

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 XLI.

1961 - 1962

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

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

“I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord” (Rom. xvi. 22).

In this sixteenth chapter of Romans, the Apostle expresses his indebtedness to thirty-five fellow-helpers. In Phil. iv. we have the comforting assurance that the names of Paul’s fellow-helpers are “in the book of life”.

We feel that we may have been somewhat remiss in this matter, and take this belated opportunity of associating ourselves with all whose fellowship make *The Berean Expositor* possible and available.

“I did the planting, Apollos did the watering, but it was God
Who made the seed grow We work together in God’s service”
(I Cor. iii. 6, 9 Moffatt).

The initial responsibility for the articles that have appeared during these fifty years is, of course, the responsibility of the Editor alone. But the MSS must be legible, and so is typewritten. The Scriptures references, punctuation, spelling must all be checked. The printer’s proofs must be read and corrected, addresses of subscribers kept up to date, envelopes addressed, and parcels packed and posted. Bills must be paid, and accounts kept, while advertising must be planned and supervised. We are happy to say that all those who thus take part do so willingly and as fellow-members, looking to Christ from Whom as Head:

“The entire Body is welded together and compacted by every joint with which it is supplied, the due activity of each part enables the Body to grow and build itself up in love.”

May all our witness be conducted in this spirit.

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

November 1962.

INDEX

EPHESIANS—

Chamber No.7. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1-13)	
Proof provided in what Paul had “written afore”	9
What is a “Joint-Body”? (iii. 6)	13
Unsearchable Riches	17
A ministry of, and by, grace (iii. 2 and 7)	20
The Mystery and the principalities and powers (iii. 10)	23
God’s Age-Poem (iii. 11-13)	27
The Seven-fold Doctrinal Section seen as a whole	30
The Central Tower (iii. 14-21)	
“What is the breadth, length, depth and height”	32
The Great Doxology—The Triumphant “Amen”	35
The Practical Section (iv. - vi.)	
“Worthy” (iv. 1)	41
The Walk and the calling (iv. 1)	43
The Walk and its characteristics (iv. 2)	46

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE ORACLES OF GOD--

“In Isaac shall thy seed be called”	50
“Ye are a chosen generation” (I Pet. ii. 9)	55
Noah, a type of the last Adam	61
Babel (Gen. x. 8-12; xi. 1-9)	66
The Foundation Covenant (Gen. xii. 1-4)	70
Joseph-The Dominion Promised and Postponed	74
Moses-The Principle of Separation (Exod. v. 1)	79
The Lamb without blemish (Exod. xii.)	82
The Feast of Unleavened Bread	87
Israel’s passage through the Red Sea (Exod. xiv.)—“Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider He hath thrown into the sea” (Exod. xv. 1)	95
Marah, Elim and Manna	98
Aaron and Hur, types of fellowship (Exod. xvii. and xviii.)	104

GREATER RICHES THAN THE TREASURES IN EGYPT--

All things ours, in Christ (I Cor. i. 30; iii. 21-23)	110
The setting of our key texts (I Cor. i. 30; iii. 21-23)	113
“What Christ has been ‘made’ unto us” (I Cor. i. 30; iii. 21-23)	115
“The Just for the Unjust”	121

HEBREWS--

What is meant by “tasting death”?	124
-----------------------------------	-----

"We see not yet . . . But we see . . ." (ii. 6-9)	127
"All of one"	133
Him who had the strength of death (ii. 14, 15)	137
Propitiation and the Pilgrim (ii. 16-18)	141
"In all points tempted like as we are" (iv. 15)	146
The Profession of the heavenly calling	152
"Whose House are we IF . . ." (iii. 2-6)	155
The Apostle and High Priest of our profession (iii. 1)	159
Moses, a servant; Christ, a Son (iii. 2-6)	166
The Provocation	170
The Sabbath, the Sword and the Sympathy	176
"THE HOUSE OF JACOB SHALL POSSESS THEIR POSSESSIONS"--	
"Dullness" in hearing. "Sloth" in following	181
Three hindrances. Terah, Lot and the Canaanites	182
The sending of the spies	187
"The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" (Gen. xv. 16)	190
"Ye have compassed this mountain long enough"	194
MEDITATIONS ON PSALM LI.--	
The inner character of sin indicated (verses 4-6)	197
ON THE THRESHOLD--	198
ONE LORD--	
The term "Economy" as applied to the doctrine of the Trinity	200
To Whom is Creation ascribed in the N.T.?	205
The Son of God, The Son of Man	209
A review of some problematic passages	214
Not a "Creed" but "This is the sum" (Heb. viii. 11)	217
ONE MEDIATOR--	
The spirit of Mediation (I Tim. ii. 1-6)	225
"There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus" (I Tim. ii. 5)	229
OTHER SHEEP	5
THE PLEROMA--	
Introduction and chart	
Some lessons taught by the parable of the patch	233
Creation and its place in the Purpose	237
The First "Gap" "Without form and void"	241
The Temporary nature of the Present Heaven and Earth	243
WITH HIS STRIPES WE ARE HEALED—(Isa. liii. 5)	7

Other Sheep

pp. 76, 77

“So-and-so loaned us a copy of’s magazine that contained a study of this problem, namely that the use of *allos* and *heteros* as defined by the Lexicon, made it impossible to believe that Gentiles could be referred to in John x. 16 as the ‘other sheep’, which you have so Scripturally showed to be hung on a flimsy thread, and were it not for your lesson, many sincere believers could be fooled.”

“Probably 99% of believers are not equipped, without your help, to come to the right answer. It seems to me that the great importance of your findings would make it a very profitable study in the *Berean Expositor*. Probably many people who read your magazine do not hear your tapes and may be on’s mailing list.”

It has been remarked more than once, that we do not fill the pages of the *Berean Expositor* with arguments for self-justification, and we are not stooping to that here. We have however a responsibility to our readers, and as we are unable to reply to correspondence that involves much time, we are perforce obliged either to let the matter go by default, or to use this means of dealing with the problem raised.

Recently a fellow-searcher after truth, with whom we have the friendliest relations, after exhibiting some occurrences of two Greek words which are translated ‘other’ namely *allos* and *heteros*, and after quoting from the lexicons that *allos* means ‘other of the same kind’, and *heteros* ‘other of a different kind’ made the following observation.

“In the light of this positive evidence and sure knowledge of the inspiration of the Scriptures, it is inconceivable that the words ‘the other sheep’ (*allos probata*) in John x. 16 can be applied to the Gentiles. Had this been the case *heteros* would have undoubtedly been used.”

With such confident and emphatic statements before them it is not surprising that some readers have been concerned as to the truth of this matter.”

In many articles in the past we have urged USAGE in line with the principle of I Cor. ii. 13, as over against man-made definitions; for the Lexicons are modern; the writers of Scripture had no need for their help.

Here are some quotations from the inspired Scriptures.

Matt. xiii. 5, 7, 8	compared with	Luke viii. 6, 7, 8:
Some (<i>allos</i>) fell stony		Some (<i>heteros</i>) rock
Some (<i>allos</i>) fell thorns		Some (<i>heteros</i>) thorns
Some (<i>allos</i>) fell good		Some (<i>heteros</i>) good

Do you say “This is inconceivable”?

In I Cor. xv. Paul actually speaks of the things that DIFFER and uses *heteros* twice in verse 40, but where he *states* that one star differs from another star he uses *allos*! Here the lexicon rule is reversed. Which is right? According to Matt. ii. 12 the wise men went ‘another’ way where *allos* is used, but Rahab is said to have sent the spies by ‘another’ way and here *heteros* is used (James ii. 25). Which way did they go? The wise men, however, did not consult a lexicon, so all was well. Matt. xix. 9 used *allos*, where Rom. vii. 3 uses *heteros*; is Matthew in error?

Among the proof texts that were submitted was one from John v. 32, where the reference is to the ‘other’ Comforter, namely the Holy Ghost, yet the same writer in the same chapter uses the same Greek word for another Who foreshadows the Antichrist! Does John contradict John?

Matt. xxv. 32, 33 definitely uses the word ‘sheep’ of the ‘nations’ and in the final regathering; Isa. xix. 23-25 demands that in that One Flock, there shall be Gentiles too.

Let us be thankful for the labours of learned men who have provided us with so many useful tools, but do not let us make lexicons our masters, nor try to put the living language of the Word of God into the strait-jacket of modern lexicography, but rather carefully note the *usage* of the “words which the Holy Ghost teacheth”.

With His Stripes We Are Healed
(Isa. liii. 5).
pp. 199, 200

With the New Testament in our hands, we do not need to attend faith-healing campaigns to believe that countless thousands were miraculously healed during the earthly ministry of the Saviour, at Pentecost and through the years covered by the Acts of the Apostles, alike by Peter and by Paul and in such churches as those that were of the same type as set forth in the first epistle to the Corinthians. Those sent forth to preach the near approach of the kingdom were commissioned to:

“Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers raise the dead, cast out devils” (Matt. x. 8).

The Ascended Christ is seen, in Mark xvi. 15-20 “confirming the word with signs following”; “they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover”.

We often read accounts of healing ministry, and we do not doubt that in some cases the restoration to health has been genuine, but what we are asking is:

“Do these cures, even if they are indeed genuine, do they fulfil the words of Isa. liii. 5 and I Pet. ii. 24?

‘He was wounded for our transgressions,
He was bruised for our iniquities;
The chastisement of our peace was upon Him;
And *with His stripes we are healed*’ (Isa. liii. 5).

‘Who His Own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: *by Whose stripes ye were healed*’ (I Pet. ii. 24).”

It will be observed that both Isaiah and Peter place “healing” in the same relationship to the Cross as our sins. Peter says “Ye were healed”, and this raises a question of the first magnitude. Before ventilating this question, let us notice Peter’s own explanation of a healing miracle. When the Apostle was questioned by the religious leaders of his day concerning the healing of the man who had been lame from birth, he said:

“If we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole, Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Whom ye crucified, Whom God raised from the dead doth this man stand here before you healed neither is there THE SALVATION in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among man, whereby we must be saved” (Acts iv. 9-12).

The word “whole” in verse 9 is a translation of the Greek verb *sozo*, the word “salvation” in verse 12 is the Greek noun *soteria*, and the words “be saved” in this verse is once again the Greek verb *sozo*. In addition, the article “the” must be employed, “the

Salvation” for Peter is comparing the *immediate physical* healing of the lame man, with “the Healing” or “the Salvation” of which the miraculous cure was but *a type*.

The critical questions which we now ask are: Where is the lame man now? Where is the man born blind, who was cured, as recorded in John ix.? Where is Lazarus, who was raised from the dead? Can we not re-word the question of Eccles. ii. 16, where he says “How dieth the wise man?” and the answer is “as the fool” for “one event” awaited both. Those who use Isa. liii. 5 as a proof text for the healing of the sick, can they ever point to one solitary example of anyone thus healed and say “This corruptible has put on incorruption”, “This mortal has put on immortality”, “Mortality has been swallowed up of life”? This is “the healing” of Isa. liii. 5 which is full, complete and undying, as is the deliverance from our transgressions and our iniquities. The “healings” of Pentecost were “signs”, not the real and final “healing” of Calvary. The Hebrew Christians had “tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come”, and this is what the healing miracles really were. Instead of avoiding or escaping the “groan” of creation, we read:

“For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, *And not only they*, but ourselves also which have the FIRST FRUITS of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves WAITING for the adoption, to wit, the *redemption of our body*” (Rom. viii. 22, 23).

The hope of resurrection is weakened not only by the doctrine of natural immortality and of the disembodied intermediate state, but by this transfer of the temporary sign gift of healing, the properties that belong to the standard set by the “no more” of Rev. xxi. 4.

EPHESIANS.

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

No.59. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1 - 13).

**Proof provided in what Paul had “written afore”.
pp. 1 - 5**

We have considered the testimony of the Psalm titles and subscriptions as they bear upon the Mystery of Christ, and realize that if Psa. viii. be a pre-eminent portion of O.T. Scripture which contains a revelation of the mystery of Christ, as the LXX has it “The Secrets of the Son”, then the use which *Paul alone* makes of the words ‘all things under His feet’ most certainly substantiates his claim to a fuller comprehension of this mystery than had been given to any who went before. The verse of Psa. viii. reads:

“Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet” (Psa. viii. 6).

What is meant by ‘all things’ here is immediately explained:

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

Here, the dominion is co-extensive with that given to Adam as recorded in Gen. i. 26. When however, we read what is written in the epistles of Paul on these words ‘all things under His feet’, his superior knowledge of the Mystery of Christ is fully substantiated. The Apostle refers to these words of Psa. viii. in three epistles, I Corinthians, Hebrews and Ephesians. Let us examine these passages and see how far he substantiates his claim to have attained to a fuller and richer understanding of the Mystery of Christ than those who went before him. The first reference is I Cor. xv. 24-28, which we will set out in structure form straight away.

I Cor. xv. 24 - 28

A | xv. 24-. The end.
B | a | -24-. WHEN He delivers up the kingdom.
b | -24. WHEN He abolishes all rule.
c | 25-. FOR He must reign.
d | -25. Till all enemies under His feet.
d | 26. The last enemy; death abolished.
c | 27-. FOR He hath put all things under His feet.
b | -27. WHEN The one exception.
a | 28-. WHEN The Son Himself subjected.
A | -28. That God may be all in all.

There is no word for ‘cometh’ in the original of verse 24; it simply reads “Then the end”. Some understand the words to mean “Then the end *rank*”, but we can find no justification for such a rendering. Cremer, in his note on *to telos*, says that this word does not primarily denote the *end, termination*, with reference to time, but the *goal reached*, the completion or conclusion at which anything arrives, either as *issue* or *ending*; or a result, acme, consummation, e.g., *polemon telos*, “victory” (literally ‘the end of war’, end, not measuring time but object); *telos andros*, ‘the full age of man’ (not the end of man—death), also of the ‘ripening of seed’. In Luke i. 33 and Mark iii. 26 the idea of termination seems uppermost. The idea of *issue, end, conclusion*, is seen in Matt. xxvi. 58, “To see the end”; James v. 11, “Ye have seen the end of the Lord”; I Pet. iv. 17, “What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel?”

The idea of a *goal reached* is seen in Rom. vi. 21, “The end of those things is death”; Phil. iii. 19, “Whose end is destruction”. So also II Cor. xi. 15; Heb. vi. 8. When the Apostle wrote the words of I Cor. xv. 24, “Then the end”, what goal had he in view? What is the object of resurrection? Does it not take man back into the place intended for him in the Divine purpose, for which sin and death had for a while rendered him unfit? The goal, this end in view, is contained in the words of I Cor. xv. 28, “That God may be all in all”. Although ‘the end’ is mentioned immediately after the resurrection of those that are Christ’s at His *parousia*, it is not attained without a reign of righteousness and a rule of iron. The uninterrupted statement of the end is as follows:--

“Then the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father with the object that God may be all in all.”

The reader is aware, however, that the end is not attained in this unbroken sequence. The first ‘when’ is conditional upon the second. “When He shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power.” This will not be effected by one grand miraculous stroke, but by the reign of Christ as King of kings. “For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet.” He reigns ‘till’, His reign has one supreme ‘end’, and that end cannot be reached while one unsubdued enemy exists.

In this category comes death, the last enemy of mortal man. “Even death, the last enemy, shall be abolished.” This is included in the Divine purpose, “For He hath put all things under His feet”. The resurrection is therefore absolutely essential to the fulfillment of the great purpose of God.

But it may be asked, Can such an expression as ‘destroyed’ or ‘abolished’ speak of resurrection? Take the statement of II Tim. ii. 10:

“But is now made manifest by the manifestation of our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who hath abolished (*katargeo*) death, and illuminated life and incorruptibility through the gospel.”

This refers to the Lord Himself in the first instance. He abolished death when He arose from the dead. Not only did He abolish death, but He commenced that destruction

of all rule and power which He will carry through when He sits upon the throne of His glory:--

“That through death He might destroy (*katargeo*) him that had the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. ii. 14).

Other passages illustrating the meaning of *katargeo* (‘put down’, ‘destroyed’ I Cor. xv. 24-26) are Rom. vi. 6; I Cor. ii. 6; II Cor. iii. 7; Eph. ii. 15; II Thess. ii. 8.

When we read ‘all rule and all authority and power’, we may be inclined to make too wide a sweep, but the corrective of I Cor. xv. 26 enables us to see that we are dealing with *enemies*. There are two distinct actions, and two distinct classes in view in these verses. The enemies are ‘abolished’, but others are ‘subdued’. This word ‘subdued’ (*hupotasso*) is a cognate of *tagma*, ‘order’, ‘rank’ of verse 23, and looks to the perfect order and alignment that will characterize the kingdom of Christ. It is used even of Christ Himself in the words, “Then shall the Son also Himself be *subject* unto Him that God may be all in all”.

The first occurrence of the word is beautiful in its suggestiveness. That One of Whom it was prophesied that ‘all things should be subjected beneath His feet’ did not presume to act out of harmony with the Father’s will for Him during His boyhood, for:

“He came to Nazareth (with His parents), and was subject unto them” (Luke ii. 51).

In Rom. viii. 7 the two words ‘enmity’ and ‘subjection’ are seen to be irreconcilable:--

“The carnal mind is *enmity* against God, for it is not *subject* to the law of God, neither indeed can be.”

The word ‘subject’ involves the idea of a ‘willing surrender’. All must come down in that day. Some by being ‘abolished’ or ‘destroyed’, others by a willing surrender like unto that of the Son of God Himself. In Rom. viii. 20 it is revealed that the creation become involuntarily subjected to vanity, and this cries aloud for that willing submission of all things to the true goal of all creation—Christ, the willingly submissive Son. The word is used in Phil. iii. 21, where the transforming of the body of humiliation is said to be according to the selfsame energy whereby He is able to *subject* all things to Himself. Surely this cannot include the power that destroys; it is foreign to the thought. Destruction *or* subjection is the idea of I Cor. xv.

While I Cor. xv. is mainly concerned with the human phase of the great purpose of God, as expressed in the words ‘in Adam’, nevertheless the reference to ‘all rule and all authority and power’ goes beyond the sphere of Adam. Before the Son delivers up the kingdom, all rule, authority and power will be abolished (*arche, exousia, dunamis*). These are the principalities and powers of Col. i. 16 and Eph. i. 21. They are linked with death in the closing verses of Rom. viii., over which the believer even now is more than conqueror. Eph. vi. reveals that the church of the One Body has principalities and powers among its spiritual enemies, and yet Col. i. 16-20 shows that some principalities

and this of itself is a strong witness to the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews. In I Cor. xv. 'all' includes enemies which are to be 'destroyed'. In Heb. ii., it is the Devil, the holder of the power of death that is destroyed. From the dispensational point of view, the hope and calling of Hebrews necessitated the statement 'we see *not yet* all things under His feet' but from the dispensational view point of Ephesians this limitation is excluded. *At the very same time* that the Apostle could say 'we see not yet' he could say:

“And *hath put* all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body” (Eph. i. 22, 23).

Universal headship has not yet been taken by the Saviour, but He IS NOW Head over 'all things' TO THE CHURCH. The very parenthetical nature of the dispensation of the Mystery, makes it possible to see all things under His feet here and now, yet to say in Heb. ii. 'we see not yet all things under His feet'. I Cor. xv. and Heb. ii. refer to Adam, either in type or by name. Ephesians does not quote Psa. viii. so fully, and Adam is not named. The earlier epistles (I Cor. and Heb.) do not go back further than Adam, who was created in the image of God, whereas Ephesians goes back before the overthrow of the world to Him in Whose 'Image' Adam himself was created. The claim of Paul to have received a fuller and richer revelation of the Mystery of Christ is most clearly made good by the way in which he was inspired to expand the dominion enumerated in Psa. viii. as 'all sheep and oxen' to include all principality and power, throne and dominion. To the unbiased reader Paul will have substantiated his claim, but even inspired truth can be rendered void by tradition, bias and prejudice.

No.60. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1 - 13).

What is a “Joint-Body”? (iii. 6). pp. 21 - 24

Much controversy and confusion has arisen out of the failure to discern between “The Mystery”, and the “Mystery of Christ” in Eph. iii. 4-8. We extract this member from the structure in order that this distinction shall be recognized.

- C | Two Mysteries and Two Ministries. |
- d | 4. Mystery of CHRIST.
- e | 5-. Apostles and Prophets (*plural*).
- f | -5, 6. The Mystery. |
- g | In Spirit (*sphere*).
- h1 | Joint-heirs.
- h2 | Joint-body.
- h3 | Joint-partakers.
- g | In Christ (*sphere*).
- e | 7, 8-. Paul alone (*singular*).
- d | -8. Unsearchable riches of Christ.

The subject matter of the Mystery of Christ is capable of comparison “Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men *as it is now* revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets” (Eph. iii. 5). The subject matter of the Mystery is not capable of similar comparison “The mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but is now made manifest to His saints” (Col. i. 25-27). If the two statements of the Apostle speak of the same thing, then we must admit a contradiction into the Scriptures. The A.V. has veiled the truth by translating the Greek word *genea* ‘ages’ in Eph. iii. 5, and ‘generations’ in Col. i. 26. The moment these translations are made to agree, the distinction between the two mysteries becomes apparent. The mystery of Christ WAS made known in other GENERATIONS; the Mystery was NOT, for it was HID from ages and from GENERATIONS. It is this Mystery which Paul claims to have been revealed exclusively to him:

“Whereof I was made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given me to youward even the mystery” (Col. i. 25, 26).

