similar ministry at the time of the Lord's Second Coming. When the Redeemer shall come to Zion, when He establishes with them His covenant, then and then only will it be possible to say:

“Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee”  
(Isa. lix. 20, 21; lx. 1).

Any attempt to isolate Isa. lx. 1 from its context must be resisted, the glory of the Lord will not rise upon Israel until the Lord of glory returns (see Isa. lix. 20, 21). Only when the Lord's way has been prepared, shall “the glory of the Lord be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together” (Isa. xl. 3-5).

When the Lord brings again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, Joel declares that the Lord will also gather all nations, and bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for “My people and for My heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations and parted My land” (Joel iii. 2). It should be noted how explicit the time note is of this prophecy, “For behold in those days and in that time” refer back to chapter ii. where the words quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost are found. In response to the words “I will also gather all nations” we read in verse 11:

“Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen (nations), and gather yourselves together round about” (Joel iii. 11).

The harvest is come (verse 13), and the same phenomena that is associated with the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord, is repeated here.

“The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood” (Joel ii. 31).  
“For in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance” (Joel ii. 32).  
“The sun and the moon shall be darkened . . . . the Lord also shall roar out of Zion  
. . . . the Lord your God dwelling in Zion” (Joel iii. 15-17).

This gathering of the nations is comparable with the revelation of Matt. xxv. 32 and this takes place:

“When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations”  
(Matt. xxv. 31, 32),

and just as that is an inquisition into the way in which the nations have treated Israel (Joel iii. 2-8), so there will be an inquisition as to the way the nations have treated the Lord's brethren (Matt. xxv. 35-44). For as Joel iii. 12 declares “there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about”. The “mighty ones” of Joel iii. 11 referring to the “holy angels” who come with Him (Matt. xxv. 31 and II Thess. i. 7).

So far we have limited our investigation to those passages which employ either the word “scatter” or “gather”. We must, however take the subject a stage further and consider the bearing that certain other features have on this great issue. We commence this second aspect of our study with Isa. xxvii. 12:

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall beat off from the channel of the river unto the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel” (Isa. xxvii. 12).

“Beat off” translates the Hebrew word *chabat*, the first occurrence of which reads “when thou beatest thine olive tree” (Deut. xxiv. 20), and the second “and beat out that she had gleaned” (Ruth ii. 17). In Judges vi. 11 it refers to “threshing wheat” and in Isa. xxviii. 27 to beating out fitches with a staff. The statement “Ye shall be gathered one by one” (Isa. xxvii. 12) seems to indicate that the reference here is to the harvesting of the olive berry. Twice, Isaiah speaks of the “shaking of an olive” (Isa. xvii. 6; xxiv. 13), and the figure used in Isa. xxvii. 12 is that Israel shall be gathered “one by one” as olives are beaten off the boughs, not gathered indiscriminately mixing wheat and tares together in one sheaf.

Two rivers are indicated in Isa. xxvii. 12. “The river”, Hebrew *nahar*, refers to the river Euphrates (see Gen. ii. 14; xv. 18; Deut. i. 7; Jer. xlvi. 2). The “stream” of Egypt refers to a brook, Hebrew *nachal*, usually translated “brook” as in the references to “the brook of Eshcol”, “the brook of Arnon”, “the brook Kidron” (Numb. xiii. 23; xxi. 14; II Sam. xv. 23). Dr. Lightfoot says “this is not the *Nile* in Egypt, but Sihor in the way of Egypt, Josh. xiii. 3; Jer. ii. 18. In the LXX it is *rhinocorura*”. Dr. Young, in the map contained in his *Analytical Concordance*, places “the stream of Egypt” south of Gaza, a strip of territory much in the news as these words are written. The word Mesopotamia “between the rivers” is *aram naharaim*, retaining this word *nahor* “the river”, i.e. the Euphrates. The “channel” of the river is the translation of the well-known word *shibboleth*, used as a test by the men of Gilead to discover the Ephraimites, who at the passages or fords (Judg. xii. 6) of Jordan asked permission to go over, the test word “shibboleth” being one of the names in Hebrew given to a ford, a channel or a wady. The gathering “one by one” not only alludes to the method of gathering olives, but suggests that there will be no possibility of anyone “gate crashing” as in Matt. xxii. 12. This “one by one” discriminate gathering is compared with the way in which the tithe of the herd was counted, as in Lev. xxvii. 32, “whatsoever passeth under the rod”. In Ezek. xx., the prophet says of Israel, that they will say: “We will be as the heathen, as the families of the countries, to serve wood and stone.” To this the Lord replies:

“As I live, saith the Lord God . . . . I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered . . . . and I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond (or the “binding obligation”, only occurrence of this world) of the covenant: and I will purge out from among you the rebels” (Ezek. xx. 33-38).