The fact that the Apostle uses the title ‘the sons of men’ to indicate those to whom a partial unveiling of the mystery of Christ was made known, seems intentional in order that the higher type of ministry ‘His holy apostles and prophets’ should be thereby seen to advantage. The A.V. makes the words ‘by the Spirit’ follow the reference to the Apostles and prophets, as though to teach us how the revelation was made known to them. The universal witness of the Scriptures is so definite that ‘Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost’ that one may pardon a moment’s indecision and ask why it seemed necessary for believers like the Ephesians to put this note in here at all? Immediately we refer to the original and read *en pneumati*, our minds travel back to the same two words with which chapter ii. closes, there translated ‘through the Spirit’. When examining these words in article No.52 of this series, we noted the four occurrences of the phrase *en pneumati* in Rev. i. 10; iv. 2; xvii. 3; xxi. 10, and also saw an intended contrast between the *sphere* ‘in spirit’ of Eph. ii. 22, with the realm indicated in the same chapter as ‘in the flesh’ and ‘in the world’. So, when we come to the end of Eph. iii. 5, we must allow the words *en pneumati* to stand as a heading of the newly-revealed constitution of the church “Joint-heirs”, etc., which is balanced at the close by the words *en Christo Jesou*. This correspondence we have noted in the structure.

An illustration of the use of a word to introduce a new section of a book is provided by Dan. ii. 4:

“Then spake the Chaldeans to the King in Syriack.”

If this simply meant that the Chaldeans spoke their native tongue there seems little reason for the information, for generally Hebrews speak Hebrew, Chaldeans speak Syriack, Greeks speak Greek. When, however, we discover that the remainder of the chapter, together with every chapter up to the end of chapter vii., is written not in Hebrew but in Syriack, we realize that it was not to tell us that the Chaldeans spoke their native tongue, but that a new section of the prophecy here commenced which Daniel

wrote in Syriack. So in Eph. iii. 5 “in Spirit” governs the statement that follows. That statement we must now consider:

“That (in spirit) the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel” (Eph. iii. 6).

We are here immediately faced with the problem of interpretation. The one pre-fix *sun* ‘together with’ is used three times, *sunkleronoma*, *sussoma*, *sunmetocha*, yet the A.V. translates these three words FELLOW heirs, OF THE SAME body, and PARTakers. In one word *sun* is translated ‘fellow’, in the next word it is rendered ‘of the same’ and in the third case it is not translated at all except it be by the word ‘part’. Moffatt translates co-heirs and co-partners, but falls down over *sussoma* rendering it ‘companions’, which is very wide off the mark. We must preserve the threefold use of *sun*. The R.V. gets over the difficulty by rendering the three words “fellow heirs, and fellow members of the body, and fellow partakers” which while it has the merit of preserving the three occurrences of the preposition *sun*, adds to the Apostle’s words the word ‘member’ which is questionable. Rotherham, in his *Emphasized New Testament* reads “Joint heirs, and a joint body and joint partakers” which is found also in J. N. Darby’s translation. Possibly this is as near to the original as our English language will permit, but even so, the translation sets us a problem, for *what is* a joint body? The essential characteristic of a ‘body’ is that it has many members, each differing from the other in function and importance. Such a body can provide an analogy for a spiritual company, and this analogy is employed by the Apostle in I Cor. xii. where the different members are indicated. The Ancients who were not limited to the English language, have revealed their difficulty to express the Greek word *sussoma* adequately. Jerome renders the word in the Latin Vulgate by *concorporates* and says:

“I know that in Latin it makes an ugly sentence. But because it stands in the Greek, and because every word and syllable and stroke and point in the Divine Scriptures is full of meaning, I prefer the risks of verbal malformation to the risk of missing the sense.”

We believe all true Bereans will endorse these sentiments. One expositor has used this word ‘concorporate’ but it is not in common use.

“In relation to the Body the members are ‘incorporate’: in relation to one another they are ‘concorporate’ that is sharers in the one Body” (J. Armitage Robinson, D.D.).

Here then, with the advent of the dispensation of the Mystery, a church came into existence so different from any that had gone before, as to call for the coining of a word, and the figure which that word conjures up in the mind is that of a body *never seen or known on earth*. No one has ever seen a body in which every member was on absolutely equal terms as any other, but we have already been reminded that this body is only possible ‘in Spirit’. Nothing like this can be discovered before the Middle Wall went down, and that wall was not removed until Acts xxviii. In the flesh, Israel can brook no peer (c.f. The olive tree in Rom. xi.); only ‘in Spirit’ can such an equality be possible.

Another correction is called for when using the A.V. Eph. iii. 7 reads “Whereof I was made a minister”, and the commencing of a fresh verse with these words may

prevent the reader from realizing that they are an integral part of the preceding passage. It is not the full truth to say that in this new company the Gentiles are joint partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel, the complete statement is that the Gentiles were joint partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel WHEREOF PAUL HAD BEEN MADE A MINISTER. When writing late to Timothy, the Apostle adds a similar rider, he does not simply say to Timothy:

“Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead”
(II Tim. ii. 8),

that would be a salutary word indeed, for without the resurrection all are without hope. Paul was more incisive and exclusive; what he did say was:

“Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead
ACCORDING TO MY GOSPEL: WHEREIN I SUFFER unto bonds”
(II Tim. ii. 8, 9).

The same Saviour and the same Resurrection provides Peter’s Gospel with blessed assurance of the fulfillment of the promises made to David concerning his THRONE (Acts ii. 24-30). The same Saviour and the same Resurrection has taken us “far above all thrones” as we have seen in Eph. i. 19-23. The Gentiles members of this “Body” do not inherit and share ‘promises’, they share on equal terms “His promise”, and that found in the gospel entrusted to Paul alone. These believers do not share the promise of the Father (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4; ii. 33). These joint partakers do not take to themselves the promise of Acts ii. 39. These fellow heirs do not inherit the promises made unto ‘the fathers’, and which were confirmed during the earthly ministry of Christ (Rom. xv. 8). They are concerned with ‘the promise of life’ which antedates the beginning of the ages (II Tim. i. 1, 9; Titus i. 2, 3). The seal which they have received is “the Holy Spirit of promise” not ‘of the promises’ (Eph. i. 13) for they were, while in the flesh, “strangers from the covenants of promise” (Eph. ii. 12). The teaching of Eph. iii. 6 is *not* that the unequal partnership that existed between the Jewish believer and the Gentile believer has been exchanged so that the Gentile now enters into the promises, originally held so exclusively by the Jew, on equal terms. No, the teaching is that a new promise is brought to light, a promise that Abraham never knew, a new man has been created, and into that new company and concerning that one new promise no one has precedence over another, the membership of this Body is ‘concorporate’ and the partaking of the promise found in the Gospel preached by Paul the Prisoner, is a ‘joint partaking’. The new company as Paul wrote to the Colossians is ‘a new Man’ and it is ‘created’ not ‘evolved’ from the period covered by the Acts.

“Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all” (Col. iii. 11).

The claim of the Apostle to have received a new dispensation, together with a special gospel, we must consider further, but this must occupy our attention in subsequent articles.

The following extract from an article contributed to *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly* for Jan.-April 1953 by Sir J. L. Myres, writing on the relationship of Persia, Greece and Israel and particularly dealing with the concept of the POLIS or City, has a note that may prove suggestive to the reader after studying the threefold fellowship of Eph. iii. 6:

“Fundamental principles of such an association of hereditary groups, not originally or necessarily related by blood, were

ISONOMAI, equality of assignment in material and social amenities,

ISEGORIA, equality of utterance,

ISOTELEIA, equality of function and responsibility.

The results was literally ELEUTHERIA, ‘grown-up-ness’ (to translate the Greek word for *freedom*); every member was his own master, so long as he was master of himself, of his own behaviour (that is) toward the others.”

No.61. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1 - 13).

Unsearchable Riches.

pp. 41 - 43

With the opening words of Eph. iii., the Apostle has used extraordinary language, and made exceedingly high claims. His prison is not described in terms of bondage or affliction, but as of a place of signal honour. He claims to have received the highest stewardship revealed in the Scriptures, namely the Mystery, and supports that claim by an appeal to his superior knowledge of the associated mystery of Christ, which the sons of men in earlier days saw but dimly in comparison. The threefold fellowship of this Mystery which was revealed through him is unlike anything before made known, and he declared that he had been made a minister of this special set of good news, according to a gift of grace, and inworking of Divine power.

Knowing the Apostle as we do by acquaintance with his other epistles, we are not surprised at the sudden change introduced by verse 8. He still says ‘unto me’ as he did in verses 2, 4 and 7, but now he continues “Unto me less than the least of all saints”. Whenever great feeling influences human language, we generally find the speaker or writer resorting to figures of speech. Two such figures can be seen in the writing of the Apostle here. First, the figure known as *Meiosis* or a Belittling, “By this figure one thing is diminished in order to increase another thing” (Dr. E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*). Examples of this figure are found in both the Old and New Testaments, ‘dust and ashes’ (Gen. xviii. 27), ‘as grasshoppers’ (Numb. xiii. 33), ‘unprofitable’ (Phile. 11). The other figure discernible here is called *Oxymoron* or wise-foolly. “This is a figure in which what is said at first sight appears to be foolish, yet when we come to consider it, we find it exceedingly wise” (*Figures of Speech*). “Stripping” the naked of their “clothing” (Job. xxii. 6); “When I am weak, then am I strong” (II Cor. xii. 10) are examples from each Testament.

“Eph. iii. 8 ‘Less than the least of all saints’. This pleasing *oxymoron* emphasizes the Apostle’s growth in grace (i.e. in his knowledge of what grace was to him, and what it had done for him). Before this (in 60A.D.), he said: I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles (II Cor. xi. 5). In 62A.D., he could say he was ‘less than the least of all saints’, while later than this (67A.D.), his knowledge of God’s grace made him see himself as ‘the chief of sinners’. (I Tim. i. 15, 16)” (*Figures of Speech*).

It must not be thought that, by employing a figure of speech, the speaker is superficial; it is *we* who note the figure, but at the time, the speaker is too deeply moved to be conscious of the particular mould into which his language falls. Here, in Eph. iii. 8, the Apostle means every word he said even though, by mathematics and logic one could prove that it is impossible to be “less” than the ‘least’. Shakespeare knew this for a basic truth of human nature when he employed the same figure in the words ‘The most unkindest cut of all’. When Paul came to write subsequently to Timothy, the same sensitiveness is evident:

“According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust. And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, Who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief” (I Tim. i. 11-13).

It is this deepening sense of personal unworthiness in the presence of increasing trust, that made the Apostle, in his closing epistles, add the word ‘mercy’ in his salutation (I Tim. i. 2; II Tim. i. 2; Titus i. 4), epistles written not to the church, but to fellow servants. When the Apostle once more says ‘that I should preach’, the emphasis is not on “I”, but on the wondrous grace that could stoop to use so earthen a vessel. There is, too, another side to this. However humble a man may be, however, sincerely he may protest his unworthiness, no personal opinions either of himself or others can alter or minimize in the slightest degree a trust that has been given, a call made, a stewardship granted. The Paul who could not, and would not magnify himself, did most rightly “magnify” his ‘office’ (Rom. xi. 13). Even though he was not meet to be called an apostle (I Cor. xv. 9) he could also say:

“I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles” (II Cor. xi. 5).

On either side of the opening words of Eph. iii. 7, 8 are the words ‘gift’ and ‘grace’.

“According to the *gift* of the *grace* of God
(Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints)
is this *grace given*”,

and it is in virtue of this gift that Paul can stress with all emphasis, yet with all humility, the extraordinary nature of his apostleship and ministry. He returns, after this momentary pause, to the thing that mattered most, the substance of the message entrusted to him.

“That I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ” (Eph. iii. 8).

In addition to the emphatic “I” and the repeated reference to ‘the Gentiles’, the Mystery and its peculiar theme is given a new title ‘the unsearchable riches of Christ’.

That they are riches, yea exceeding riches both of grace and of glory, the two chapters already studied bear testimony. There we have read of ‘riches of grace’, ‘riches of glory’ and of ‘exceeding riches of grace’ (Eph. i. 7, 18; ii. 7). These riches are concerned with redemption, with hope and inheritance and with the glory of the future ages. The Apostle once more uses the word riches, but this time prefaced by an unusual word, ‘unsearchable’. Moffatt translates the passage ‘the fathomless wealth of Christ’, which has the merit of bringing to the reader’s mind something that is ‘past finding out’, something extending beyond the usual. *Anexichniastos* is a compound of *a* negative, *ex* out and *ichnos* a footstep, not to be traced out, untraceable, leaving not a footmark behind.

“Thy way is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps (*ichne*) are not known” (Psa. lxxvii. 19).

This reference, if it does nothing else, shows that it is not only futile, but unbelieving to search the O.T Scriptures for the teaching of the Mystery, seeing that God has purposely avoided leaving a ‘trace’.

“God which doeth great things and *unsearchable*” (Job v. 9).
“Which doeth great things *past finding out*” (Job ix. 10).

The Hebrew word used in these passages of Job is *cheqer*. This word comes from root meaning ‘to dig’. The word is found in Job xi. 7 where Zophar asks the question “Canst thou by *searching* find out God?” A similar word *ragal* is used for ‘spying out’ a land in Judges xviii. 2. What a blessing it is that *no spies* can return with an evil report concerning *our* inheritance for our blessings are ‘unsearchable riches’. The mystery of Christ, which was made known in other generations to the sons of men, were ‘searchable’ and this ‘searching’ was among the qualities that so commended the Bereans (Acts xvii. 11), and which exercised the hearts of the prophets themselves (I Pet. i. 10) and was either commanded (search), or commended (ye search), by the Saviour Himself (John v. 39). These riches therefore belong to another category; they are unsearchable riches. They come from the same treasury of truth, they belong to the same great purpose of the ages as we shall see, but they have been kept in reserve until the defection of Israel made the gap which these unsearchable riches were foreordained to fill. In other words they are ‘the Mystery’. The phrase ‘that I should preach’ is balanced in the next verse by the words ‘And to make all men see’, “among the Gentiles” being echoed by “all men”; and the ‘unsearchable riches’ being put in correspondence with the Mystery which had been ‘hid in God’. These added items are too important merely to form an appendix to the present article. They demand the fullest consideration, and accordingly we hope to devote all the space available in our next issue to Eph. iii. 9-13.

No.62. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1 - 13).
A ministry of, and by, grace (iii. 2 and 7).
pp. 61 - 64

The three most wonderful characteristics of the church of the Mystery as set forth in verse 3 with its emphasis upon equality in inheritance, in membership of the One Body, and of partaking in the promise, are referred to both in the words 'In Spirit', 'In Christ Jesus' and 'by the gospel'. Here we have the sphere in which these blessings are enjoyed, and the instrument by which they were introduced and presented. This leads us to the fact, not always appreciated as it should be, that the word 'gospel' covers a wider range of truth, than is covered by the conception of our initial deliverance from sin or the passing from death unto life. To enumerate but a few. We have "The gospel of the Kingdom" (Matt. iv. 23), but Peter's attitude to the Lord's own prophecy of His approaching death, as made manifest in Matt. xvi., shows that salvation as we understand the term was not then in sight. Those to whom the Apostle addresses his epistle to the Romans were saved people 'called saints' and 'beloved of God'. He spoke of the mutual faith both of you and me, yet to this same company he said:

"So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also" (Rom. i. 15),

which suggests a fuller content than the initial gospel of forgiveness. Again, he told this church that when he did at length come to them, he hoped to come "in the fullness of the gospel of Christ" (Rom. xv. 29).

We have in Ephesians both 'the gospel of your salvation' and the 'gospel of peace' which is associated with the whole armour of God. Again, the title 'The glorious gospel of Christ' of II Cor. iv. 4 can read 'The gospel of the glory of Christ', a message that goes beyond the initial deliverance from sin. And again in I Tim. i. 11 we could translate the passage 'The gospel of the glory of the happy (*makarios*, not *eulogetos*) God'. So, when Paul links the most peculiar constitution of the church of the Mystery with the gospel which had been entrusted to him, he intends the special 'good news' or 'glad tidings' which the new revelation brought to the erstwhile far off Gentiles. So is it also with the word 'preach' in Eph. ii. 17, the preaching of 'peace' was a preaching to believers, it was to 'far off and nigh' dispensationally. In like manner Paul claimed the distinctive honour of preaching 'the unsearchable riches of Christ' (Eph. iii. 8). Of this gospel, the Apostle says he became a 'minister'.

There are three words that are translated 'minister' in the N.T. *diakonos*, *leitourgos* and *huperetes*, and some eight or nine words for the verb 'to minister'. *Huperetes*, means an 'under rower', one who had a most dangerous and degrading position, often chained to the oar and to the bench of a Greek galley. It came into more general use as descriptive of a subordinate, either of a law court officer, of a rich man's servant, or an official of the Sanhedrin or of the synagogue. The word is used of Paul in Acts xxvi. 16 and

I Cor. iv. 1, and both in connection with some phase of special service. *Leitourgos* is employed in the O.T. only of the priests and the Levites, but in the N.T. the term is used of magistrates, of angels, and of Christ Himself, as well as of Paul in Rom. xv. 16. *Diakonos*, the word used in Eph. iii. 7 becomes in English the word 'deacon' and the verb is found in Acts vi. 2 where we read of serving tables, and of Paul when he took the contributions made by the Gentile churches 'to minister' unto the saints at Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 25), and most graciously by the Saviour of Himself in Matt. xx. 28, where His ministry involved giving His life a ransom of many. The noun *diakonia* is used of Martha (Luke x. 40), and when Paul in Rom. xi. 13 said 'I magnify mine office', this is the word used. What a range of service is covered by this word! Martha's service at the one end and the Saviour's at the other. *Diakonos* is found seven times in the Prison Epistles, once translated 'deacon' (Eph. iii. 7; vi. 21; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 7, 23, 25; iv. 7). Three of these occurrences refer to Paul's exclusive ministry of the Mystery:

- "Whereof I was made a minister" (Eph. iii. 7).
- "I Paul was made a minister" (Col. i. 23).
- "Whereof I am made a minister" (Col. i. 25).

When we were considering Eph. iii. 3 we found that the Apostle used the word *kata* 'according to revelation', and now he declares that he was made a minister of this special truth "according to the gift of the grace of God given me by (literally according to) the effectual working of His power" (Eph. iii. 7). How are we to understand "The gift of grace"? Some, with Ellicott, see in this the apostolic office, others with Alford see that it is grace that was the gift of God, as the next verse declares 'is this grace given'. Something of the steps of the Apostle's argument and the correspondence of the two references to the gift of grace can be seen if set out thus:

- A | The gospel (*evangelion*) whereof I was made a minister.
- B | According to the gift of the grace of God.
- C | Given unto me by the effectual working of His power.
- C | Unto me, who am less than the least.
- B | Is this grace given.
- A | That I should preach (*evangelizo*) the unsearchable riches.

There can be no doubt but that the preaching of the unsearchable riches of Christ has to do with the Mystery, and the correspondence of the passage helps to confirm the feeling that the earlier reference to the gospel also is closely related to making it known. The Greek reader would be conscious of a connection between the words 'promise' and 'gospel', which is not obvious to the English reader. Promise, in the Greek is *epangelia*, gospel is *evangelion*, both compounds of the same root word meaning a 'message'. Whatever gospel Paul preached, we know that it was only by the grace of God that he originally learned its glorious message, and that he received continuing grace to make it known. Here he actually says so in no uncertain terms:

- "Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of His power" (Eph. iii. 7).

Both the words ‘gift’ and ‘grace’ preclude human merit or mere attainment. *Dorea* is used in Acts ii. 38; viii. 20; x. 45 and xi. 17 for the special enduement with Holy Spirit that was characteristic of Pentecostal times. In Paul’s witness this is only used once of such gifts, namely in Heb. vi. 4, the other references (Rom. v. 15, 17; II Cor. ix. 15; Eph. iv. 7), speaking of the grace of God in salvation and without special reference to gifts as such. The form *dorean* which occurs nine times, and translated ‘freely’, ‘without a cause’, ‘in vain’ and ‘for nought’ the more emphasizes the freeness of the grace thus bestowed.

Charis ‘grace’ is a term that is very characteristic of the ministry of Paul. James uses the word twice, Peter twelve times, the epistles of John, Jude, the Revelation four times between them, the gospels twelve times and the Acts sixteen times, whereas Paul uses the word one hundred and ten times in his epistles! The distribution of the word ‘grace’ in Ephesians is as follows:

***Charis* (grace).**

- A | i. 2. Grace to you.—Salutation.
- B | i. 6. Grace exhibited in salvation.
 - a | i. 7. Riches. Redemption.
 - b | ii. 5. Saved.
 - a | ii. 7. Riches in ages to come.
 - b | ii. 8. Saved.
- C | iii. 2. Dispensation of the grace of God.
- B | Grace manifest in service.
 - a | iii. 7. According to gift of grace.
 - b | iii. 8. Grace given to preach.
 - a | iv. 7. According to gift of Christ.
 - b | iv. 29. Grace ministered to hearers.
- A | vi. 24. Grace with all.—Benediction.

How truly does the divine arrangement of this word emphasize its place and importance. No salvation is complete without it, and the very benediction is enriched by it. It runs through the whole fabric of redemption, covering the ages past and to come with its unction. It gives its name to the special dispensation committed to the Apostle Paul, marking it off as pre-eminently one of grace. It vitalizes the outcome of redemption, namely service, being as much a necessity for the inspired and gifted Apostle while preaching the Word, as for the individual believer in his everyday conversation.

While grace and works belong to two very different categories, as Rom. xi. 6 will make very clear, grace can and should lead to works, even as Eph. ii. 8-10 has already demonstrated. So the gift of grace given to the Apostle had not been bestowed in vain, as he declared:

“But by the grace of God I am what I am and His grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain: but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me” (I Cor. xv. 10).

“By the effectual working of His power” Moffatt translates “By the energy of His power”, which recognizes the presence of the Greek word *energeia*. This word is found only in Paul’s epistles, and as follows. The faith of the inworking of God, associating the believer with the mighty power of resurrection now (Eph. i. 19; Col. ii. 12), and lastly, the Satanic travesty, with its corresponding retributive justice in connection with the apostasy of the last days (II Thess. ii. 9, 11). The word *energeo* ‘to inwork and energize’ occurs four times in Ephesians thus:

PURPOSE. “According to the purpose of Him Who *worketh* all things after the counsel of His own will” (i. 11).

FAITH. “His power to usward who believe which He *wrought in* Christ when He raised Him from the dead” (i. 20).

DISOBEDIENCE. “The spirit that now *worketh in* the children of disobedience” (ii. 2).

FULNESS. “Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that *worketh in* us” (iii. 20).

What a full parenthesis this chapter of Ephesians is, started as it was by the claim made by the Apostle to having received a peculiar ministry associated with his imprisonment. Yet there is more to be considered before this great claim concerning the Mystery and the Gentiles is fully vindicated. This, which is contained in the six verses that follow, will occupy our wondering attention as we study its wording and its implications next time.

No.63. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1 - 13).

The Mystery and the principalities and powers (iii. 10). pp. 81 - 84

We have seen that the unsearchable riches of Christ, which Paul was commissioned to preach among the Gentiles, were associated with the Mystery hid in God and revealed for the first time to him as the prisoner of Christ Jesus. We pick up the thread of the argument in Eph. iii. 9, where we read “And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery”. In article No.54 we discussed the revised reading ‘dispensation’ instead of ‘fellowship’ here, and now take the revised reading for granted. Ellicott’s note is “The reading *koinonia* ‘fellowship’ has only the support of cursive MSS and is a mere explanatory gloss”. ‘To make all men see’ *kai photisai pantas*. The literal translation of these words must evidently be ‘and to enlighten all’, *photisai* being a part of the verb *photizo*.

There are four references to ‘light’ in Ephesians, and one of them tells us that ‘whatsoever doth make manifest is light’ (Eph. v. 13). In Colossians where the same theme as that of Eph. iii. 1-13 is being unfolded, we read concerning the Mystery which had been hid ‘but now is made manifest to His saints’ (Col. i. 26). Here we have the same word ‘make manifest’ *phaneroo*, that is used in Eph. v. 13, and the same word

‘hid’ *apokrupto* that is found in Eph. iii. 9 and in Col. i. 26, together with the same words ‘dispensation’, ‘minister’ and ‘mystery’. This close comparison will enable us to perceive the extent of the Apostle’s range when he said ‘to make all men see’. First of all, there is no word for ‘men’ here and ‘all’ must be defined, it cannot be intended to be universal. In Colossians ‘the riches of the glory of this mystery’, so evidently parallel with ‘the unsearchable riches’ of Eph. iii. 8, are made known ‘among the Gentiles’ (Col. i. 27). In Colossians these words ‘among the Gentiles’ are but another way of saying ‘to His saints’ (Col. i. 26), consequently, the ‘all’ of Eph. iii. 9 must refer to ‘saints’ from among the ‘Gentiles’ and not all men indiscriminately. The only other occurrence of *photizo* in Ephesians is in chapter i. 18, where the verb appears as a perfect, passive, and should read:

“The eyes of your understanding *having been enlightened*”,

apparently something that must be taken for granted in those for whom the Apostle made this prayer for increased knowledge. The light may shine in darkness, but the darkness may not comprehend it and the understanding of the Gentile we learn was ‘darkened’ (Eph. iv. 18). Only by redeeming grace were these Gentiles delivered from the authority of darkness (Col. i. 13), and so, while we make no reservations, and while we use great plainness of speech, we shall only be asking for disappointment if we believe that men will immediately respond, or that great numbers will receive the revelation made known through the Apostle Paul. The enlightenment in view here is as to ‘what is the dispensation of the mystery’. It may be objected upon reading this, that in the preceding verses, the Apostle has already ‘made known’ both the fact and the peculiar character of this new dispensation, but this confuses the making of a thing known, and the illuminated understanding that can perceive *what is* made known. Paul may plant and Apollos may water, Paul may preach and the *Berean Expositor* may supplement with articles on Ephesians, but God alone can give the increase, and the necessary illumination. Strictly speaking a mystery can only be known by initiation.

This dispensation of the Mystery is said to have been hid in God from the beginning of the world. The words ‘from the beginning of the world’ are in the Greek *apo ton aionon* ‘from or since the ages’. Now this particular calling goes back to ‘before the foundation or overthrow of the world’ and to ‘before the world began’ (II Tim. i. 9) which in the Greek reads *pro chronon aionion* ‘before times of ages’. In each of these passages, including Titus i. 2 where the reference is to ‘from’ and ‘before’ the ages, we find the Apostle using either the words or their equivalent ‘but now is made manifest’ and that through his own peculiar ministry. The truth was not only hid but ‘hid in God’. Even if we look upon the preposition *en* as a preposition of agency and translate ‘hid by God’, the effectual hiding of this mystery is unimpaired.

“Who created all things by Jesus Christ” (Eph. iii. 9).

The Revised Text omits the words ‘by Jesus Christ’ which Alford says are ‘apparently a doctrinal addition’.

“The exact reason for this particular designation being here appended to *Theo* has been somewhat differently estimated” (Ellicott).

First we can understand that anyone who could conceive the Mystery, and keep it in perfect silence since the ages began, must have complete control of time, space and individuals, both angelic and human. Who could this be but One, even the Creator?

“The stress is on *ta panta* ‘the all things’.” (Alford).

Why is the stress placed upon these words, and what do they mean? In John i. 2 we read ‘all things were made by Him’, where the Greek word ‘all’ is *panta* and means the whole creation. In Col. i. 16 we read ‘by Him were all things created all things were created by Him’ and in verse 20 ‘to reconcile all things unto Himself’, here the Greek is *ta panta* ‘the all things’. Do these expressions mean just one and the same thing, or is there an intended and essential difference? Pursuing our reading in Colossians we come to chapter iii. 11 where we read that ‘the all things’ (*ta panta*) and ‘in all things’ (*en pasi*) is Christ. So in Eph. i. 10 it is not ‘all things’ universally but ‘the all things’ that are gathered together under one Head (*anakephalaiomai*); it is ‘the all things’ that work together after the counsel of His will (i. 11); it is *panta*, all things universally both good and evil, that are put under His feet (i. 22, 23), and it is over *panta*, all things universally, that He has been made Head for the sake of His church, that church which is His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth ‘all’ (*ta panta*) in all. All things without reserve are made to work together for good, but it is ‘the all things’ (not the evil as well as the good) that are ‘freely given us’ with the gift of Christ (Rom. viii. 28, 32). Where Christ is set forth as ‘God blessed unto the ages’ (Rom. ix. 5) no limitation is intended—here evil as well as good ‘all things’ in their widest significance are intended. In Rom. xi. 33-36 dispensational limitations must be observed—here ‘all things’ are limited and once again it is *ta panta* that is found here. The scribe who slipped in the words ‘by Jesus Christ’ at the end of Eph. iii. 9 may have been giving expression to the fact that a special section of creation was here in view, and if so, it appears that he had recognized the meaning of the words *ta panta*. This is not all however. Verse 10 flows out of verse 9, the phrase ‘to the intent that’ links in a logical sequence the creation specified in verse 9 with the choice of the church as a vehicle of knowledge to principalities and powers in heavenly places. Let us set the passages out to show this connection.

“The dispensation of the mystery hidden God Who created all things IN ORDER THAT NOW might be made known to principalities and powers in the heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God, according to the purpose of the ages”

Here we are taken right back to the beginning, where creation and purpose are seen together, where the Mystery and its peculiar sphere was planned, and where light is thrown upon the relationship which God intended should exist between the mighty inhabitants of heavenly places, and these lowly, far off, uncovenanted Gentiles, who, with Christ are to be seated together ‘far above all principality and power’. Perhaps we have wondered why? Here at least is one reason, that through this church thus chosen thus blessed, should be manifest the manifold wisdom of God. Notice it is the ‘wisdom’

of God that is the peculiar theme, not His love nor His power, but His wisdom. It is in definite association with the Mystery that had been hushed during the ages, that God is called “The only wise God” in Rom. xvi. 27. If the fallen Prince of Tyre, spoken of in Ezek. xxviii., be a symbolic picture of Satan, we read that originally he is said to have been ‘full of wisdom’, but later that he had corrupted that wisdom (Ezek. xxviii. 12, 17), and it is in the exercise of His Wisdom, that God concealed from the eyes of His enemy the climax purpose of the ages, namely “The Mystery”, intending by the Church therein called to make known to the unfallen principalities and powers in the heavenly places, vacated of some of these spiritual dignities that had fallen away in the earlier Satanic rebellion, the manifold wisdom of God. We do know at least one occupation for which we have been saved, and are yet to be inducted, namely that of being the channel of instruction on this theme to these spiritual powers. This wisdom is said to be ‘manifold’. When Peter uses the word ‘manifold’ as he does in I Pet. i. 6 and iv. 10 the Greek word is *poikilos*, a word meaning variegated, and found in the Septuagint of Gen. xxxvii. 3 where we read of ‘the coat of many colours’. The word occurs in eight different forms, and the majority of references is to embroidered work. The word used in Eph. iii. 10 is the intensive form *polupoikilos* ‘very varied’, and is unknown in the Septuagint. It is found in classical Greek, where it refers to a cloth or painting bearing a complicated pattern.

As in everything else, the word used in Ephesians is the superlative of its kind. The revelation of the Divine purpose as it pertains either to Israel or to the Church of the Acts period, did not need the use of the word meaning VERY manifold, but the revelation of the Mystery did. Even with our limited understanding, we can see that the fall of angels, the overthrow of the world and the determined attack of the enemy of truth, call for superlative wisdom to encompass the ultimate goal of the ages. This not only called for the exercise of wisdom in what was made known in the Scriptures, but what was kept secret. It also called for wisdom as to when this secret should be made known, by whom and to whom. So far as the Gentiles on earth, here and now are concerned, during this great parenthesis in the outworking of the purpose of the ages, Paul, as the Prisoner of Jesus Christ, was the chosen vehicle, but when once these believing Gentiles were formed into a church, that church became the chosen and predestined vehicle of instruction—not to men, not even to angels, but unto principalities and powers. Angels, we learn ‘desire to look into’ the things that pertain to the sufferings of Christ and the glories that follow (I Pet. i. 12). Angels appear throughout the N.T. record manifesting a keen interest in all that happens as the Divine purpose unfolds from Bethlehem to Calvary, from the tomb in the Garden to the Ascension, and with the yet future Coming again. Principalities and powers are only mentioned once outside Paul’s epistles namely in I Pet. iii. 22, and it is only in Ephesians that we learn of their most evident interest in the outworking of the purpose of grace as it pertains to the Mystery. We must remember too, that Christ is revealed in Col. ii. 10 as ‘the Head of all principality and power’, even as He had already been revealed as the Head of the Church which is His Body. Col. i. 16-20 suggests moreover that the mutual reconciliation which is predicated of the Church will also be enjoyed by these principalities and powers. We are being prepared for high society, but even so we can give thanks unto the Father which HATH MADE US MEET for the inheritance of the saints in light.

No.64. The Secret Chamber (iii. 1 - 13).

God's Age-Poem (iii. 11 - 13).

pp. 101 - 103

The 'intent' to make known through the church the manifold wisdom of God to principalities and powers in heavenly places (Eph. iii. 10), is preceded by a reference to creation, and followed by a reference to purpose:

"According to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"
(Eph. iii. 11).

The literal rendering of this passage reads 'according to the purpose of the ages'. Eternity as such is not a subject of Scripture. The word 'eternity' in Isa. lvii. 15 is the Hebrew *ad*, and when this word is used of man, it is translated 'of old' (Job xx. 4). The word translated 'eternal' in Deut. xxxiii. 27 is *qedem* 'before in time or place', and the one other word in the O.T. thus translated is the Hebrew *olam* (Isa. lx. 15), and *olam* means something secret (Psa. xc. 8). Eternity as such does not enter into the O.T. Scriptures. *Kata prothesin ton aionon* "According to a purpose of the ages". This is the literal translation of the words of Eph. iii. 11. Three things are thereby presupposed:

- (1) That the dispensation of the Mystery, the appointment of Paul, the peculiar condition of the church, their relation of this Mystery with creation and the principalities and powers in heavenly places, are all 'according to', or in harmony with a purpose.
- (2) This purpose or plan has been already variously spoken of in Ephesians as God's choice, before the foundation of the world, His predestination, the good pleasure of His will, the mystery of His will, and the purpose of Him Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will.
- (3) This purpose is called 'The purpose of the ages'.

The word *aion* is translated 'age' in Eph. ii. 7 and iii. 21, but is translated 'course', 'world' and 'eternal' in other references. There seems to be need for revision when one word in one epistle can be translated by so widely different terms as 'this world' which is admittedly transitory, and 'eternal' which endures for ever.

The ages, according to Ephesians, are subdivided into this age (Eph. i. 21; vi. 12), the ages past (iii. 9) and the ages to come (ii. 7). The second epistle to Timothy, and the epistle to Titus combine the words *pro aionios* with *chronos*, translated in the A.V. 'before the world began' but literally 'before *aionion* or age-during or age-past times', and 'the present age' *ton nun aiona* 'the now age'. These references bring before us the sweep of the ages, revealing that there was a time which could be spoken of as 'before' that which is spoken of as 'now', 'this age', and a period spoken of as the ages that are to come. Considering what is written in Eph. i. 4, we perceive that 'before the ages' and 'before the overthrow of the world' synchronize, and that the ages therefore must begin at

a line drawn through Gen. i. 2. Most of the teaching is veiled or distorted if we adopt the translation of *aion* in terms of eternity. The A.V. reads ‘The eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus’ (Eph. iii. 11) as though the word ‘purpose’ was repeated. The second word translated ‘purposes’ is the verb *poieo* ‘to make’. At first sight, the idea of ‘making’ does not seem so fitting, and the A.V. seems more reasonable. However, we believe that the choice of the word *poieo* must be considered as under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit, and therefore to attain the truth intended we must consider the usage of this word. In Heb. i. 2 we read ‘by Whom also He made the worlds’ where the word ‘worlds’ should read ‘ages’. Here again ‘making’ is employed in connection with the ages. In the same epistle *poieo* is used, where the A.V. reads ‘appointed’ and ‘kept’ (Heb. iii. 2; xi. 28). In Eph. ii. 3 *poieo* is translated ‘fulfilling’. In Eph. ii. 10, where we read ‘we are His workmanship’, the word so translated is *poiema*. Solomon, writing in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, says that there is a season and a time to every purpose under heaven, and after itemizing fourteen pairs of experiences, states in verse 11:

“He hath made everything beautiful in his time; also He hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end.”

Everything is not beautiful at present, but ‘in its proper season’ it will be. The word ‘world’ is literally the ‘age’, and this so pre-occupies the heart of man, that he cannot comprehend the work of God that goes back before the ages, and which will go on when the ages have ceased. The LXX uses an expressive term *ta sumpanta* for ‘everything’, all things together, a complete and completed whole. Here also we find the Greek word *poiema* ‘the work that God maketh’. It occurs again in verse 17 allied with ‘purpose’, “every purpose and every work”. ‘The work of God’ (Eccles. i. 13) include apparently things that at present are ‘crooked’, yet which will be beautiful ‘in their season’. Again *poiema* is used in Eccles viii. 17 “Then I beheld all (*sumpanta*) the work (*ta poiemata*) of God, that a man cannot find out the work (*poiema*) that is done under the sun he shall not find it”. The concealed nature of these *poiemata* is indicated in xi. 5, where once again the comprehensive *sumpanta* is found. Both terms *sumpanta* and *poiemata* are used of man as well as of God, for the last verse of chapter xii. says:

“God will bring every work (*sumpan to poiema*) into judgment.”

The choice of the word *poieo* therefore, in Eph. iii. 11 is in line with the use of the word in that quest concerning the purpose of the ages which is found in the book of Ecclesiastes. To make, or to do, while satisfying many occurrences, by no means present a full account of the verb *poieo* as the following extracts from Grimm-Thayer’s Lexicon, will show:

“With the names of things, to produce, construct, form, fashion joined to nouns denoting state or condition, it signifies to be the author, to cause”

The fact that *poiema* becomes in English a ‘poem’ shows that something beyond mere doing or making is in mind. What a lovely thought it is, that at last, out of the agony of the ages, like a butterfly emerging from a chrysalis, there will emerge a poem unto His

praise: A verse from Francis Ridley Havergal comes to mind, which we can only quote from memory.

“So onward, and yet onward
For the dim revealing show,
That system unto system
In grand succession grow.
That we deemed a volume
But one golden verse may be
One rhythmic cadence in the flow
Of God’s great poetry.”

In this most glorious purpose of the ages, the church of the Mystery has its place and its privileges, among them the Apostle brings into prominence ‘access’. In Eph. ii. 18 ‘access’ is placed at the climax of the blessed privileges that belong to this newly created company. Here again access is brought forward as crystallizing in itself all that can be said of this Christian privilege, and not only so, access is supplemented by boldness and confidence in iii. 12, and is made to rest, not upon *our* faith in the Lord, but ‘through the faith *of* Him or His faithfulness’. Having reached this happy vantage ground, the Apostle turns back to the theme with which the chapter opens, saying:

“Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory”
(Eph. iii. 13).

Why should Paul think that the Ephesians would be likely ‘to faint’ when they heard of his tribulations? The word means rather to become dispirited, to lose heart rather than to faint. Paul says in effect ‘my tribulations’ constitute me “The Prisoner of Christ Jesus”, they are ‘for you’, just as my Prison ministry is ‘for you Gentiles’. This Prison ministry with its dispensation of the grace of God, deals with the unsearchable riches of Christ, and these tribulations which are for you, are ‘your glory’. So with these words this most blessed parenthesis comes back to its starting point:

- A | iii. 1. FOR THIS CAUSE.
- B | 1. The Prisoner of Christ Jesus FOR YOU.
- C | 2-12. The wonder of this dispensation thus entrusted.
- B | 13. My tribulations are FOR YOU.
- A | 14. FOR THIS CAUSE.

We are therefore ready to follow the prayer with which chapter iii. ends, and realize its relationship with the closing verse of chapter ii., rejoicing meanwhile that the Apostle was compelled to make so illuminating a detour as that which has occupied our worshipping attention for these eleven articles on Eph. iii. 1-13.

**No.65. The Seven-fold Doctrinal Section seen as a whole.
pp. 121 - 123**

The reader who has followed this series of studies so far will need no explanation of the many allusions to a great building. We have followed our guide through the seven chambers of doctrinal truth, and now stand at the foot of the central tower which represents the prayer of Eph. iii. 14-21 and occupies a central position between the seven sections of doctrine and the seven sections of practice. Before ascending this tower, our guide pauses to draw our attention to a stained glass window, and we observe that it is in reality a symbolical representation of the sevenfold correspondence which is observable upon the study of the doctrinal section as a whole. The reader will see that we have attempted to display this correspondence below, and believe that if each item is compared, fuller light will be forthcoming. This detailed examination we have ourselves made, but we can here only give the actual references, trusting that the reader may be sufficiently interested to take them and the several correspondencies, and pursue the study of their bearing upon one another more fully than we hope to do here.

We have already seen that there is a close correspondence between the seven sections of doctrine which occupy Eph. i. 3 - iii. 13 and the seven sections of practice that occupy chapters iv.-vi., but this is not the only set of correspondencies clearly indicated in this great epistles. If we take the seven doctrinal sections and consider them as a whole, and unrelated to the practical portion, we shall still find that this law of correspondence holds good. In the drawing of the window of the chart which follows, we have not attempted any detail; this we now supply.

**- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - -
(BE-XLI.122).**

Eph. i. 1, 2			
SAINTS		FAITHFUL	
Eph. i. 3 – 14		Eph. iii. 1 – 13	
Dispensation—Fullness 10	i.	Dispensation of Grace and Mystery	iii. 2, 9
Mystery of Will	i. 9	Mystery of Christ	iii. 3, 4
Purpose of Him	i. 11	Purpose of the ages	iii. 11
All things	i. 10	All things	iii. 9
Before overthrow, chosen	i. 4	Since the ages, hid	iii. 9
Gospel of salvation	i. 13	Gospel, promise of	iii. 6
Riches of grace	i. 7	Riches, unsearchable	iii. 8
Heavenlies, blessings	i. 3	Heavenlies, principalities and powers	iii. 10
Inheritance	i. 11	Heirs—fellow	iii. 6
Wisdom, prudence	i. 8	Wisdom manifold	iii. 10
Make know mystery	i. 9	Make all see Mystery	iii. 9
Eph. i. 15 - 19-		Eph. ii. -19 - 22	
Saints' inheritance	i. 18	Saints. Fellow-citizens	ii. 19
Prayer threefold	i. 18, 19	Together threefold	ii. 19-22
His inheritance	i. 18	Habitation of God	ii. 22
Eph. i. -19 - ii. 7		Eph. ii. 11 - 19-	
Time past walk	ii. 2, 3	Time past Gentiles	ii. 11
Trespases and sins	ii. 1	Far off—nigh	ii. 13
Death and life	ii. 5	Distance and nearness	ii. 13
World walk	ii. 2	World sphere	ii. 12
Flesh desires	ii. 3	Flesh condition	ii. 11
But God	ii. 4	But now	ii. 13
Together raised	ii. 6	Both one, New man	ii. 15
Seated in heavenlies	ii. 6	Middle wall, access	ii. 14, 18
Wrath	ii. 3	Aliens	ii. 12
Body church	i. 22, 23	Body reconciled	ii. 16
Eph. ii. 8 - 10			
BY GRACE ARE YE SAVED			

As an example of the value of this comparison of passages, we observe that there are three references to the word 'dispensation', one in the first panel and two in the second. This enables us to see that the dispensation of the fullness of the seasons need not be a title of the yet future day of glory; it can well be another title of the present dispensation of the Mystery. We must however be prepared to follow our guide, and he appears to be about to ascend the first flight of stairs in the ascent of the central tower. This window will be there at the foot whenever we may wish to ponder its pattern and arrangement; and so, in our next article we commence the study of the central prayer, Eph. iii. 14-21.