In Jer. xxxiii., where Israel’s desolations are to be restored, the same figure is used:

“In the cities of Judah, shall flocks pass again under the hands of him that telleth them” (Jer. xxxiii. 13).

It is not without purpose that the Psalmist associates “the gathering of the outcast of Israel” with the fact that the Lord:

“Telleth the number of the stars; He calleth them all by their names” (Psa. cxlvii. 4).

This insistence by the Prophets on the “one by one” gathering, the passing under the rod, the telling of the names, is all against a mass movement crashing into Palestine at the impulse of fear, or for the satisfaction of political purposes. When Israel enter their land, the tares will be discriminated from the wheat. The names Cain, Lot, Ammon, Moab and Ishmael come to the mind at once. When Israel left Egypt on the night of the first Passover, we read “a mixed multitude went up also with them” (Exod. xii. 38), and Nehemiah uses the same word and refers to this same event in Neh. xiii. 3, where he also recorded his indignation and sorrow at a similar “mixture” which threatened to undo all that he had been led to do for the returned captives.

“In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab: And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin. Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives? And one of the sons of Joida, the son of Eliashib the high priest, was son in law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me” (Neh. xiii. 23-28).

We read that Esau married two women who were Hittites (Gen. xxvi. 34). Seeing that these wives pleased not Isaac and Rebekah and that Jacob was charged not to take a wife of the daughter of Canaan, he married a daughter of Ishmael, thus adding still further to the mixture of his descendants. One may interpose here, and say, even so, but as Esau was not in the line either of the Covenant nor of the Messiah it does not matter so much. But here we are mistaken, for in the days of David, Edom became a subject people (II Sam. viii. 14), and in I Kings xi. 1 we read that Solomon loved many strange women . . . . of the Moabites, Ammonites, *Edomites*, *Zidonians* and Hittites. During the time of Elisha, Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah, and made a king over themselves (II Kings viii. 20). But later, under the Maccabees “the children of Esau finally lost their independent existence, and became substantially merged in the house of Israel” (*Imperial Bible Dictionary*).

Josephus informs us that about B.C.125 Edom was finally subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled them to submit to circumcision and other Jewish rites “that they were hereafter NO OTHER THAN JEWS” (*Jos. Ant.* xiii. 9. 1).

Here then is a “mixture”. Those called “Jews” even by so aristocratic a Pharisee as Josephus could include Edomites, whose mothers were Hittites and Ishmaelites! We do not know that at the time of the end there will be those who “say they are Jews, and are not” (Rev. iii. 9), and it is certain that when the Jews were dispersed during and at the close of the Acts, they were “a mixed multitude”, tares mingled with wheat, not to be segregated until the harvest. Israel is to be sifted among the nations as corn is sifted in a sieve (Amos ix. 9). The word translated sieve is the Hebrew *kebarah*, a network, but the word “sift” is not the verbal form of this word, but the Hebrew *nua* a word meaning “to

wander up and down”, “fugitive”, “vagabond”, “scatter”, and other terms which graphically picture the “wandering Jew”, and suggests one way in which this “sifting” will be accomplished. This element of mingling and mixture, necessitates the purging and the refining that must take place before Israel can be given their land at the opening of the day of the Lord.

“For he is like the fire of smelters and the acid used by fullers; He will sit down to smelt and purge, purging the sons of Levi, refining them like silver and gold” (Mal. iii. 2 Moffatt).

“Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in Mine anger and in My fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you . . . . as silver is melted in the midst of the furnace” (Ezek. xxii. 19-22).

To go outside the pages of Scripture for our information is fraught with danger, we are neither historians nor ethnologists, we simply refer to a further evidence of this great intermingling that has taken place since 70A.D. There is evidence in hand to show that another nation was incorporated into the Jewish faith, a people called the Khazars who occupied the south-eastern corner of Europe in the eighth century A.D. About the end of the seventh century, the Khazars became converted to Judaism, and Rabbis were brought over from Spain to minister in their synagogues. Later on this Khazar kingdom became incorporated in Southern Russia, and this accounts for the great Jewish population of Poland, Rumania, and adjacent countries. All this, however, we take “on trust”, knowing little more from history than that such a kingdom existed.