No.66. The Central Tower (iii. 14 - 21).

“What is the breadth, length, depth and height.”
pp. 141 - 144

The habitation of Eph. ii. 19-22 supplies the figure already considered, the dwelling of Christ in the heart by faith. It will be remembered that the Apostle had no hesitation in blending the figure of building and growing in the earlier section “In Whom all the building fitly framed together groweth” (Eph. ii. 21), which growth is seen in the parallel to be the growth of the ‘Body’. “May grow up unto Him the whole body fitly joined together unto the edifying (upbuilding) of itself in love” (Eph. iv. 15, 16). So, in the prayer before us, the Apostle blends together the two figures ‘That ye being rooted and grounded in love’. The same double figure meets us in Col. ii. 7 “Rooted and built up in Him”. *Rhiza* ‘root’ is well known as an English equivalent of ‘root’, there being at least forty-five words, mostly scientific, which use the word *rhiza*. Gardeners are familiar with roots called *rhizome*, such as those of the ‘flag’ or iris. In the N.T. the ‘root’ is closely related to growth and fruit, ‘Because they had no root they withered away’ (Matt. xiii. 6), and of cause or origin “The love of money is (a) root of all evil” (I Tim. vi. 10). Before speaking of the soil in which the believer is considered to be ‘rooted’, the Apostle adds the word ‘grounded’, the Greek *themelios*. Just as the figure of growth is borrowed from Eph. ii. 19-22, so is the word ‘grounded’ for the word ‘foundation’ in Eph. ii. 20 is the Greek *themelion*. There are but six occurrences of *themelios* ‘to be grounded’ or ‘founded’ namely (Matt. vii. 25; Luke vi. 48; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 23; Heb. i. 10 and I Pet. v. 10). The usage ranges from laying the foundation of the earth to the settling and stablishing of the believer. In passing we observe that the word ‘foundation’ does not occur in Eph. i. 4. The parallel to Eph. iii. 17 in Col. ii. 7 should be compared with Col. i. 23. According to these passages, to be grounded is to continue in the faith, and not to be moved away from the hope of the gospel.

The reader will probably have recognized ‘these three’ so often brought together in the witness of Paul. ‘Faith’ and ‘love’ are found in Eph. iii. 17, ‘faith’ and ‘hope’ in Col. i. 23. In the prayer before us, Paul does not speak of being rooted or grounded in either faith or hope; these form a subject of the prayer of the first chapter. Here love is uppermost, ‘rooted and grounded in love’, and this leads on to the comprehension of the love of Christ, which in reality passeth knowledge. Before reference is made to the love of Christ, the Apostle introduces ‘breadth, length, depth and height’. Many and varied have been the explanations offered by writers of all periods of these words. Some saw in them the outspread arms of the cross, combined with the humiliation and exaltation connected with it. Others see a reference to the temple of Diana at Ephesus, which was one of the seven wonders of the world, and combined with this a reference back to the temple already mentioned in Eph. ii. 21. Yet again we may see in these four dimensions the peculiar character of the dispensation of the Mystery, stretching back as it does to before the foundation of the world, ascending up far above all, embracing the far off Gentile, and looking forward to the ages to come. Yet when all these explanations have

been given, we come back to this prayer and ask what is the purpose of this petition? How does it fit in with the intention of the epistle as a whole? Can we relate it to the expressed desires of the Apostle in connection with his peculiar ministry, and what is the testimony of the Scriptures themselves to breadth, length, depth and height? Let us begin with this inquiry, and consider the way in which these terms are employed elsewhere.

Platos the Greek word translated 'breadth' occurs elsewhere only in Rev. xx. 9 and xxi. 16. "The breadth of the earth", 'the breadth of the Holy City'.

Mekos the Greek word translated 'length' occurs elsewhere only in Rev. xxi. 16, where it is also used of the Holy City. This fact must surely be taken into consideration when we seek an explanation of the Apostle's purpose.

Bathos 'depth', occurs nine times in the N.T. It is used of the deepness of the soil for seed sowing (Matt. xiii. 5; Mark iv. 5); for the sea (Luke v. 4); for the deep things of God and of Satan (Rom. xi. 33; I Cor. ii. 10; Rev. ii. 24); for the depth of the poverty of the Corinthians (II Cor. viii. 2) and for the reference Rom. viii. 39 "Nor height nor depth" which were among the many things that, though formidable, could never separate from the love of God.

Hupsos 'height'. This word is used of the heavenly Jerusalem in Rev. xxi. 16 and the supreme glory of the Ascended Saviour in Eph. iv. 8. Elsewhere it is translated 'on high' (Luke i. 78; xxiv. 49) and 'exalted' (James i. 9). What emerges from this comparison is the fact that the Revelation uses three of these words to describe the Holy City, the heavenly Jerusalem, omitting 'the depth'. When we turn to the O.T., we find the word breadth used:

- (1) For the breadth of the Ark (Gen. vi. 15).
- (2) For the breadth of the land of promise (Gen. xiii. 17).
- (3) For the breadth of the furniture and building of the Tabernacle and Temple.

Length is also used for the Ark, for the land of promise, and for the furniture and buildings of the Tabernacle and the Temple. Depth does not appear to have been used in the O.T. either of the land or of the Tabernacle and Temple. Height is used of the Ark, of the land, and again of the Tabernacle and Temple. In addition, depth and height are used of God and His ways as contrasted with those of man. These we must consider separately. What does emerge from this comparison of terms is the following fact:

- (1) The earthly inheritance promised to Abraham is defined by two measurements only "The breadth and the length".
- (2) The heavenly city, the new Jerusalem, the heavenly side of Abraham's inheritance, is defined by 'breadth, length and height', three measurements.
- (3) The inheritance of the Mystery appears to have been in the Apostle's mind when he spoke of 'breadth, length, depth and height', four dimensions, and so something 'spiritual' and not associated or confined by the limitations of our present three dimensional existence. Philosophers speak of 'the fourth dimensions', but for all practical purposes we live in a world of three dimensions: breadth, length, height.

These items, supplied by the Scriptures themselves, wonderfully confirm the teaching given elsewhere of “Three spheres of blessing”, namely (1) The Land, (2) The heavenly City, (3) The position far above all. This leaves the two ‘depth and height’ to be considered, for their usage is wider than ‘breadth and length’ and so must embrace something more. The Apostle forces us to give attention to them in Eph. iv. 9, 10, breaking into the narrative by saying:

“Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.”

A similar employment of the figure of ascending into heaven and descending into the deep is found in Rom. x. 6, 7. According to Prov. xxv. 3 “The heaven (is) for height, and the earth (is) for depth”, with a context that indicates the unsearchable nature of these spheres. Is it too much to believe that, in this reference to ‘what is the depth and height’, the Apostle also had in view those riches which were unsearchable? Height and depth moreover speak of possible spiritual foes (Rom. viii. 38, 39) with whom are associated ‘principalities and powers’, but which can never separate the believer from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus. Before considering this mighty theme we must pause to observe that the breadth, and length, and depth and height, can only be comprehended ‘with all saints’. What does this mean? Why should the comprehending of these demand the fellowship of the saints? In the first prayer of Eph. i. 15-19 Paul makes his basis the love that the Ephesians had ‘unto all the saints’, here he suggests that knowledge and comprehension of the holy mysteries implied in breadth, length, depth and height would be veiled to all but those who were not only ‘one Body’, but who had access ‘in one Spirit’ and who endeavour to keep the unity in the bond of peace.

In earlier writings particularly those epistles to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews, he had shown the evil effect of divisions, and of their connection with immature growth and dullness of hearing. It would appear that it is useless to profess to be a member of the One Body, and yet fail to act as part of a unity. Had the Apostle not been assured of the Ephesians, ‘love unto all the saints’, he would not have been able to pray that they might know what is the hope of His calling, or the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints. So here, we cannot truly comprehend the wonders of the high calling of this third sphere, and be indifferent to the unity which is its one and only earthly manifestation. The concluding words of this section ‘and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge’, seem to envisage in concrete form the vaguer statement covering depth and height.

“Which passeth knowledge.” In this expression we find the Greek word *hyperballo* which occurs in Ephesians three times.

“What is the *exceeding* greatness of His power to usward” (Eph. i. 19).

“That He might show the *exceeding* riches of His grace toward us” (ii. 7).

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

We go from the power of His resurrection to the riches of His grace, and on to the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. “To know that which passeth knowledge”

sounds like a contradiction. That is because the subject transcends all human thought. We are here in the realm of the superlative. It is the same in Philippians. There a peace is spoken of, a peace that can be experienced, and yet when all is said it remains a peace ‘that passeth understanding’ (Phil. iv. 7) or as Weymouth renders it ‘which transcends our powers of thought’. Christ Himself is God’s “Unspeakable Gift”, yet who can refrain from speaking of Him? Christ’s love is beyond our comprehension, yet throughout life’s present pilgrimage, and on through the ages to come, that love, which passeth knowledge, must surely be the goal of all attainment. Let us then seek the apparently impossible, ‘to know the love of Christ that passeth knowledge’, for we are heirs of glory beyond the dreams of man.

No.67. The Central Tower (iii. 14 - 21).

The Great Doxology. The Triumphant “Amen”. pp. 161 - 166

The third and final stage of the central prayer of Eph. iii. is now before us; it is the climax petition ‘that ye may be filled with all the fullness of God’. There is no intention on the part of the Apostle to suggest that any one believer or all put together could *contain* ‘all the fullness’ of God, what the Apostle said was *hina plerothete eis pan to pleroma tou theou*, “In order that ye may be filled unto all the fullness of God”. ‘Unto’ indicates a goal or a standard. The members of the One Body differ in capacity; some are grace enabled to contain more than another. The point however is not the *size* of the vessel, but that no vessel should remain only partly filled whatever the capacity; it should *be filled to the brim*. From the doctrinal and basic point of view this is looked upon as an accomplished fact, for this church is actually called ‘The fullness of Him that filleth all in all’. Using similar words as those found in Eph. iii. 17, the Apostle wrote to the Colossians:

“Rooted and built up in Him In Him dwelleth (*katoikeo* as in Eph. iii. 17) all the fullness (*pan to pleroma* as in Eph. iii. 19) and ye are those having been filled to the full (*pepleromenoi*) in Him” (Col. ii. 7-10).

Here every member is conceived of as being ‘filled *unto* all the fullness of God’. In Eph. iii., this same full measure is the object of prayer. The Apostle is working along similar lines to those which led to this prayer in the first place. It will be remembered that, at the close of chapter ii. of Ephesians, there is a reference made to the ‘habitation’ of God (or of Christ—Revised texts), and as a consequence Paul prayed that what the believer is in grace, in Christ and in position, he may be in experience, in realization and in enjoyment ‘in order that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith’. So even now this church of the One Body has already been given its ultimate title “The fullness of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23). Is it any marvel then that in such a prayer the Apostle should intercede and pray that members of such a company and calling, with such a title

and destiny, might be ‘filled UP TO all the fullness of God’? Whether looked at in Christ Himself for in the church itself this fullness resides ‘bodily’—it is the Divinely appointed vehicle of manifestation, and if the believer fails to respond, so far, on the experimental plane, will not the manifestation of the Divine fullness be hindered? This matter of the fullness is so vast that no attempt will be made to deal with it here. Some attention has been paid to the theme both in a series of articles now commencing in *The Berean Expositor* and already published in the *Alphabetical Analysis* under the heading *The Pleroma*. There we realize that the term covers the purpose of the ages, and that no other company of the redeemed occupy so exalted a position in this purpose as ‘the church which is His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all’. With this third petition, the prayer of Eph. iii. reaches its summit, Paul like David could say, the prayers of Paul the apostle ‘are ended’. Only the doxology remains, and in that doxology we shall find gathered expressions that will indicate some further associations in the glory of this highly favoured church. These doxologies that appear in the epistles of Paul, were no mere ejaculations that, while being genuine expressions of praise and worship, submit to no analysis and need not be given too serious a consideration. They form a part of all Scripture and have their place just as much as any purely doctrinal, dispensational or practical affirmation. The order of Paul’s epistles may never be satisfactorily settled so far as the exact place of each individual epistle is concerned, but there is practical unanimity regarding the chronological order of those epistles which contain doxologies, and so set them out as follows:

- “Blessed be God Who comforteth us.” (II Cor. i. 3, 4).
- “God blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.” (II Cor. xi. 31).
- “The Creator, Who is blessed for ever.” (Rom. i. 25).
- “Christ, Who is over all, God blessed for ever.” (Rom. ix. 5).
- “For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: To Whom be glory for ever. Amen.” (Rom. xi. 33-36).
- “To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen.” (Rom. xvi. 27).
- “Blessed be God Who hath blessed us.” (Eph. i. 3).
- “Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all generations, world without end. Amen.” (Eph. iii. 21).
- “Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.” (I Tim. i. 17).
- “King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, Who only hath immortality Whom no man can see, to Whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.” (I Tim. vi. 15, 16).

We have not listed the occasions when the Apostle breaks his narrative to say “I thank God” or some such expression, but the following passages should be noted (Rom. i. 8; vii. 25; I Cor. i. 4, 14; xiv. 18; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3, 12; iii. 17; I Thess. i. 2; ii. 13; II Thess. i. 3; Philemon 4). It will be discovered that a careful examination of these ten doxologies gather up into themselves much of the doctrine that precedes or follows them, and one example here must suffice. The central feature of I Timothy is the “Mystery of Godliness”. God *manifest* in the flesh seen of angels. The doxologies of chapters i. and vi. emphasize among other things (1) God’s “invisibility”, (2) that what is attributed in chapter i. to “God” is attributed in chapter vi. to Christ, for He is “King of kings and Lord of lords”. The following abbreviated structure may exhibit the relationship of these two doxologies to the teaching of the epistle as a whole.

I Timothy.

- A | i. 1, 2. Salutation.
- B | i. 3-20. *Hetero didaskaleo*, “Teach no other doctrine” (i. 3).
Committed to trust (i. 11).
The Doxology.
The King, incorruptible, invisible (i. 17).
Shipwreck (i. 19).
- C | ii. 1-7. The salvation of all men (ii. 4).
- D | ii. 8 - iii. 15-. I hope to come (iii. 14).
- E | iii. -15, 16. MYSTERY *God Manifest*.
- E | iv. 1-8. APOSTACY *Demons*.
- C | iv. 9-12. The Saviour of all men (iv. 10).
- D | iv. 13 - vi. 2. Till I come (iv. 13).
- B | vi. 3-20. *Hetero didaskaleo*, “Teach otherwise” (vi. 3).
Committed to trust (vi. 20).
The Doxology.
King, immortal, unseen (vi. 15, 16).
Drown (vi. 9).
- A | vi. 21. Salutation.

We return therefore to the closing doxology of Eph. iii. with the assurance that the phraseology used, however exultant, was under the superintendence of the Spirit Who inspired all Scripture. Let us attempt a more literal rendering than is found in the A.V. which while not readable enough to be a substitute, will throw into prominence essential features.

“Now to Him Who is of power (*dunameno*) above all things to do above what we ask or think, according to the power (*dunamin*) that inworketh (*energoumenen*) in us, to Him be the glory in the church in Christ Jesus, unto all the generations of the ages of the ages. Amen.”

It will be perceived that ‘power’ is brought over from the body of the prayer, once translated in the A.V. ‘to be able’ which is correct, and once translated ‘power’. This we have enforced by translating *dunameno* ‘to be of power’. The word translated in the A.V. ‘worketh’ is the Greek *energeo* our word ‘energize’, which comes in the earlier prayer of Eph. i. 19, 20. This ‘power that worketh in us’ is moreover very pointedly contrasted with Eph. ii. 2, where another force is seen at work “The Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience”. This reference in Eph. ii. takes on a deeper significance when we realize that it is aligned with the ‘answering’ of our prayers, for that surely is travestied by the blinding and undoing of the children of disobedience, in the ‘fulfilling’ of the desires of such.

The special note of time with which the doxology ends is unique. No other doxology envisages ‘the generations’ of the ages to come. The Prison Epistles speak of:

(1) Generations past.

“Ages” or literally ‘generations’ past, to which the truth of the mystery of Christ was not so clearly revealed as it is now (Eph. iii. 5). The Mystery itself (as distinct from the ever unfolding mystery of Christ) had been ‘hid’ (not gradually revealed) both from the ‘ages’ and from the ‘generations’ (Col. i. 26).

(2) The present generation.

In the midst of a crooked and perverse ‘generation’ among whom the church shines as a light in the world (Phil. ii. 15).

(3) The future generation.

“To Him be glory in the church, in Christ Jesus, unto all the generations of the age of the ages” (Eph. iii. 21).

The epistles contain but one other occurrence of *genea* and that refers back to Israel in the wilderness (Heb. iii. 10) and so is distinct from those spoken of in the epistles of the Mystery, as we should expect. It is evident that these future generations are placed in contrast with the past and the present. In contrast with the past, they will be to the glory of God in two capacities, (1) in the church, (2) in Christ Jesus, and these two echo the two mysteries, “the Mystery of Christ” only partly revealed in generations past, and “the Mystery” itself which had been hidden from ages and generations. This points to the fact that ‘glory’ is associated both with ‘knowledge’ and with ‘fullness’ as may be seen in prophecies of other spheres, for example:

“The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea” (Hab. ii. 14).

“His glory is the fullness of the whole earth” (Isa. vi. 3 margin).

The generation that shall glorify the Lord is the generation that knows Him, a generation in contrast with all those from whom the truth of the Mystery had been hidden. It will be also a generation in blessed contrast with the wicked and perverse generation that alas is the description of the world in which the revelation of the Mystery was given. The subject for which the Apostle prayed both in Eph. i. and iii. demand something more than ordinary grace and power for their realization. Paul associates them with the mighty power that raised Christ from the dead and set Him at the right hand on high; he contrasts it with the spiritual energy that works its will in the wicked and perverse generation that knows not God.

The reader has already been informed that the word ‘exceeding’ of Eph. i. 9; ii. 7 and ‘which passeth’ of Eph. iii. 19 is the Greek *hyperballo*, and it would be natural to believe that in verse 20 the word ‘exceeding’ will be one more occurrence of *hyperballo*. This however is not so. *Hyper* comes twice, translated in the A.V. ‘above’ and together with other words ‘exceeding abundantly’ but the word *hyperballo* is not used. Instead we have the phrase *hyper ek perissou*. The word *perissos* is a form of the preposition *peri* ‘concerning’, ‘about’ and in combination expresses ‘beyond’, possibly because that which surrounds a thing lies beyond the thing itself. We have *perisseuo* ‘to exceed’ (Rom. v. 15), *perisseia* ‘abundance’ (Rom. v. 17), *perissos* ‘exceeding’ (Rom. iii. 1

‘advantage’), *perissoteros* ‘more abundantly’ (Gal. i. 14). The fact that the A.V. translates *perisseia* ‘superfluity’ (James i. 21) shows that it ranks with the words *hyperbole* and *hyperballo* as a word indicating excess, even to the extravagance were not God Himself and all His resources the pledge of fulfillment. As one looks back over the revelation that has been given in these three chapters of Ephesians, the heart may well quail at the prospect of rising to any level of appreciation or approximation, but this the Apostle answers by pointing a way to God Himself as One Who is able to do ‘exceeding abundantly’.

Eph. i. 3 opened our study with the words “Blessed be God”. Eph. iii. 21 concludes our study with this marvelous doxology, and here the doctrinal portion of this mighty epistle reaches its utmost limit. The fullness of God as expressed in the love of Christ fills all breadth, length, depth and height. All that lies beyond is not a matter of present revelation, and therefore cannot form part of present Christian doctrine. We can end on one note only, a note of thanksgiving and of praise. It is fitting that a section which opens with a benediction “Blessed be God Who hath blessed us” should close with a doxology “Now unto Him be glory”. We shall appreciate this sublime doxology the better if we observe that it falls into three parts:

- (1) Him to Whom the praise is given.
- (2) The medium through which this praise will be offered.
- (3) The duration of this adoration.

“Now unto Him Who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.” This is the character of the One to Whom such a prayer as that of Eph. iii. can alone be made. Here we learn that even when we breathe these inspired petitions, we shall not apprehend one half of the magnitude of our request. God however does not limit our praying or His answers to our apprehension. He is able to exceed all our asking and all our thinking, and one of the reasons may be suggested in the next clause, “According to the power that worketh in use”.

In the opening of the prayer the limitless source of supply is revealed—“According to the riches of His glory”. In the doxology the equally limitless power that answers these requests is made known.

What is this mighty power that works both in us and that moves the very arm of God? It is presupposed that the teaching of Eph. i. will have been grasped before the teaching of Eph. iii. is reached, In that early chapter the Apostle prayed that we may know:

“What is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe, according to the inworking of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead far above all Head over all things to the church the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.”

The power that *answers the prayer* of Eph. iii., is the power that *raised Christ from the dead*, that placed Him at the right hand of God, that put all things under His feet.

It is understandable that one may say ‘I do not *feel* this mighty power’; ‘Should I not be *conscious* of it if such a power was associated with my Christian life?’ In chapter ii. we read that the unsaved are energized by a mighty spiritual power, yet at the same time such walk according to the age of this world, that is, they are just ordinary people. They fulfil their own desires, and are certainly not conscious they are being inwrought by the spirit of the Prince of the power of the air. In the same way, we who now seek to walk worthy of our high calling, who seek to fulfil the will of God, who are guided by His written Word, we are not always conscious of the power that alone makes such an effort possible or acceptable.

The doxology that has been interrupted by this testimony to the mighty power that is related to its prayer is resumed by the repetition of the words ‘Unto Him’.

“Unto Him be glory by the church and by Christ Jesus.”

A little previously the Apostle had written that through the church heavenly beings were learning the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 10), and in chapter ii. 7 he reveals that this church when raised and seated in the heavenlies will show in the ages to come God’s exceeding riches of grace in His kindness toward them in Christ Jesus.

What we may do *now* in our small measure ‘whether we eat or drink or whatsoever we do’, we shall do *then* in a fuller degree. This is indeed ‘fullness’. It will be so for the very earth itself. The marginal reading of Isa. vi. 3 being:

“His glory is the fullness of the whole earth.”

When heaven and earth are united and the great dwelling of God is at last complete, Psa. xxix. 9 will be fulfilled ‘Every whit of it uttereth glory’.

“For all the generations of the age of the ages.”

What this statement indicates is perhaps beyond our present abilities to grasp. When we read “A Hebrew of the Hebrews” or a “Pharisee of the Pharisees” we know that we are reading of something superlative. So here this represents the climax and crown of time.

In Gen. ii. 4 we read of the ‘generation of the heaven and earth’, a history which takes Gen. ii. 5 to iv. 26 to unfold. Within this short compass Sin, Death, Curse. The Two seeds and finally Seth are introduced. Here in Ephesians is the glorious opposite. Sin and death will be unknown: no curse will ever fall. The false seed will have been gathered and removed as the tares are, and God will be all in all.

No.68. The Practical Section (iv. - vi.).

“Worthy” (iv. 1).

pp. 181 - 183

There is scarcely anything more important and in need of more emphasis and repetition than that doctrine must ever be accompanied by practice, that walk must correspond with calling, that visible fruit must manifest the hidden root. This correspondence of doctrine and practice is most happily displayed in the Epistle to the Ephesians. It naturally divides into its two main sections—the first three chapters containing the great revelation, the second three chapters the resulting exhortation. Take a few instances by way of illustration. To see the whole would necessitate a most detailed structure of the epistle.

DOCTRINE (i. - iii.)	PRACTRICE (iv. - vi.)
The power of His might and the principalities and powers (i. 19-23). <i>This shows our doctrinal position and sphere of spiritual blessings.</i>	The power of His might and the evil principalities and powers (vi. 10-17). <i>This shows the corresponding conflict and spiritual foes.</i>
The old walk—“the world” (ii. 2).	The old walk—“vanity of mind”; “uncleanness”; “darkness”; “as fools”.
The new walk—“new creation” (ii. 10).	The new walk—“lowliness of mind”; “in love”; “as light”; “circumspectly”.
The new creation—The new man (ii. 10-15).	The old man—put off. The new man—put on (iv. 22-32).
The Temple—“fitly framed together” (ii. 19-22).	The Body—“fitly joined together” (iv. 7-16). <i>Its present manifestation.</i>

These examples will suffice for the moment. What a stimulus we receive to unity when we see that the exhortation to be ‘fitly joined together’ as members of the one Body is but a temporal and corporal expression of the higher and fuller unity of the Temple so marvelously ‘fitly framed together’.

Or again, it is not enough that we should learn the doctrine of the new creation and the new man; it must have some result. The old man with his ‘former conversation’ (iv. 22) and ‘with his deeds’ (Col. iii. 9) must be put off, otherwise the glorious doctrine remains without life. The exalted position of the believer in the ascended Lord—“far above all”—brings him into conflict with ‘principalities and powers’ that are associated with evil. The mighty power that raised Christ from the dead is the power in which alone each member of the Body can hope to overcome these spiritual foes. All this and more is expressed in the one word of Eph. iv. 1, “Walk worthy”. The word ‘worthy’ (*axios*):

“refers to a pair of scales in which, when the weights on each side are *equal*, they bring or draw down (*axiouse*) the beam to a level or horizontal position” (Parkhurst).

What a wonderful thought this is. Let us think of the balances. On the one scale all the blessings, the riches, the glories of our calling as revealed in Eph. i.-iii.; on the other scale the walk that should balance these blessings, these riches, these glories, the walk that brings the beam of the balance to the horizontal, the walk that is ‘worthy of the calling’. There is a sense of comparison in the word. In Rom. viii. 18 the Apostle says that:

“the sufferings of the present time are *unworthy of comparison* (*ouk axia*) with the glory about to be revealed in us.”

The first occurrence of the word *axios* in the LXX is suggestive of the idea of something ‘equivalent’. Abraham, when negotiating the purchase of the cave of Machpelah, said:

“for as much money as it is worth he shall give it me” (Gen. xxiii. 9).

The Hebrew is given in the margin ‘full money’, the Greek version being *argurion axion*. This was ‘weighed in the balances’ to the last shekel of the 400 as we see in verse 16. This same sense is felt in Job xi. 6:

“God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth.”

Here again the LXX uses *axios*. The idea of comparison is seen in Prov. iii. 15 ‘not to be *compared* with her’. Such is the word that Paul uses at the opening of his exhortation, “Walk *worthy*”. Walk so that there may be a comparison between doctrine and practice.

The word *axios* is an adverb, and standing alone would be translated ‘worthily’, but the word does not stand alone in any of its occurrences in the N.T.; it is always followed by such an expression as ‘of the Lord’, ‘of the calling’, ‘of the gospel’. “Worthy of the Lord” must be taken as an adverbial phrase. “As becometh saints” (Rom. xvi. 2) is literally ‘worthy of saints’. “After a godly sort” (III John 6) is literally ‘worthy of God’. The word *axios* comes three times in the Prison epistles, and in each case it is associated either with the calling, the gospel, or the Lord. We are not allowed to think merely of the walk, not merely of walking worthily, not simply to be studying our walk as such, but ever to think of the walk as it is related to something higher and nobler than ourselves.

In Eph. iv. 1 we have “walk worthy of *the calling*”.
In Phil. i. 27 “manner of life worthy of *the gospel*”.
In Col. i. 10 “walk worthy of *the Lord*”.

How it must influence us if we but remember that in the one scale of the balance is our calling, the gospel, yea, even the Lord Himself. What a walk that must be therefore that shall be ‘worthy’.

The word 'walk' occurs in the epistle seven times, and therefore bears the hall-mark of Divine emphasis:

- A | ii. 2. Walk according to (*kata*) world.
- B | ii. 10. Good works,
iv. 1. Worthy of calling.
- A | iv. 17. Walk as (*kathos*) Gentiles.
- B | v. 2. In love.
v. 8. As light.
v. 15. Circumspectly.

The negative is grouped under "A", the positive under "B". We need both. We need to be warned of that walk which is according to *the age of this world*, of that walk which partakes of the characteristics of those conditions we have left behind. We are exhorted to remember that we were once *Gentiles* in the *flesh*, and in the *world* (ii. 11, 12), and to see to it that our walk shall not be in accord with either of these.

Let us once again be permitted to bring before the mind's eye the *balances*, as we repeat the exhortation "Walk worthy".

No.69. The Practical Section (iv. - vi.).
The Walk and the calling (iv. 1).
pp. 201 - 203

It will be noticed that, when referring to himself as the 'prisoner' in iii. 1, the Apostle calls himself "The prisoner of *Christ Jesus*" (R.V.), but that in chapter iv. he styles himself "the prisoner of the Lord". These titles are not used at random. "Christ Jesus" speaks of the ascended and risen Saviour in Whom we find our acceptance, our ground of blessing, our hope of glory. "Lord" speaks of our relationship with Him in the practical sphere.

"Ye call Me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet the servant is not greater than his Lord" (John xiii. 13-16).

In the A.V. of this epistle the title "Lord", standing alone, occurs 16 times. Of this number only one occurrence is found in the three doctrinal chapters (ii. 21, "An holy temple in the Lord"). The remaining 15 occurrences are all found in the three practical chapters.

- The prisoner of the Lord, beseeches the saints to walk worthy (iv. 1).
- The unity of the Spirit gathers around the one Lord as its centre (iv. 5).
- Paul testifies in the Lord that the saints do not henceforth walk as the Gentiles (iv. 17).
- As light in the Lord, the believer should walk as child of light (v. 8).

Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord (v. 10),

and so through the whole series.

“In Christ” expresses our doctrinal position, our standing.

“In the Lord” indicates our practical relationship, our state.

I may address a fellow believer as a dear brother “in Christ” far more freely than I call him a brother “in the Lord”. This distinction must be remembered when applying the teaching of I Cor. vii. 39:

“She is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only IN THE LORD.”

This limitation means much more than that marriage should not be contemplated as between a saved and an unsaved person. Many an unhappy and profitless marriage has been contracted by two children of God. The trouble has arisen from the fact that though they have been one ‘in Christ’, they have not been one ‘in the Lord’. They did not seek the same thing, they did not believe or practice the same thing. Their callings may have differed, and division and bitterness have often been the result. The Apostle was a prisoner not only of Christ Jesus, but of the Lord. As such he could exhort those who recognized the same Lord to walk worthy of their calling, and later, exhort them to consider his own walk as a pattern.

The theme of chapter iv. may be discovered by noticing the way in which he returns to his subject. First he speaks of the walk positively, as worthy of the calling, with all humility of mind. Then, after a long digression concerning the unity of the Spirit, he returns to the walk, this time speaking negatively—not as Gentiles, in the vanity of their mind. This again is followed by teaching concerning the new man. It will be more apparent if set out thus:

Ephesians iv. 1 - 32.

A | 1, 2. The walk, positively. Humility of mind.

B | 3-16. The One Body.

A | 17-19. The walk, negatively. Vanity of mind.

B | 20-32. The New Man.

This division of the subject brings to light an important truth. By omitting the parenthesis of iii. 2-13 we realize that the great prayer of iii. 14-21 arises directly out of the fact that the Church of the One Body is the Temple of the Lord. The Apostle’s “I therefore” of iv. 1 links the One Body on to the Temple, indicating that the Body aspect is the outward (and perhaps only temporal) manifestation of the real and lasting Temple character.

Now, we see further by the analysis of chapter iv., that the One Body is also a reflection of the New Man. This is confirmed by a reference back to chapter ii. 15, “For to create in Himself of twain one new man”. No doctrine of Scripture is isolated. All is part of the great purpose of the ages. While we must ever seek rightly to divide the Word

of truth, we must remember that, within the dispensational section to which we belong, our faith is one, our hope is one, our Lord is one.

The walk of the believer appears to be presented as having a threefold relationship in the opening exhortation:

	Worthy of calling.
TO WALK	With all lowliness, etc.
	Endeavouring to keep the unity, etc.

Let us consider this order. Is it possible to reverse it without involving ourselves in trouble and disappointment? Let us see. Suppose we attempt to keep the unity of the Spirit without the necessary humility, forbearance and long suffering! The result will be sectarian harshness, the puffing up of some few stronger minds and the crushing of the weak. How shall the graces of humility, meekness, forbearance and long-suffering be encouraged? We are driven to the inspired order; these qualities will thrive and grow as we seek to walk worthy of our calling. As we realize the marvelous grace that has been manifested to ourselves, so we shall in our turn be the better able to manifest that grace to others. We assume that all our readers know that the word 'vocation' of Eph. iv. 1 is simply the word 'calling'. The calling of believers during the Acts differed in many essentials from that of the prison ministry of Paul. In one sense, at least, it would be the same, and we may take to ourselves the words of I Cor. i. 26-29:

“For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; THAT NO FLESH SHOULD GLORY IN HIS PRESENCE.”

These words may well throw us back to Eph. ii. 11, 12 where we are urged to remember:

“That ye were Gentiles, without Christ, aliens strangers having no hope, and without God in the world.”

To remember this will certainly make humility of mind, long-suffering, and forbearance, far more possible than if it is forgotten. While a wholesome 'remembrance' has a gracious effect upon our walk, there is, from another aspect, an equally important 'forgetfulness':

“Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, according to a mark, I press toward the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing” (Phil. iii. 13-16).

So whether we look back to the pit from which we have been delivered, or look onward to the glories that stretch out ahead, whether we 'remember' in the one sense or

‘forget’ in the other, our walk must be the meeker, and the lowlier for it. Then think of the humbling effect of such a passage as this:

“Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of His goodness, and the work of faith with power: that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you” (II Thess. i. 11, 12).

Finally, what an effect upon our walk and our attitude to others such a passage as II Tim. i. 19 should have:

“Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the age times.”

Let us remember our calling, and seeing its grace and its glory, seek to walk worthy of it “*that the name of the Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified*”.

No.70. The Practical Section (iv. - vi.).
The Walk and its Characteristics (iv. 2).
pp. 221 - 223

A frame of mind, a spiritual graciousness, is necessary before it is possible to attempt to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of the peace.

“With all lowliness, and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love” (Eph. iv. 2).

The word ‘lowliness’ is better rendered ‘humility of mind’, which brings out more clearly the contrast of verse 17, “vanity of mind”. This word is so translated in Acts xx. 19, where the Apostle says:

“Serving the Lord with all humility of mind.”

We can imagine that some, nay many, if they had received the calling and commission of the Apostle Paul, would have displayed arrogance of mind, haughtiness, a temper that would not brook denial or misrepresentation. If we would understand the causes that combined together to make the change from Saul the Pharisee, ‘breathing out threatenings and slaughter’, to the humble, despised, faithful bond-servant of Christ, we must follow his steps as recorded in the Acts and the Epistles, and realize that only a close fellowship with the Son of God makes such a change either possible or permanent. Unity without humility is hopelessly impossible.

Against such, continues the Scripture, there is no law. The ‘touch not, taste, not, handle not’ of Col. ii. is a sure sign of the false humility. This spirit of meekness ever looks back to our state by nature and our liability to fall.

“Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; *considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted*” (Gal. vi. 1).

Meekness must go hand in hand with authority and teaching.

“In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth” (II Tim. ii. 25).

Moses, whose position raised him infinitely above his fellows, with whom God spoke face to face, is recorded as being ‘very meek above the all the men which were on the face of the earth’ (Numb. xii. 3). If Moses was meek, if Paul was meek, yea, if the Lord of Life and Glory was ‘meek and lowly of heart’, who are we to dare to walk abroad with high look, or to act towards our fellows in a vain show? Without opening the Book, could our readers name the first thing said of love in I Cor. xiii.?

“Love suffereth long, and is kind” (verse 4).

Humility of mind and meekness are accompanied by this first expression of love, viz., longsuffering. Like meekness it is the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22). It is placed as the goal of the believer’s walk in the parallel passage of Col. i. 10, 11:

“Unto all patience and longsuffering with joyfulness.”

When Paul would set his own doctrine and practice before Timothy as an antidote to the selfishness that will characterize the perilous times of the last days, he says to him:

“But thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, longsuffering, charity, patience” (II Tim. iii. 10).

We gather from various allusions in the epistles that Timothy was of a retiring, shrinking nature. The rudiments of this world would teach such to develop self-assertion, to see to it that others were kept well informed of their authority. What says the wisdom of God?

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all LONGSUFFERING and DOCTRINE” (II Tim. iv. 2).

Is this the reason why so many are repelled? Is this the reason why some do not come to a knowledge of the truth? We must make no mistake, the Word is to be fearlessly preached; doctrine must be maintained, but the truth needs to be spoken *in love*, the doctrine *with longsuffering*, the instruction and the restoration *with meekness*.

Lastly comes, 'Forbearing one another'. Not until our walk is manifested by these gracious qualities may we proceed to that noble endeavour of keeping the unity of the Spirit.

Let us, brethren, seek to *adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things* (Titus ii. 10).

The First Principles of the Oracles of God

(A series especially addressed to new readers)

No.28. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called."

pp. 5 - 10

The history of the true seed has now been before us from Adam to Abraham. We have seen the line descending from Adam through Seth to Noah, and through Noah to Shem, and from Shem through Eber, Peleg, and Terah to Abraham. Abraham's son Ishmael is repudiated, and Isaac the child of promise, the child of resurrection power, carries forward the great purpose. This process of selection and repudiation still goes on. Isaac has two sons Esau and Jacob, but Esau is set aside. Jacob has twelve sons, but Judah, the son of Leah, the first wife of Jacob, is chosen as the channel through whom the seed should come. Judah is the ancestor of David the King, and it is sufficient for Matthew's purpose that he shows that "Jesus" was the 'Son of David and the Son of Abraham' to prove that the promise concerning the true seed had at length been fulfilled.

With the opening of the N.T. we leave promise and begin fulfillment, and as our salvation and hope are bound up with the realization of the promises of God concerning the seed, we must give our attention to the unfolding of this great theme.

We observe that throughout the Gospels, Christ is referred to as 'the Son of David', but when we consider the testimony of Paul, he avoids the title 'Son of David' and uses the deeper and more significant title "The Seed of David". At first sight this distinction may savour of 'hair-splitting', for He Who is the Seed of David must also be his Son. Yet on the other hand it is also true that He Who is the Son of David may not necessarily be his 'seed' in the full significance of that term as we shall see.

We all know that Solomon was a son of David, and most of us would remember Nathan and Absalom, but how many of us know that in the genealogy given in I Chron. iii. 1-9 there are nineteen sons of David named? Six were born in Hebron, four were born in Jerusalem, and nine are listed without specifying either the name of their mother or the place of their birth. Even this list of nineteen sons is not complete, for the chronicler adds 'besides the sons of the concubines' (I Chron. iii. 9).

In the course of time David's strength began to fail, and claimant voices began to be heard regarding succession to the throne.

"Adonijah the son of Haggith exalted himself, saying, I will be king" (I Kings i. 5).

Nathan the prophet visited Bathsheba and warned her of the danger and advised her to go to the king and say:

"Didst not thou, my lord, O king, swear unto thine handmaid, saying, assuredly Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne? Why then doth Adonijah reign?" (I Kings i. 13).

The result was that Solomon was proclaimed king, and the rest of David's sons were set aside so far as succession to the throne was concerned. Throughout the Gospel of the kingdom, Matthew, the title "The Son of David" is reiterated, for Christ as the Son of David was born to sit upon the throne of David (Luke i. 32).

When we turn from the Gospel of the Kingdom to the epistles of the church we do not find Paul speaking of Christ as the 'Son' of David; he goes deeper and calls him "The Seed of David". As the 'Son', Christ was the rightful king of Israel, but this title and rule did not comprehend all that was conceived by God at the beginning. Paul does not obtrude into the epistles to the church a title that would confuse these two departments of the redemptive purpose: he omits the kingdom title and uses the deeper and more significant title "The Seed of David". Not only so, he uses this title when writing the epistle to the Romans (Rom. i. 3) and he uses it again after the dispensation of the Mystery had come in (II Tim. ii. 8), and Timothy is called upon to 'remember' this relationship, and that it formed an integral part of that which Paul called especially 'my gospel'. In both passages the resurrection is prominent. While therefore David's son Solomon and his successors are the heirs to the *throne*, Christ as David's SEED carries the great primeval promise of God to its glorious consummation.

The Syro-Phoenician woman was made to realize that in Christ as "The Son of David" she had no place (Matt. xv.22), but the Seed of David was declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection (Rom. i. 3, 4) and the good news associated with Him in that capacity was addressed to both Jew and Gentile. While the succession to the throne came through Solomon, Mary's line descends through Nathan, Solomon's brother, and so in Matthew we have 'The son of David' with special reference to the king and kingdom, whereas in Luke iii. we have "The Seed of the Woman" descending from David, through Nathan and Mary. Luke was the evangelist who laboured so faithfully with the Apostle Paul. It is Luke's account rather than Matthew's that stresses "The Seed", and there are some commentators who believe that what Paul speaks of as 'my gospel' is actually this gospel according to Luke. In like manner Christ is called "The Son of Abraham" (Matt. i. 1) but it is never so called by Paul, for just as we found that Paul speaks of Christ as the Seed of David, so also does he speak of Christ as the Seed of Abraham.

"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).

Many of the reference books that have been consulted make Paul here quote from different passages in Genesis. *The Companion Bible* refers the reader to Gen. xxi. 12 "In Isaac shall thy seed be called". This passage is most certainly quoted in Rom. ix. 7, and it has one item that attracts it to Gal. iii. 16, and that is, that the word 'seed' here must be understood as being singular, because of the singular verb that follows it "it shall be called". Turpie's book on quotations refers Gal. iii. 16 to Gen. xxii. 18. We feel however that Paul would remind us that he actually cited the word "And" 'And to thy seed', and consequently we must refer to Gal. iii. 16 to such texts as Gen. xvii. 7, 8 or to Gen. xxiv. 7 which in the LXX agrees with the words quoted in Galatians. This is

the opinion of Gough in his book on N.T. quotations. To these passages can be added Gen. xiii. 15.

It must be remembered that the Hebrew word *zeraim*, 'seeds' in the plural means 'various kinds of grain' even as the plural *spermata* does in I Cor. xv. 38, and Ellicott says on this passage "we hold therefore, that there is certainly a mystical meaning in the use of *zera* in Gen. xiii. 15; xvii. 8 as there is an argument for resurrection in Exod. iii. 6, though in neither case was the writer necessarily aware of it".

If we read the context of Gen. xiii. 15, we are met with the stated fact that the word 'seed' is used in the plural, for verse 16 goes on "And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth so shall thy seed be numbered". The same is true of the context of Gen. xvii. 8, for the words 'in *their* generations' which comes in verse 7, and 'in *their* generations' which is repeated in verse 9 show that the word 'seed' is used in the plural. If we continue in our reading of Gal. iii., until we get to verse 29 we shall read:

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

So therefore, all the seed are 'in Christ', even as 'In Isaac' the seed were called and can be reckoned as one.

In Rom. ix., the Apostle has more to say about this seed. The high privileges that belong to Israel are set in contrast with their rejection which was imminent; and the day when Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans drew from him the arguments of Rom. ix. 6-13.

First of all he puts forward this thesis: "Not all who are out of Israel, are Israel." The second mention of Israel here does not refer to the man Jacob, but to the nation, the thought being that fleshly descent does not constitute the seed or the election, for both are by promise and by grace.