If to the Edomite intermixture we add the Khazar, and other additions we can well understand that the “all Israel” that God is pledged to “save” (Rom. xi. 26) cannot include many who are “of Israel” or who can call Abraham their “father” (Rom. ix. 6-8), such are not the children of the *promise who are counted for the seed*. If we have represented the character of the “Jew” aright, it makes it simply impossible, that to such a mixture, the blessed words should be addressed, “Arise, shine; for thy light is come”; such an unholy mixture could never be used by God as a Pre-Millennial kingdom, for their melting and refining, the ridding of their dross, takes place on the eve of the Lord’s return at His Second Coming. Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles until the end of Gentile time. Gentile time will end when the Stone cut without hands smites the image of Dan. ii. The people that become a blessing to all nations will be those who at long last will look upon Him Whom they have pierced, and who will say:

“Unto Him that loved us, and washed (or loosed) us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen” (Rev. i. 5, 6).

In line with all that we have seen, is Peter’s appeal immediately following Pentecost:

“Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord” (Acts iii. 19).

The word presence, *prosopon*, is generally translated “face” and CANNOT possibly mean “absence”. In verse 13 we read of the “presence of Pilate”, and in v. 41 identical language is used for departing “from the presence” of the council, and in the reference to the Second Coming in II Thess. i. 9. The promised “refreshing” and the threatened “destruction” flow alike from the immediate personal presence of the same Lord. This “Scattered People” will at last become the Lord’s “Gathered People”, and that gathering will take place on the eve of the Second Coming. At that gathering a great sifting and refining will take place, which shows that before that time Israel will be in no position to become a blessing in the earth; they stand in need evidently of a personal blessing themselves.

Let us rejoice that:

“He that *scattered* Israel will *gather* him.”

### THE PROPHETIC EARTH

As an appendix to this study, we draw the reader’s attention to a series of articles in Volumes XXXVI and XXXVII of the *Berean Expositor* under the title “The prophetic earth”, which suggests that the prophetic earth does not extend further than that ruled over by Nebuchadnezzar and his successors; in other words from the Indus to the straits of Gibraltar. We quote:

“It seems a sound argument to affirm that by reason of Israel’s *lo-ammi* condition at Acts xxviii., the time element in the history of the successive rulers from Nebuchadnezzar should cease to have a place, and it seems reasonable to believe that, when the prophetic clock again begins to tick, the parenthesis will be closed and the powers indicated by the two feet and the ten toes (which toes are symbols of the ten kings yet to reign with the Beast, at the time of the end) will reign, in the first place, over the same territory as was governed by their predecessors.”

“The reference to ‘the kings of the East’ in Rev. xvi. 12, does not refer to the Far East as we speak of it to-day. The Greek word *anatole* is used of the home country of the wise men (Matt. ii. 1). The corresponding terms in the Hebrew are *mizrach* which means ‘from the rising (of the sun)’ (Josh. iv. 19) or *qedem*, a land, comprehending Arabian Desert, Ammon, Armenia, Assyria and Mesopotamia. This is the *anatole* of the Hebrews. To this region belong the kings of the East, for the Hebrew words *melchi qedem* are found in Isa. xix. 11 and are there translated “ancient kings”, but Pharaoh may be boasting here that he is descended from the kings of the East.”

Psa. lxxxiii. 4 refers to “crafty counsel” taken by those who are “confederate against” Israel, and have said:

“Come and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel be no more in remembrance.”:

words that have been unconsciously repeated by Arab leaders and reported in our newspapers in our time. Then, we ask, is it accidental that TEN NATIONS of the Middle East are immediately enumerated?

Edom, Ishmaelites, Moab, Hagarenes, Gebal, Ammon, Amalek, Philistines with Tyre, Assur and Lot (Psa. lxxxiii. 6-8).

“The great powers outside the limits of the prophetic earth naturally play their part and exert a great influence, but just as the reference to the new heavens and new earth in Isaiah is localized, and our attention is focused upon ‘Jerusalem’ (Isa. lxxv. 17, 18), or Millennial blessings are peculiarly associated in the first place as with ‘all My holy mountain’, before the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord (Isa. xi. 9), so the doings of the nations in the limited zone of the prophetic earth preceded and anticipate the wider activities and judgments that follow.”

We make no pretence to being “prophets” and can only be guided by what is written, realizing that much is still “sealed”; nevertheless in 1952/3 we wrote:

“Two items of peculiar interest are OIL and THE SUEZ CANAL, the oil fields of Iran and Iraq (Persia and Mesopotamia, so including Babylon) and the canal which passes through Egypt. It may well be that a ‘corner’ in oil and a command of the Suez Canal will make the rest of the world say of the last dictator:

‘Who is able to make war with him?’ (Rev. xiii. 4).”

***(Prophetic Earth37).***