Abraham had eight sons—Ishmael by Hagar; Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak and Shuah by Keturah; and Isaac by Sarah. Ishmael was 'cast out' for he could not be the heir together with Isaac (Gen. xxi. 10). Of the sons of Keturah it is written: "Abraham gave gifts and *sent them away* from Isaac his son" (Gen. xxv. 6). But of Isaac we read: "And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac" (Gen. xxv. 5). If mere physical descent from Abraham had constituted a claim, then seven other nations descended from these seven other sons might have disputed Israel's rights, or have anticipated some arguments in favour of universalism; the deciding factor was God's sovereign election.

Again, coming closer to the problem, the Apostle carries the argument a stage further. The other nations referred to above were descended from different mothers, but Paul goes on to show that even sons born to Isaac by the same mother do not share equal privileges. Esau was the elder, Jacob was the younger, both children of the same mother, yet Esau was rejected and Jacob chosen:

“For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger” (Rom. ix. 11, 12).

This is not the only place where a distinction is made between the true seed and the merely natural seed. For example, when the Lord looked upon Nathaniel, he said: “Behold an Israelite indeed” (John i. 47). And again, in John viii., we read:

“They answered and said unto Him, Abraham is our father. Jesus said unto them, If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham Ye do the deeds of your father Ye are of your father the devil” (John viii. 39-44).

In the epistle to the Romans itself, we have already had the distinction between the natural and the spiritual seed brought forward:

“For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly: and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God” (Rom. ii. 28, 29).

These words are immediately followed by the question:

“What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?” (Rom. iii. 1).

In Gal. iv. Ishmael is likened to the unbelieving Jews ‘born after the flesh’, while the true believing Jews are likened to Isaac, and his mother, the freewoman, to Jerusalem that is above and free. These constitute the “Israel of God” (Gal. iv. 21-31; vi. 16). As we study the argument put forward by the Apostle in Rom. ix. an important principle emerges that extends beyond the limits of the people of Israel.

“In Isaac shall thy seed be called (Rom. ix. 7).

“The children of the promise are counted for the seed” (Rom. ix. 8).

The following extract from Nedarim f. 31.1 is suggestive:

“Is not Ishmael an alien, and yet of the seed of Abraham? It is written, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. But is not Esau an alien, and yet of the seed of Isaac? No. In Isaac, but not all Isaac.”

This brief quotation which we leave without comment is sufficient to show that Paul’s method of argument was familiar to the Jews and would be easily followed.

When dealing with Rom. iv. we find that the words ‘counted for’ or ‘imputed for’ indicate that one thing, namely “faith”, was reckoned for another, namely “righteousness”, and both on account of the finished Work of Christ. In that chapter the fact is stressed that Isaac was not begotten merely by the flesh, but that his birth was a foreshadowing of the resurrection of Christ. The fact that Isaac is again brought into prominence in Rom. ix., and that mere physical descent is set aside, only the children of promise being ‘counted for the seed’, provides conclusive proof that the fulfillment of the purposes of God does not necessitate that every individual Jew and every physical

descendant of Abraham must be saved. Known unto God from the beginning are those who constitute 'the seed of promise'.

The fact that the bulk of the nation was in a state of unbelief at the time that Paul wrote, did not in any way throw doubt upon the accuracy of prophecy and the promises. Rather the reverse, for there are a number of references in the O.T. to Israel's apostasy and the preservation of a remnant. Isaiah, in a day of departure, speaks of this remnant in i. 9; x. 20-22, and is quoted in Rom. ix. 27:

"Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved."

On the day of Pentecost, Peter omitted the close of Joel ii. 32, because the appeal was to the nation. Subsequent events, however, proved that what Joel had prophesied was fulfilled. The omitted words—"and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call"—were applicable then, and will again be true in the future days of Israel's restoration. When, therefore, we read in Rom. xi. 26 "And so all Israel shall be saved", we must read the words 'all Israel' in the light of Rom. ix. 6-9. The 'all Israel' that shall be saved is not co-extensive with a total number of Abraham's descendants, but indicates a definite company—'children of promise', a 'reckoned seed'.

The same principle holds good with respect to 'all in Adam' and 'all in Christ'. These terms do not extend to every individual descendant of Adam, for some, like the Canaanites, ought never to have been born. At the creation of Adam, God had already in view a chosen seed. Although this purpose has been attacked by Satan and imperilled in many ways, by Cain and others, by the offspring of the sons of God and the daughters of men at the time of the Flood, and by the 'tares' in our Lord's own day (John viii. 39-44), the children of promise are preserved, and will finally reach their true goal. Universal reconciliation is true if applied to the true seed. It is a serious error when extended to spiritual Canaanites, to Tares and to those who could be called 'Children of the wicked one'.

Had the Apostle, when writing Rom. ix., intended to discuss the doctrines of free-will, eternal election and reprobation, he would have been obliged to have introduced many other arguments. His purpose in this chapter is much simpler. He is pointing out that the whole history of the people of Israel is the outworking of an elective purpose, and that if this elective purpose is satisfied for the moment by the salvation of a remnant, then there can be no truth in the suggestion that the Word of God has failed. When seen in their true context, the words 'hated' and 'loved' in verse 13 create no insuperable difficulty, but if Paul's object in Rom. ix. is misunderstood, then we must expect confusion and the inevitable evils that flow from a false representation of the sovereignty of God. Just as the advocates of eternal punishment can only find a basis for their dreadful creed by ignoring the qualifying statements of Scripture, and applying what is peculiar and limited (Matt. xxv.) to what is universal, so in Rom. ix. we can only build up the Calvinistic doctrine of eternal reprobation, with the allied error which regards sin as part of the Divine decree, if we fail to see that Paul is here dealing with the dispensational question of Israel's rejection and failure.

We conclude by giving the structure of the passage just considered.

The remnant, and the Word of God (Rom. ix. 6 - 13).

A1 | 6-8. The Word of God.

B1 | 6-8. To Isaac a seed reckoned. |

a | All out of Israel, these are not all Israel.

b | The seed of Abraham, these are not all children.

c | In Isaac the seed shall be called.

a | The children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.

b | The children of promise.

c | Counted for a seed.

A2 | 9. The Word of Promise.

B2 | 9. To Sarah a child promised. |

a | At this time.

b | Will I return.

c | Sarah shall have a son.

A3 | 10-13. It was said unto her.

B3 | 10-13. To Rebekah, a nation chosen. |

a | Rebekah . . . Isaac. Common parentage.

b | Purpose according to election.

c | Greater, lesser, loved, hated.

**No.29. “Ye are a chosen generation” (I Pet. ii. 9).
pp. 24 - 30**

Ecclesiastes, after making its initial pronouncement ‘Vanity of vanities all is vanity’, places first on the list the fact that “one generation passeth away, and another generation cometh” (Eccles. i. 2, 4). This succession of generations is so universally recognized as a part of the present scheme of things, that it may never have occurred to us, that it is of itself an evidence that some ‘breach of promise’ some alteration of the Divine plan may have taken place. Had the passing away of one generation in death been normal, could it at the same time have been listed with “Vanity of Vanities”? When Adam by his disobedience let sin into the world and death by sin, man made in the image of God became ‘subject to vanity’ (Rom. viii. 20), not willingly certainly, and in hope most blessedly, but subject to vanity nevertheless. The doom pronounced in Gen. iii. 19 “Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return” is seen by Ecclesiastes as something that reduced man to the level of the beast of the field. He comments ‘as the one dieth, so dieth the other’ (iii. 19). If the coming of death has necessitated the successive passing and coming of the generations of men, then the question arises, what would have been the state of things had Adam remained unfallen?

Now we readily admit that from one point of view, this argument based upon what might have happened but which did not, is often futile, and we are well advised to face things as they are. If, however, we approach such a question with a chastened spirit, admitting all the time that what we say may nevertheless be very wide of the mark, some light upon the vexed state of affairs that now obtain may repay our modest inquiry.

It is categorically stated that God made man upright, but that men have sought out many inventions (Eccles. vii. 29), so that we can go behind the record of the fall in Eden with this fact in mind. The unfallen Adam was commanded by His Creator to 'be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth' (Gen. i. 28), yet it is very evident that, if time went on and the population of the earth continued to increase, nations and rulers would soon be facing a most serious problem of feeding and supporting these teeming millions. Only by the sad fact now that 'one generation' passes, can the earth continue to support 'the generations' that come. It appears therefore that had man not fallen and death not intervened, the succeeding generations that would have made up the number of the elect seed would have appeared without break, and that the earth would have provided abundant accommodation for them all. There would then have not been necessary the thousands of years which the ages span, and none of the 'tares' would have challenged the true seed and occupied so much of their territory.

It is safe to say, however, that no inheritance set aside for those predestinated by Divine grace, ever has written across it "With VACANT possession". In every case a usurper has to be dispossessed before the true heirs can take possession; see Deut. ii. for this in type. The multiplication of man after the fall, was not made up entirely by the true seed; Satan sowed his tares, and those tares outnumbered the true seed so disproportionately that by the time that Noah was grown to manhood 'all flesh' with the exception of one family of eight souls (I Pet. iii. 20) had so corrupted his way upon the earth, that they were completely destroyed from the earth (Gen. vi. 13), 'everything that is in the earth shall die' was the verdict (Gen. vi. 17), and "Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the Ark" (Gen. vii. 23).

Again, upon emerging on to dry land, Noah is commanded, as was Adam before him, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. ix. 1). This increase in number however was not limited to the true seed, for we read the Midianites and the Amalekites came 'as grasshoppers for multitude' (Judges vi. 5; vii. 12) whereas Israel were greatly impoverished. The 'multitude' of the Canaanites (Judges iv. 7); of the Syrians (I Kings xx. 13); of the Ethiopians (II Chron. xiv. 11); of the children of Moab and of Ammon (II Chron. xx. 2); of the Assyrians (II Chron. xxxii. 7); of Babylon (Isa. xiii. 4); of the nations (Isa. xxix. 7); of Egypt, of Elam, of Meshech and Tubal and of Gog; and finally the multitudes in the valley of decision (Joel iii. 14), indicate something of the menace to the true seed in the earth that the multiplying of these nations must have been. The picture before the mind is a field of wheat, smothered by the growth of charlock and poppy. The passages which speak of Israel being a multitude are well known, two passages, namely Gen. xxviii. 3 and xlvi. 4 need to be corrected in the A.V. for the word there translated 'multitude' is the Hebrew word *gahal* meaning 'a called out

assembly', or as Stephen says 'the church in the wilderness' (Acts vii. 38), and has no connection with the question of number.

While the promise was made to Abraham that his seed should be like the stars, the dust and the sand that cannot be numbered, we know that the Lord had said of them "Ye were the fewest of all people" (Deut. vii. 7) although from being 'three score and ten persons' they had become by the time of Moses wrote 'as the stars of heaven for multitude' (Deut. x. 22). At the time of the end of the Millennium the evil seed are so numerous that they are likened in number to 'the sand of the sea', and went up on 'the breadth of the earth' (Rev. xx. 8, 9). At last, however, the nations of the earth will become so decimated by war, famine and self destruction that Zechariah speaks of 'every one THAT IS LEFT of all the nations which come against Jerusalem' (Zech. xiv. 16)! It is thus that Israel, as the vehicle of the true seed on earth, come into their own, for then "Israel shall blossom, and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit" (Isa. xxvii. 6); it is then that they 'enlarge the place of their tent' and their seed 'shall inherit the Gentiles' (Isa. liv. 3) even as their fathers in small yet typical measure 'inherited' the land held by the Amorite (Deut. ii. 31).

Coming back from this survey to the time of Adam, and supposing, for the sake of argument, that Adam did not fall, that neither sin nor death were factors in the purpose, and that consequently redemption by the shedding of blood would be unknown and unnecessary, let us think further along this line. Heb. ii. 14 makes it clear that the Saviour took part in flesh and blood in order that He might be the Kinsman-Redeemer of all the seed, but John i. 14 reveals that He was made flesh so that of His fullness we all might receive, and that as the Word made flesh revealed to man the Father (John i. 18). It is something that is impossible of belief that, had there been no sin, even then God would still have been manifest in the flesh? Was the Virgin Birth that took place about 4,000 years after the creation of man, but the postponement of a most glorious and miraculous event, that had it not been for sin, would have taken place in the garden of Eden before any other children were born? Was it *this* that lies behind the mystery of the Temptation and the Fall, with its close connection with the two seeds, the immediate reference to childbirth, and the birth of Cain who turned out to be 'of the wicked one'? We ask these questions, we may entertain our theories, but questions and theories they must remain.

Had the coming in of death not made the successive generations follow the death of those that preceded them, the full tale of those chosen either before or since the overthrow of the world would have been early reached, and the translation from Adam to Christ effected and the different spheres of predestined glory entered. As it is, the evil seed jostle the true heirs for room and many times overrun them and keep them down both in number and in possessions. The very character of this age turns the true heirs into pilgrims and strangers, yet it still stands written "The meek shall inherit the earth" and that not only in the Sermon on the Mount, but in Psa. xxxvii. where the believer is told to fret not because of evil doers for yet a little while and the wicked shall not be (Psa. xxxvii. 9, 10). As a consequence of what actually occurred in Gen. iii., Christ, the true Seed, is revealed as the Kinsman-Redeemer, and resurrection now becomes the gate

to glory. Doubtless all has been overruled by Divine love. The rugged pathway that we have been called upon to walk, the attacks and the snares of the evil one, all contribute to that essential experience which arising out of patience, ultimately leads to a hope that maketh not ashamed (Rom. v. 4, 5).

The Scripture speaks more than once of a 'Book of Life', Paul speaks of it, saying, "My fellow labourers, whose names are in the book of life" (Phil. iv. 3), showing that those called during his prison ministry have their names therein. In Rev. iii. 5 the Divine promise strengthens the overcomer in his fight by assuring him that "I will not blot out his name out of the book of life" and the reader may find his mind turning to Rev. xxii. 19 where we read in the A.V. "God shall take away his part out of the book of life" whereas the R.V. reads "from the tree of life" with the critical texts. Those "whose names are not written in the book of life" will worship the Beast (Rev. xiii. 8), even as Rev. xvii. 8 reveals. At the Great White Throne the Book of Life is brought forward, and to keep close to the wording of the inspired original we read "And *if any one* was not found written in the book of life, *he* was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. x. 15). The prominence given to the Book of Life in the Revelation may be because the emergence of the true seed is imminent. It refers particularly to the overcomer. See *Millennial Studies* in Volume XXXIX. The true seed whose names are in that book will never apostatize; the false seed whose names were never in that book will follow their own course. Some of the true seed will miss the glory of the Millennial kingdom and other spheres of blessing, and will not emerge until the Great White Throne is set up, but even there, it is revealed that some will be found written, and pass on into life that is life indeed.

A prayerful reading of Psa. cxxxix. would be extremely helpful at this point, of which the following is a quotation:

"My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.

Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them" (Psa. cxxxix. 15, 16).

The conflict between the two seeds arose out of the disobedience of Man in relation to the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. iii.). When writing to the believers at Rome, the Apostle Paul said concerning some that "By good words and fair speeches they deceived the hearts of the simple" (Rom. xvi. 18). He then went on to speak of their 'obedience' saying that he would have them wise unto that which is *good*, and simple concerning *evil*. Now this word 'simple' *akeraios* occurs in the proverb "Wise as serpents, and *harmless* as doves" (Matt. x. 16), where it is evident that the simplicity inculcated by the Apostle is in marked contrast to the subtlety of the serpent. These words occur just before the concluding section which deals with the revelation of the mystery which had been kept in silence (Rom. xvi. 25-27). This mystery we have shown elsewhere refers to the relationship that exists between Adam, his fall and his seed. It is therefore no surprise to us to find in Rom. xvi. 20 immediately following these words that remind us of the Fall, a most definite reference to Gen. iii.

"And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly."

Strictly speaking these are the last words of positive doctrine in Romans. All leads up to this.

In Rom. i., Christ is seen as coming of the Seed of David according to the flesh, and at the last, together with His redeemed, fulfilling the primal promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. The doctrines of Justification and Reconciliation, together with the two key characters, Adam and Abraham, links these two references to the 'Seed'. This climax is comparable with 'the end' which shall be attained according to I Cor. xv. 24-28, the last enemy there being, not Satan, but that power which Satan wields through sin, namely death. The passage has in common with Rom. xvi. 20 the words "under feet". These words, quoted in I Cor. xv., in Eph. i. and in Heb. ii. in the phrase "Thou hast put all things under His feet" are cited from the eighth Psalm, which has as its subscription "Upon Muth-labben".

Psa. viii. looks in two directions, back to Adam and the limited dominion given to him, and forward to Christ and the universal dominion which shall be His. In Heb. ii. the reference to the eighth Psalm is associated with His suffering and death, and to the 'world to come' *oikoumene*; in I Cor. xv., the reference to the eighth Psalm looks beyond the limitations of the habitable world, to the goal when God shall be all in all; while Eph. i. alludes to Psa. viii., when speaking of the principalities and powers that are subjected beneath the feet of Christ, in His capacity as Head over all things to the church. In the *Berean Expositor* of May 1951, Psa. viii. and its subscription is shown to speak of the "secrets of the Son", and the reader's attention is drawn to this article because of the extreme importance of the subject.

The bruising of the serpent's head was not accomplished however without suffering on the part of the Great Deliverer. "He shall bruise His heel".

It is not surprising that this primeval prophecy should have been known to the ancient world. The ancients confounded the name *Zero-ashta* "The seed of the woman", interpreting the word *ashta* to mean fire, and so giving the name Zoroaster. Throughout the mythology of the ancient world, the struggle between the Serpent and a Deliverer is well known:

"And while sublime his awful hands are spread,
Beneath him rolls the dragon's horrid head,
And his right foot unmoved appears to rest,
Fixed on the writhing monster's burnished crest" (Landseer, *Researches*).

In Greek mythology the constellation that sets forth the crushing of the serpent's head is called *Engonasis* 'the Kneeler' but this is owing to the confusion of tongues. In Chaldee *E* represents 'the', *nko* 'to crush', *nahash* a serpent; and so *enkonahash* became in Greek *engonasis*. The story of Achilles 'vulnerable only in his heel', is also a most evident echo of Gen. iii. 15.

The word 'bruise' used in Gen. iii. 15 is the translation of the Hebrew *shuph* which is by no means so simple a word. Authorities differ as to the primary meaning of the word. *Gesenius* derives the word from a root which means first to gape upon, then to lie in wait, to fall upon. *Davidson* gives the meaning 'to cover with darkness', which is very similar to *Parkhurst's* 'to cover, overwhelm, as with a tempest'. This word is found in Job ix. 17 "He *breaketh* me with a tempest", and again in Psa. cxxxix. 11 "Surely the darkness *shall cover* me". That some of the ancients understood this to be the meaning of the word *shuph* is clear, *Symmachus* uses *episkepasei* 'will hide', and a Hexaplar version *kalupsei* 'cover' or 'veil'. *Shuph* in a reduplicated form is used of a species of serpent so called from its *concealing* itself in the sand or in holes, and occurs in Gen. xlix. 17 "Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an *adder* that biteth the horses *heels*'. Here it will be observed, two words occur that are also found in Gen. iii. 15, *shuph* 'bruise', *shephiphon* 'adder' and *aqeb* 'heel', and this fact must be kept in mind when translating Gen. iii. 15.

Paul in Rom. xvi. 20 employs the word *suntribo* to translate *shuph* 'bruise'. In Rom. iii. 16 he uses the word in slightly different form, *suntrimma*, "Destruction and misery are in their ways". *Suntribo* is translated elsewhere in the N.T. "bruise" (Matt. xii. 20); break or break in pieces (Mark v. 4; xiv. 3; Luke iv. 18; John xix. 36; and Rev. ii. 27). The English word *triturate* 'to reduce to fine powder by rubbing', *trite* 'worn out by constant use or repetition', *tribulation* from the wearing down effect of a threshing instrument, and *diatribe* 'a discourse which wears away time' will no doubt occur to the reader.

Taking all things therefore into consideration, the 'bruising' of Gen. iii. 15 and of Rom. xvi. 20 indicate an agonizing and protracted process, wearing in its effect, and associated with concealment, darkness and attack. That it is a protracted struggle, the record of the ages bear witness. That it was agonizing the cry both of Gethsemane and of Calvary reveal.

"All Thy waves and Thy billows have gone over Me" (Psa. xlii. 7).
"My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me" (Psa. xxii. 1).
"This is your hour, and the power of darkness" (Luke xxii. 53).
"From the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour"
(Matt. xxvii. 45).

The glorious outcome of this dreadful conflict is given in Isa. liii.:

"He shall see His seed He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied" (Isa. liii. 10, 11).

The redemptive work of Christ permits of no collaboration. He alone could be the sin bearer, He alone could be the ransom. Yet the primeval prophecy of Gen. iii. 15 speaks not only of enmity between Satan and Christ, but between the woman's seed and the serpent's seed.

Inasmuch as all the seed are found in Christ (Gal. iii. 16, 29), they, like the Apostle himself 'fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ' (Col. i. 24). Like the

seed of Abraham they suffer affliction and are kept waiting for their inheritance, while the iniquity of their spiritual ‘Amorite’ reaches its fullness (Gen. xv. 13-16).

All the seed shall at length come out with ‘great substance’, they shall enter into their possessions, and when that day comes ‘there shall be no more the Canaanite’ (Zech. xiv. 21), even as there shall be ‘no more’ death, curse, sorrow or sin. Satan and his angels shall no more corrupt the true seed, nor hinder and frustrate the purposes of God:

“He shall see His seed,
He shall see of the travail of His soul
And shall be satisfied.”

We sincerely hope that this series addressed particularly to the new reader, will have illuminated a number of expressions employed by us in the exposition of the Word, and will enable all readers to share with us and with one another, some of the wonders of our own high calling.

No.30. Noah, a type of the last Adam. pp. 44 - 49

We have devoted considerable space to the teaching of Scripture, and to Genesis in particular, concerning the two seeds that is the substance of the primeval promise of Gen. iii. 15. We have seen that Adam is a figure of Him that was to come, and passing over much that yields rich treasure to the patient seeker after truth, we come to the great outstanding figure of Noah, who stands in connection to Adam as the second Man and the last Adam, a figure of Christ in His relation to the new earth that is yet to be, and to the sphere of resurrection in which the blessings of a new creation are to be enjoyed. Noah, like Adam, was after all a frail, erring man; his every act must not be included in the type any more than every act of Adam on the one hand, or of Joseph on the other.

Let us again attempt to envisage the pattern of this book of Genesis. We find that the book divides into two main sections. The first, Gen. i. to xi. dealing with the RACE. The second, Gen. xii. to l. dealing with the NATION.

The RACE	<i>Adam</i> stands at the head of the first section.
The NATION	<i>Abraham</i> stands at the head of the second section.
The RACE	<i>Noah</i> concludes the first section with the <i>Ark</i> .
The NATION	<i>Joseph</i> concludes the second section, with a <i>coffin</i> .
The RACE	<i>Noah</i> steps out into a new world. Eight souls saved.
The NATION	<i>Joseph</i> , anticipating by faith, inheritance and resurrection, gave a commandment concerning his bones (Heb. xi. 22).

Let us note the way that Scripture leads us to conclude that Noah was a type of Christ as “The second Man and the last Adam”.

Jehovah, being the God of the age, His covenant is called the age covenant (A.V. everlasting covenant Gen. ix. 16):

“While the earth remaineth (or while all the days of the earth continue), seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease” (Gen. viii. 22).

Day after day since this promise was made, the Lord has looked down upon man whose heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and has never again interfered with the universal ordinances here specified. Famine and other judgments there may have been in places, but never universally, like the Flood. The Lord, while on earth, drew attention to the fact that the Father “maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust” (Matt. v. 45). The Apostle Paul declared that God, while suffering all nations in time past to walk in their own ways, yet “left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness” (Acts xiv. 16, 17).

The Lord appeals to the unchanging continuance of the ordinance of day and night to indicate the like character of His covenant with Israel:

“Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night If those ordinances depart from before Me then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me all the days” (Jer. xxxi. 35, 36).

It is useless for those who claim to be ‘spiritual’ Israel, and so make the promises of God of none effect, to expect us to believe them when they confess that ‘they really believe that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God’.

The A.V. and the R.V., by using here the words ‘for ever’, instead of ‘all the days’, commit the Lord to perpetuate Israel *as a nation* throughout eternity, and also an eternal perpetuation of the ordinances of the sun and moon. Neither of these propositions can be established by Scripture, and there are some passages which speak of the cessation of the ordinances of the sun, moon and stars; therefore the earnest student will be careful not to go beyond what is written. Paul, as we have seen (Acts xiv. 15-17), speaks of these things as ‘a witness’. Rom. i. 19, 20 teaches us that Gentiles, by the ‘things that are made’, might have known the ‘eternal power and deity’ of God, and thereby have been deterred from idolatry. In the same manner these covenanted ordinances are God’s witnesses. The recurring seed-time and harvest are a standing witness to the whole race, apart from the written revelation. How often the present life with its opportunities is likened to a seed-time, and how many are the warnings and the encouragements in view of the harvest at the end of the age! The day, too, when man may work, the night that cometh when man’s work is done; the daily miracle of sleeping and awaking is a foreshadowing of that sleep of death and that morning of resurrection which is so prominent in the N.T. Scriptures. All these themes the reader can pursue with profit; we

can but draw attention to the great age-time covenant, that throughout all dispensations has continued in unaltered order.

The first great dispensational fact that is made known in the new world that opened out to Noah and his descendants was that judgment is *deferred*. God will not again visit in the same way the sins of man as He did at the Flood; the wicked *now* may prosper as a green bay tree, the righteous *now* may be plagued all the day long; 'the end', as seen in 'the sanctuary of God', reveals the fact of a future day of individual judgment. So it is that, even though man continues in his sin, seed time and harvest, and day and night, do not cease.

In Gen. ix., the Lord lays the foundation of human government. We must go back further into history than the days of Nebuchadnezzar, for the divine institution of 'the powers that be'. We must retrace our steps to Noah. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man" (Gen. ix. 6). When Cain shed his brother's blood, God made a special protection for him against the hand of his fellow-man. Here, however, in the covenant with Noah, man is appointed judge and executioner. A change also in the food of man is made. To Adam God gave every herb bearing seed, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; now, "every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you every thing". To this divine change in human diet the Apostle Paul alludes in I Tim. iv. 4, 5 "For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, being received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer". The false teaching of the apostasy, the doctrine of demons, included the forbidding of marriage and the abstinence from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.

To progress in what is called Spiritism, abstinence from flesh foods and from marriage is essential; the seducing spirits with their doctrines of demons seem to be characteristic of the 'latter times'. The days of Noah are to be repeated, and the spirit activities that brought about the corruption of the earth ending in the Flood are to be expected again. If the abstinence from flesh food and from marriage makes intercourse with the spirit world easier, we can perceive the wise provision in the change of human food as given to Noah, and the reason why such an institution should be discontinued as a prelude to demon activities in the latter times.

After blessing Noah, and saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth', God speaks of man's new relationship to the animal world; this is exactly in the same order in Gen. i. 28. There are one or two modifications, however, that indicate a change from Gen. i. 28; man is told not only to replenish the earth, but to subdue it, a type of Him who will yet subdue all things beneath His feet; further, he was to 'have dominion', another type of the Lord from heaven. This appears to be directly connected with the fact that man was created in the image of God. That the image remained after the Fall and after the Flood is abundantly testified by Gen. ix. 6 and James iii. 9. Instead of the word 'dominion', we have, in the re-institutions of Noah, 'the fear of you and the dread

of you' shall be upon every beast, fowl and fish. This is something lower than dominion, and harmonizes with the general character of the age.

When Nebuchadnezzar was made 'the head of gold', he became more than king of the Babylonian Empire, or the first of a new dynasty, a dispensational change took place, almost as great as is indicated in Gen. ix. When Daniel interpreted to Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of the great image he said:

"Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of MEN dwell, the BEASTS of the field and the FOWLS of the heaven hath He given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all" (Dan. ii. 37, 38).

The words 'hath He given into thine hand', are an echo of Gen. ix. 2, 'into your hand are they delivered'; there is also more than a coincidence in the fact that in Gen. i. 9 and Dan. ii. these things are associated with an 'image', in the one case 'the image of God', in the other a "great image whose brightness was excellent, and its form terrible" (Dan. ii. 31).

We feel that the evident relation between the dispensation connected with Adam, and that connected with Noah is important enough to receive the following tabulated list of parallels and contrasts, and we trust the interested reader will pursue the them more fully than we are able to do in these pages; we write always for BEREANS (Acts xvii. 10, 11):

List of parallels and contrasts between the dispensations headed by:	
<i>A D A M</i>	<i>N O A H</i>
A judgment in the background which left the earth without form and void (Gen. i. 2; Isa. xlv. 18).	A flood in the background that left the earth a ruin (Gen. vii. 17-24).
(The parallel between these two passages is so close that commentators are divided as to which of them II Pet. iii. 5, 6 refers.)	
The dry land appears on the third day, grass and trees grow (Gen. i. 9-13).	The dry land appears in Noah's 601st year, and the pluckt olive leaf indicated to Noah that this was so (Gen. viii. 11-13).
Living creatures are 'brought forth' from the water and from the earth, and God blessed them saying, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth" (Gen. i. 20-25).	Living creatures are "brought forth with Noah out of the Ark that they may breed abundantly in the earth, and be fruitful and multiply in the earth" (Gen. viii. 15-19).
Food.—"Every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat" (Gen. i. 29).	Food.—"Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things", but not blood (Gen. ix. 3, 4).

Man made in the image of God to have “dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth and God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it” (Gen. i. 26-28).	“And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea, into your hand are they delivered.” “In the image of God made He man” (Gen. ix. 1, 2, 6).
The seventh day rest (Gen. ii. 1-3).	Every flood date (except Gen. vii. 5) is a sabbath. <i>Companion Bible</i> note: The Ark rested in the seventeenth day of the month which was a Sabbath (viii. 4).
Adam has three sons, Cain, Abel and Seth (Gen. iv. 1, 2, 25). One Son, Cain, is cursed more than the earth, and becomes a fugitive and a vagabond (iv. 12).	Noah has three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth (Gen. v. 32). One Son, Ham, the father of Canaan, is cursed, even though God had promised not to curse the ground any more, and Canaan becomes a servant of servants (ix. 25; viii. 21).
God curses Cain for shedding his brother’s blood but does not sanction vengeance by human hands (Gen. iv. 10-15).	God will require the life blood from every beast and man, but now delegates the execution of judgment to man himself. “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed” (Gen. ix. 5, 6).
The Lord sets a ‘mark’ (<i>oth</i>) to protect Cain (Gen. iv. 15).	The Lord sets a bow in the cloud for a ‘token’ (<i>oth</i>) to assure all flesh (Gen. ix. 13).
God planted a garden (Gen. ii. 8).	Noah planted a garden (Gen. ix. 20).
Nakedness and shame are linked together in connection with Adam (Gen. iii. 10, 11).	Nakedness and shame are linked together in connection with Noah (Gen. ix. 21-24).
The fruit of the tree, and the fig (Gen. ii. 8; iii. 6, 7, 10).	The wine, and the vineyard (Gen. ix. 20-23).
The redemption of both man and his lost dominion is symbolized by the cherubim (Gen. iii. 24).	The redemption of both man and his lost dominion is symbolized by the animals preserved alive in the ark (Gen. vi. 13-16; viii. 1, 17-19).
The serpent beguiled the woman and brought about the curse (Gen. iii. 24; II Cor. xi. 3).	The sons of God by their actions towards the daughters of men, bring about the Flood (Gen. vi. 1-4).
All the days of Adam were 930 years (Gen. v. 5).	All the days of Noah were 950 years (Gen. ix. 29).

Many other details could doubtless be collected, and many instructive lessons be learned from the changes introduced into the new dispensation. We trust that sufficient has been given above to stimulate the reader to individual effort.

No.31. Babel (Gen. x. 8 - 12; xi. 1 - 9).
pp. 64 - 69

In the midst of the list of names given in Gen. x. we are arrested by one or two digressions. One son of Cush became so great that his name and prowess became a proverb, “Wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord” (verse nine). The other digressions in this chapter are the references to the Canaanites (18, 19); the statement that Shem was the father of all the children of Eber (21); the division of the earth in the days of Peleg (25); and the dwelling of the sons of Joktan (29, 30). We propose in this article to consider the place that Nimrod occupies in the outworking of the purpose of God.

The name Nimrod is from the Hebrew *marad*, to rebel. The Merodach of the Bible (Jer. 1. 2) is allied with the name Nimrod. The Accadian Merodach was called Amaruduk or Amarudu, and became in Assyro-Babylonian, Marduk. The suffix *uk* is dropped in the Hebrew, and the prefix *ni*, assimilating the name ‘to a certain extent to the initial forms of the Hebrew verbs’, was added giving us the Hebrew name Ni-marad or Nimrod. We would not say that *all* error is counterfeit truth, simply because our limited knowledge would not justify the assertion, but we do say that much error, *vital* error, is counterfeit truth, and this is seen in the lies of Satan spoken in Eden and incarnate in Nimrod.

Merodach (i.e. Nimrod deified) is the creator and saviour in this unholy parody. He it is who undertakes to do battle with Tiamat, and to him it was spoken, ‘Fear not, and make merry, *for thou bruise the head of Tiamat*’. *Tiamat* may be ‘the deep’ (Heb. *tehom*) personified. Here is one of the primal declarations concerning the Seed diverted from its true object. Merodach, as a result of his decision to become the avenger and the redeemer, is exalted above all gods. ‘Among the high gods *thou art highest*; thy command is the command of Anu, O Merodach, our avenger, we give thee sovereignty over the entire universe. Thy weapon will ever be irresistible. May Merodach, the mighty overseer of the heavenly spirits, exalt thy head’.

What is true concerning the usurpation of the glory and offices of Christ in this satanic scheme, is true also of all that is associated with his ‘gospel’. A complete *religion* dealing with life, death, and judgment, salvation by works, penances and rites, a Christless creed, and the very mystery of iniquity. With Nimrod, Babylon and all that Babylon stands for are associated together. “Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces” (Jer. 1. 2).

Nimrod, the rebel, is the first one that Scripture records as founding a kingdom. “The beginning of his kingdom was Babel.” Up to this time an earthly king had been unknown; how suggestive of the character and hidden purpose of human kingdoms it is that the first king was a rebel and the first kingdom began at Babylon! That the line of Divine purpose was to flow and develop through Shem is evident by a comparison of the

generations given in Gen. x. and xi. Nimrod was therefore the next great satanic attack upon that purpose, and from its first mention in Genesis, until its final mention in Revelation, Babel or Babylon has been the seat of all the rebellion and opposition to the Divine purpose throughout the world. Babylon is called “The Mother of all abominations” (Rev. xvii. 5).

Before we proceed to the more detailed account of the origin of the name Babel, as given in Gen. xi., we will endeavour to show how the great rebel has been foisted upon mankind in the endeavour of Satan to usurp the glory and the kingdom of the Son of God. Bunsen states that the religious system of Egypt was derived from ‘the primitive empire of Babel’. Birch, dealing with the Babylonian cylinders, is quoted by Layard as saying, “The Zodiacal signs show unequivocally that the Greeks derived their notions and arrangements of the zodiac (and consequently their mythology, that was intertwined with it), from the Chaldees”. Ouvaroff in his work on the Eleusinian mysteries states that these mysteries were transplanted from Egypt, which in turn received them from the East, ‘the centre of science and civilization’. Not only did Egypt and Greece derive their religion from Babylon, but so also did the Phoenicians, so Macrobius says in his *Saturnalia*; and wherever man is found and religion is professed, beneath the superficial differences of names and ritual lies the one great primitive lie originated at Babylon and linked with Nimrod.

Egypt, under the titles Isis and Osiris; India under the title Isi and Iswara; Asia as Cybele and Deoius; Pagan Rome as Fortuna and Jupiter-puer (the boy Jupiter); Greece as Ceres, the great Mother with the babe at her breast; China as Shing Moo with her child in her arms; the Papal Rome as the Madonna and child, all these and many more are the result of the original idolatry set up at Babylon to turn the minds of men away from the first promise of the true Seed of the woman to Satan’s counterfeit. The Babylonians worshiped Semiramis under the name of the great *Goddess Mother*, and it was from her son that she derived all her glory and claim to deity. By a strange process the husband of Semiramis came to be worshipped as the seed (her son), and that son and husband was NIMROD himself. Babylon, both in Old and New Testaments, stands forward as the great symbol of Anti-God, even as Nimrod usurps all the titles and prerogatives of Christ. (For fuller details as to these titles, the reader is referred to that master-work, *The Two Babylons* by Hislop).

Let us now trace the story of Babylon to see its place in the order of things. Babylon does not come into the page of Scripture (after the two references of Gen. x. and xi.), until the time of Israel’s deposition draws near. God’s king, David, and God’s city, Jerusalem, had been chosen, but until David’s greater Son should reign the purpose of God must flow in other channels. Universal sovereignty goes by Divine appointment to Babylon, to be retained in Gentile succession until Babylon and Babylonianism should be destroyed. Read Daniel for this. Isa. xiii. contains ‘the burden of Babylon’, “And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah”. In chapter xiv. 4, the king of Babylon is addressed, and what is said is prophetic of the future antichrist who said, “I will be like the Most High”. Again, in ‘the burden of the desert of the sea’, comes the words,

“Babylon is fallen, is fallen” (xxi. 9). In Isa. xlvii. 1-15 we have another prophecy of Babylon’s doom. Babylon is addressed as a woman that had been called ‘the lady of kingdoms’, and which had usurped the Divine prerogative by saying, “I AM, and none else beside Me” (verse 8).

Jeremiah speaks the word of the Lord against Babylon, and occupies chapters i. & li. with threatenings of wrath to come. The vengeance that falls upon Babylon is ‘the vengeance of His temple’. “Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord’s hand that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunk her wine; therefore the nations are mad” (Jer. li. 7). Babylon is addressed as a ‘destroying mountain’ in li. 25, and is threatened with judgment. “I will make thee a burnt mountain” (li. 25). “As Babylon hath caused the slain of Israel to fall, so at Babylon shall fall the slain of all the earth” (li. 49). Many similar passages of great importance come in these two chapters of Jeremiah which we cannot stay to quote. Jeremiah concludes with a solemn charge to Seraiah, who was going to Babylon to take the book wherein all these judgments were written, to read them there, to bind a stone to it, and to cast it into the Euphrates, and say, “Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her: and they shall be weary” (li. 64).

Just as in Isaiah we have history intertwined with prophecy, a literal Sennacherib foreshadowing the future Antichrist in his blasphemy and his doom, so Jeremiah’s prophecy concerning Babylon had reference partly to the overthrow of Babylon of the Medes (Jer. li. 11), and partly to the future overthrow of the Babylon yet to be revived again in these last days. The book of the Revelation devotes considerable space to the fall of Babylon. Six times Babylon is mentioned and five times out of the six she is spoken of as being “great” together with six other references to her as ‘the great city’ or ‘great whore’. Let us notice what is said in this last prophecy of the Word. “And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink the wine of the wrath of her fornication” (Rev. xiv. 8). This utterance has on the one side the *aionian* gospel, with its call to “worship Him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters” (verse 7). On the other there is the threat of awful judgment upon any one who *worships* the beast and his image, and who receives his mark in his forehead, or in his hand.

The next reference is in chapter xvi. 19 “And great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath”. A most mighty earthquake shakes the earth at the pouring out of the seventh vial, the great city is divided into three parts, the cities of the nations fall, every island flees away, and mountains are not found. The judgment of Babylon is in a setting of world-wide judgment. Then follows in chapter xvii. a description of this great city, and its judgment. It is likened to a woman sitting upon a scarlet coloured beast having seven heads and full of the names of blasphemy. The woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold, precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, a mystery or secret, “Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth” (xvii. 5). The woman was drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the

blood of the martyrs of Jesus. Her destruction is brought about by the ten horns which the beast carried, who are ten kings that reign for the brief hour of the Beast's dominion.

Chapter xviii. follows with a further description of the character and fall of Babylon. Again an angel cries, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and become the habitation of demons, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird" (xviii. 2). As chapter xvii. tells of the kings of the earth, so xviii. links all nations and kings in the participation in Babylon's impure vintage. Jeremiah's command to Seraiah is taken up and amplified:

"A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall the great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all. And the voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no craftsman, of whatever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee; and the sound of a millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee; and the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee; for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth" (Rev. xviii. 21-24).

Let us note these closing words: they may be a figure of speech. They may, however, be very awfully true. All the blood! not only of prophets, saints and martyrs, but every murder and every execution, every war and every assassination, all traceable back to this system of iniquity and to the father of lies (a murderer from the beginning), who, to thwart the purpose of the Most High, made his throne at Babylon. Not only is the influence and the judgment of Babylon world-wide in its effect (the very heavens resound with Hallelujahs at her downfall), heaven itself can hold the glorious Son of God no longer. He rides forth to conquer and to rule, and the reign of righteousness follows swiftly on the destruction of that city which symbolized the dread authority of the prince of darkness.

We must now return to the book of Genesis, to learn somewhat more of the beginnings of Babel. Although the division of the earth among the sons of Noah comes before the record of the building of the tower of Babel, the scattering that took place at the confusion of tongues was the cause of the division recorded in chapter x. There in chapter x. 5, 20 and 31, the descendants of Japheth, Ham and Shem are divided according to their *tongues*. This therefore must have come after the record of chapter xi., for there we read "The whole earth was of one language, and of one speech" ('one lip, and one in words'). The idea that the tower of Babel was built 'to reach unto heaven' is not Scriptural. The words are more correctly rendered "whose top with the heaven", and far more likely denote a tower like the ancient temples of Denderah and Esneh which have the signs of the zodiac represented on them.

Nimrod went back, it would appear to that deserted city, finished it, and sought to overthrow the purpose of God by becoming the first earthly king. From this, apparently, small beginning has spread all the harlot abominations of the earth, and as we saw by

reading the Revelation, no millennium is possible until that city and its system is judged before earth and heaven.

**No.32. The Foundation Covenant (Gen. xii. 1 - 4).
pp. 84 - 88**

TERAH is the watershed of the O.T., even as his generation is the central one of the eleven in Genesis. His most famous son, Abraham, not only left his city and his home but we nowhere read, 'these are the generations of Abraham', the whole of his wonderful life being ranged under the 'generations of Terah'. Abraham beyond all things else sets forth the principle of faith. He is the first one of whom the O.T. records that he *believed in the Lord*. The twelfth chapter of Genesis opens with the words:

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

Stephen in his speech before the Council said:

“The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, *before he dwelt in Charran*, and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country” (Acts vii. 2, 3).

The Lord not only called Abraham out from Ur of the Chaldees, but from his kindred, yet the first movement after the words were spoken to Abraham is that of Terah:

“And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, his son Abram's wife; and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, *to go into the land of Canaan*; and they came unto Haran, *and dwelt there* and Terah died in Haran” (Gen. xi. 31, 32).

The call of God to Abraham involved separation of a very drastic character, and we shall see that the Lord did not lay upon him the whole burden at once; he was to leave country and kindred, but not at first his father's house; he obeyed the call so far as leaving his country was concerned, and Heb. xi. records the step of faith with Divine approval. Scripture does not say, 'and Abraham took Terah'; it is put the other way, "and Terah took Abram his son". Terah's name means a 'traveler', or a 'wanderer', and as a type he may well represent that class who 'go out', not by faith, but by reason of temperament; the call that quickened Abram with a living faith acted upon the fleshly mind of Terah, and he too felt attracted by the journey.

A glance at the map shows that Terah and his family journeyed about 600 miles with Abram to get to Haran, but the map also reveals another thing, the route never took them across the river Euphrates. Even though 600 miles separated them from Ur of the Chaldees they were not separated from all that Chaldea meant to God. Haran was famous not only as a frontier town of the Babylonian Empire, but for the worship of the self-same

god that made Ur of the Chaldees famous too. Terah was not a Hebrew, *he never passed over*. It will be remembered that Pharaoh was willing to let Israel go and worship the Lord “*in the land*”, but neither Terah nor Pharaoh had the “Hebrew” spirit. Before the record is given of Abram’s departure from Haran, there is recorded the great promise made by the God of glory, introducing into the page of Scripture the purpose of election, so far as nations are concerned. The Scriptures are very exact, and we are never likely to believe them too implicitly: if we compare Gen. xii. 1 with Acts vii. 2-4 we shall find that Stephen makes an omission of one term. He tells us that the God of glory called Abraham from his country and kindred, but he does not say, “and from thy father’s house”. Abraham’s action, therefore, in allowing his father and relatives to accompany him as far as Haran was quite within the command he had received. Upon the death of his father the added words, “and from thy father’s house”, make up the full statement, and “so Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him”. Nature’s ties were no longer to hold him; a second separation must now be made. How kindly the Lord leads on! Still further and deeper trials of faith await Abram, but he is not tried above that which he is able to bear.

The Lord in Gen. xii. 1-3 makes the first of a series of eight covenants with Abraham. In this first covenant we have a promise, every item of it, as we shall see, being personal to Abraham:

“Get *thee* out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew *thee*.
 And I will make of *thee* a great nation,
 And I will bless *thee*,
 And make *thy* name great,
 And *thou* shall be a blessing,
 And I will bless them that bless *thee*,
 And curse him that curseth *thee*,
 And in *thee* shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.”

This great covenant is divided into related groups of promise, as follows:

- A | Get thee OUT, the Lord had said.
- B | COUNTRY, KINDRED, and HOUSE. A *land* shown to Abraham.
- C | a | The promise of the GREAT nation.
 - b | The promise to BLESS Abraham.
 - a | The promise of the GREAT name.
 - b | The promise that Abraham shall be a BLESSING.
 (Conditional clause added).
- B | ALL FAMILIES of the earth *blessed* in Abraham.
- A | So Abram DEPARTED, as the Lord had spoken.

Here we have the germ of the whole of God’s covenants with Abraham, viz., Israel and the Nations. Like Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, which stands on the threshold of the times of the Gentiles, this covenant spans and embraces the whole period and scope of the Abrahamic covenant, all other covenants and promises, including even Paul’s witness

to justification by faith in *Romans and Galatians*, being but expansions and details of this one grand covenant.

Abraham must ever stand out in the Scriptures as a giant of faith, and it behooves such pigmies as ourselves to be careful of our criticism, yet we realize that the faithful Word presents to us in Abraham a man of like infirmities with ourselves, and if we learn salutary lessons from the recorded failure of this man of faith, it need not minister to our pride, nor lessen the testimony to faith which Abraham gave:

“By faith, when he was called obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.”

“So Abraham departed, as the Lord had spoken to him.”

The question that is in our mind concerns Lot. The Lord had called Abram and he obeyed. He had told him to leave country, kindred and father's house. Did Abram fully obey this part of the command? The verse in Gen. xii. says, “So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him, *and Lot went with him*”. Lot was the son of Haran, therefore Abram's nephew (Gen. xi. 27, 31; xii. 5; xiv. 12), and so he was Abram's *kindred*, and Abram had been commanded to get out from his kindred. Lot seems to be mentioned several times in a somewhat detached way, “and Lot with him” (xiii. 1). “And Lot also, which went with Abram” (xiii. 5). A relieved feeling seems to come when we read, “And the Lord said unto Abram, *after that Lot was separated from him*, Lift up now thine eyes” (xiii. 14). The ties of the flesh are strong, “and Lot went with him”. Whether we are right in this, we cannot say; true it is that Lot's presence brought neither peace nor blessing to Abram, and the entry of Lot into the land of Canaan ultimately lost him his wife, his home, and finally his character. If we will but examine ourselves we shall find the most of our fullest acts of obedience, and sincerest endeavours to walk a separate path, have been somewhat spoiled by the *Terahs* and the *Lots* who will not leave us to wholly follow the Lord. The silence of Scripture as to this in the record of faith in Heb. xi., is a consolation; the Lord is not swift to mark iniquity, if He were, who would stand?

When Abram reached Sichem and the plain of Moreh, the Lord appeared unto him. Abram had crossed the Jordan, and penetrated nearly half-way through the country known as Samaria; Gilgal, where the reproach of Israel was rolled away some years afterwards, is near this place. It looks as though Abram had to venture upon the word of the Lord, walking by faith. Without further vision or revelation, surrounded by the Canaanites (ever the foes of faith), he was put to a severe test. The silence is at length broken by the appearance of the Lord, and by the utterance of a single promise, ‘unto thy seed will I give this land’. Following this promise comes Abram's response, “and there he builded” (xii. 7). What did he build? Surely, if the land was *his freehold*, and his seed's for ever, he will at once begin to build a nice comfortable house, he will be justified in adding all the latest improvements that the Canaanites may have invented, and so show that his faith was real and matter of fact, that he really believed that the land belonged to him. So reasons the flesh. Abram never built anything other than altars throughout his pilgrimage. Cain and Nimrod built cities, the whole family of mankind attempt to build a city and a tower and make a great name; Noah and Abram built altars.

There is in this a principle, true now as then, and expressed for all time in the words of Him Who spake with authority and not as the Scribes:

“Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you” (Matt. vi. 33).

The fitting accompaniment to the altar is the tent. Verse 8 tells us that Abram pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east, and there he builded an altar unto the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord. Verse 9 says, “and Abram journeyed”; the word indicates the pulling up of tent pegs. There was a definite purpose and choice in all this:

“By faith he sojourned *in the land of promise*, as in a strange country, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise.”
(Why?) “For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God” (Heb. xi. 9, 10).

The spiritual pilgrim in effect judges that no city of man’s building has *foundations*. In spite of the testimony of our senses, faith knows that “that which is seen is temporal, but that which is not seen is eternal”.

“These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth” (Heb. xi. 13).

Do we ‘declare plainly’ that such is our faith and hope? Our life and hope and inheritance are found at the right hand of God. Do we, by setting our mind on things above, and by exhibiting small concern for the fashion of this world that passeth away, do we ‘declare plainly’ that here we have no continuing city? Our citizenship is in heaven, and as such we cannot but be strangers and pilgrims on the earth; the altar and the tent are the two great characteristics of the pilgrim walk. The *altar* recognizes the claims of a holy God, the *tent* the necessity of separation for a holy pilgrim people.

Heb. xi. tells us that the fact that Abraham was willing to dwell in a tent in the land of promise, was due to the vision of faith—‘he looked for a city that had foundations’. Abraham was not a nomad by temperament, he did not choose the tent out of preference, he longed for city life, *he looked* for a city. Like others who found here no continuing city, he sought one to come. Abraham, however, realized that to have fellowship with God meant that he must share the rejection of the Lord. The altar and the city come together in Heb. xiii. 10-14, “We have an altar here we have no continuing city”. That means practically for us, “the tent”. In other words, like Abraham, we must “go forth unto Him *without the camp*, bearing His reproach”.

No.33. Joseph---The Dominion Promised and Postponed
(Gen. xxxvii. - xxxix.).
pp. 109 - 114

We have seen in earlier studies that the first section of Genesis which deals with the RACE is bounded by two typical figures, Adam and Noah. We see also that the second section which deals with the NATION is bounded by two typical figures, Abraham and Joseph.

Passing over the chapter that is devoted to the generations of Esau we open at Gen. xxxvii. and read:--

“And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan. These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph”

Jacob’s generations are not written as from Padan-aram and the house of Laban, but from Canaan, the land of pilgrimage. Jacob uses this word ‘stranger’ in xlvii. 9 when he speaks of the years of his ‘pilgrimage’. The pilgrim character of the family of faith is a very fundamental of dispensational truth. All the exhortations to leave the world and its ways, which so characterize the writings of the N.T., emphasize this truth.

The second item of importance in this statement of the generations of Jacob is the fact that it is practically the life story of Joseph. We do *not* read, “These are the generations of Jacob. Reuben” but “Joseph”. The other sons are referred to as ‘his brethren’. Joseph is pre-eminently the great type of Christ in Genesis, and this again leads us to another great fundamental of all truth; whether doctrinal or dispensational, “Christ is all”. The first great type of Christ in Genesis is Adam, ‘who was a figure of Him that was to come’ (Rom. v. 14). The last is Joseph, to whom is ‘added’ his brother Benjamin, the son of the right hand equally a figure of the same blessed One. Adam’s story is of terrible failure involving all his seed in ruin. Joseph’s story is one of suffering as a path to glory with the object that he may ‘preserve life’.

It may be interesting to note the complete little picture that Genesis presents in the seven great types of Christ that it contains:--

- A | ADAM—Sin forfeit life.
- B | ABEL—The accepted offering.
- C | SETH—Substitution.
- D | NOAH—Atonement (“pitch”).
- C | ISAAC—Substitution.
- B | JUDAH—Suretyship.
- A | JOSEPH—Sufferings lead to preservation of life.

The record in Gen. xxxvii. does not say, ‘Now Jacob loved Joseph’, but “*Israel* loved Joseph”. Israel, the prince with God, loved Joseph more than all his children. Joseph’s

position in the family is indicated by the “coat of many colours” which his father made for him. The marginal alternative of the A.V. ‘pieces’ is to be rejected. The embroidered garments of Aaron—the blue, the purple, and the scarlet, were symbols of the priestly office. Joseph was the heir and the priest of the family. When Rebekah prepared Jacob to deceive Isaac and to seek the birthright, she took ‘raiment of desires’. Throughout Scripture clothing has a symbolic value. The result of Joseph’s pre-eminence is prophetic of Christ. “His brethren hated him.”

Joseph’s career cannot be dissociated from dreams, and they run in pairs:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 1st pair | Joseph’s dreams of pre-eminence.
Lead to prison and suffering. |
| 2nd pair | The prisoner’s dreams being interpreted.
Lead to deliverance from prison. |
| 3rd pair | Pharaoh’s dreams being interpreted.
Lead to glory and honour. |

The words of his brethren at the recital of his first dream anticipate the words of the enemies of Christ:

“Shalt thou indeed reign over us? or shalt thou indeed have dominion over us? And they hated him yet the more for his dreams and for his words” (Gen. xxxvii. 8).

The statement made concerning Jacob—“his father observed the saying” (Gen. xxxvii. 11)—upon the narration of the second dream reminds one of the words concerning Mary that she “kept all these things and pondered them in her heart” (Luke ii. 19).

It is very strongly emphasized in the sequel that the envy and hatred that sought to prevent Joseph’s dreams from becoming accomplished facts were over-ruled by God to bring about their fulfillment:

“So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God: and He hath made me a father to Pharaoh, and a lord of all his house, and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt” (Gen. xlv. 8).

So Peter could say:

“Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain” (Acts ii. 23).

Joseph’s dreams spoke of rulership over his brethren. The rejection of Joseph by his brethren temporarily suspended this prophecy from fulfillment, and during the interval he became ruler and saviour among the Gentiles, reaching the destined rulership at a subsequent period. The ‘postponement theory’ cannot be proved from a type, but the fitness is nevertheless confirmatory. Christ was heralded as a King. His rejection as such

was foreknown; and when at length He is acknowledged King, it will be found that He is Saviour as well.

It is also surely not an accident that it is one named Judah (Judas in Greek) who suggested selling Joseph for twenty pieces of silver, while Judas sold Christ for thirty pieces of silver. It was the father who sent his beloved son Joseph to his brethren, the latter saying "Come now, therefore, and let us slay him". It was the Father Who sent His well beloved Son to His brethren in the flesh: these received Him not, but rather said, "This is the heir; come, let us kill Him".

We learn from the last verse of Gen. xxxvii. that Joseph was sold to Potiphar; and then, before we are told anything further, a part of the life of Judah is interjected, the theme of Joseph at Potiphar's house being resumed in chapter xxxix. Judah falls into temptation, and the signet, bracelets and staff which he left behind are a witness against him. Joseph stands firm under a similar temptation; and the garment which he left behind, though used against him falsely, was a witness really of his integrity. Joseph stands where Judah falls; how this is repeated in the temptation of Christ is recorded in Matt. iv. Those three temptations in the wilderness have their parallels in the wilderness wanderings of Israel, the three quotations used by Christ being from the book of Deuteronomy.

The pathway to glory for Joseph was *via* prison and shame. It was so with his blessed Antitype too, Who declared that He must needs have suffered these things and to have entered into His glory. When Joseph was in the house of Potiphar, we read, "The Lord was with Joseph" (Gen. xxxix. 2). This is repeated when Joseph was cast into prison (verse 21). This must have been the great sustaining fact upon which Joseph leaned during his severe trial (Psa. cv. 19). It was the consciousness too, of the Father's nearness that was the great joy of Christ during His earthly ministry.

We conclude this section with the quaint rendering of an early English version:

"The Lord was with Joseph, and he was a luckie fellow" (Gen. xxxix. 2).

Joseph sets before us in his remarkable career a clear type of that feature which is so prophetic of Christ—the sufferings and the glory that should follow".

The first half of the story leaves Joseph in the lowest depths; but we shall not leave the study of his typical career until we see him seated at the right hand of Majesty. The dreams of Joseph led to his exile; the dreams of Pharaoh led to Joseph's exaltation.

"And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as God hath shewed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art: Thou shalt be over my house, and according unto thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou" (Gen. xli. 39, 40).

Pharaoh called Joseph's name *Zaphnath-paaneah*. The A.V. gives a possible meaning in the margin by considering it a Coptic word, but more recent discovery in

Ancient Egyptian brings to light the true meaning of the name and its prophetic import. *Zaph-en-to* was a title of the last of the Shepherd Kings of Egypt and means 'The nourisher of the world', *Zap* means 'abundance'.

"Its well ascertained meaning is 'food', especially 'corn' or 'grain' in general"
(Canon Cook).

Nt (nath) is the preposition 'of', common on the early monuments. *Pa* is the definite article 'the'. *Anch* signifies 'life'. Thus one name of Memphis is *ta-anch*, the land of life, or, the land of the living. The name therefore means "Food of the life", and is a far-off anticipating of that wondrous claim which the Greater than Joseph was to make when He said "*I am the Bread of Life*".

Is there not also an echo of Pharaoh's words in the lips of Mary? Pharaoh said, when the people had no bread, "Go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do" (Gen. xli. 55). Mary said to the servants, when they had no wine, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it" (John ii. 5).

Chapter xlii. resumes the broken thread of the story of Jacob and his sons. One event, however, has happened that it is important to remember. Joseph blesses the Gentiles during his rejection by his brethren. He is united to a Gentile by marriage while exiled from his father's house. The names of his two children speak of forgetting his toil, and his father's house, and being fruitful in the land of his affliction. The famine at length appears and among those who are forced to sue at Joseph's feet are his ten brethren. The story is a long one and we will not spoil it by attempting to summarize, we know how it all ends. The outstanding typical features number among them the following:

(1) THE REPENTANCE OF ISRAEL.—When Joseph's brethren came before him and are charged with being spies, they aver that they are twelve brethren, the sons of one man in the land of Canaan; and they say:

"The youngest (brother) is this day with our father, and one is not" (Gen. xlii. 13).

The mention of the fate of Joseph and the harshness of their treatment at the hands of the ruler of Egypt causes their conscience to awaken and they said:--

"We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us"
(Gen. xlii. 21).

Reuben uses even more forceful words: "Behold, also his blood is required" (Gen. xlii. 22). The type is clear. Israel must repent before they can be blessed.

(2) THE REVELATION TO ISRAEL.—"Then Joseph could not refrain himself I am Joseph" (Gen. xlv. 1-4). When Israel's blindness is removed and for the first time they recognize the Lord Jesus as their Messiah, "They shall look upon Me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him" (Zech. xii. 10). These are the words of prophecy.

First there is the revelation of the *person*, “I am Joseph”. Then follows the revelation of the *purpose*, “God did send me before you to preserve life to save your lives by a great deliverance” (Gen. xlv.4-7).

(3) THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.—Joseph could not be content until ‘all Israel’ were safely beneath his care. Benjamin had been brought before him by the strategy of love, and now nothing must hinder the journey of his father Jacob.

One more feature of fundamental importance is marked for us in Heb. xi. If we were to select *the one act* in Joseph’s life which should eclipse all others as an act of faith, we hardly feel that the one selected by the inspired writer of Heb. xi. would be our choice. There in Heb. xi. 22 we read:

“By faith Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel; *and gave commandment concerning his bones.*”

“Concerning his bones!” What is there in these words to deserve such prominence? Joseph linked the deliverance of Israel with *resurrection*.

(4) THE RESURRECTION OF ISRAEL.—Joseph stresses the fact that the land of promise was that which God swore to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob (Gen. i. 24), and Christ shows that the title “The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” proves the doctrine of Resurrection (Matt. xxii. 23-33). Ezek. xxxvii. connects resurrection with restoration.

We are conscious that much more precious truth lies near the surface of this remarkable history. We have indicated a few fundamentals of dispensational importance. One more feature must bring this article to a close. The dreams of Joseph, though their realization was postponed, were eventually fulfilled, but the postponement shut the door upon Israel for a time and opened it to the Gentiles. So the rejection of Christ by His brethren, their refusal to ‘have this man reign over them’ deferred the time of their restoration. When Israel is at length restored, the Gentiles will have been blessed for a period of two thousand years, or as the type has it, “For these TWO years hath the famine been in the land” (Gen. xlv. 6).

The Lord who was despised and rejected shall yet be honoured and exalted, and in this glorious fact is all our hope and desire.

The name Joseph means *adding*, given by Rachel at his birth, for said she “The Lord shall *add* to me another son” (Gen. xxx. 24). Eve also, it will be remembered, had another son added, namely Seth who completes the type partly set forth by Abel whom Cain slew. In due time the other son was born, but his birth cost Rachel her life.

“And it came to pass, as her soul was departing (for she died), that she called is name *Ben-oni* (son of my sorrow): but his father called him *Benjamin* (son of the right hand)” (xxxv. 18).

However important was the place that Joseph was destined to fulfil, his name was a continual reminder of the inadequacy even of his full life to set forth the finished work of

the coming Saviour. Benjamin stresses the resurrection and the session of the Saviour at 'the right hand', without which salvation would not have been possible nor the work of redemption complete.

**No.34. Moses---The Principle of Separation (Exod. v. 1).
pp. 114 - 116**

**“Let My people go” (Exod. v. 1).
The Principle of Separation.**

The demand of Moses made when he entered into the presence of Pharaoh, and Pharaoh's refusal and attempts at compromise, form a type of the age-lasting feud between the "Church and the World":

“Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let My people go, that they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness” (Exod. v. 1).

No feast to the Lord could be held in Egypt, the type of the world. The wilderness was the place chosen by the Lord for worship. Pilgrims and strangers may worship acceptably; slaves to the world and the flesh cannot worship in spirit. In Exod. v. 3 the two terms are added that are typically suggestive. God is called "The God of the Hebrews", suggesting the separate character of His people. The journey that the Israelites must take in order to worship God was to be a "three days' journey". From the Creation week onwards the third day sets forth resurrection. True worship is not of the world (*Egypt*), it is offered by a free people (*Let My people go*), and a separate people (*Hebrews*), and is upon resurrection ground (*three days*). One sacrifice only was offered in Egypt, the Passover; all else was reserved for the Tabernacle in the wilderness.

Pharaoh's answers, "Who is the Lord?"; "I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go"; "Get you to your burdens", are, in their turn, typical of the world's attitude towards spiritual service. The 'burdens of Egypt' are far more important than the service of the Lord, and even among the Lord's people Martha finds more imitators than Mary, so much of Egypt do we all carry with us.

The judgments of God begin after Pharaoh's refusal, and in chapter viii. Pharaoh calls for Moses and Aaron and suggests the first compromise, "Go ye, sacrifice to your God IN THE LAND" (25). God had said 'in the wilderness' and a "three days' journey". Pharaoh says, in effect, 'You can worship *your* God, I do not ask you to bow down to any of mine; you can offer your sacrifice, but there is no necessity for making yourselves *so peculiar*, sacrifice to your God *in the land*'.

The first great snare set by the god of this age is that of mixing the world with the church. Moses repudiated the compromise, the first reason being that the very centre and basis of their worship was an *abomination* to the Egyptians. The world is quite willing to

speak of “Jesus”, and especially so if they can refer to him as the ‘Galilean’ or the ‘Carpenter’, but the centre of the faith, the cross, “Christ crucified”, is an ‘offense’. The cross reveals the hopeless and helpless condition of the flesh, and this is an ‘abomination to the Egyptians’.

The second reason for repudiating the suggestion is just as strong as the first, but one that we are apt to forget. The suggestion ran counter to God’s express statement, and that is enough to condemn it. When He says ‘wilderness’ and “three days’ journey”, to *debate* the question of ‘in the land’ is sin. Upon this resolute stand being taken by Moses, Pharaoh appears willing to lengthen the chain, but it is still a *chain*:--

“I will let you go, that ye may sacrifice to the Lord your God in the wilderness”
(Exod. viii. 28).

So far, that is good. Pharaoh, moreover, does not speak irreverently of God; he uses the full title of the Lord. The snare, however, is still set. “Only”—ah yes! the world will give a good length of chain. “Only ye shall not go VERY FAR AWAY.” The contested point is the clear-cut division between the Church and the World. While many would hesitate to offer the abominations of the Egyptians IN THE LAND, they are ensnared at the HALF-WAY HOUSE. Let the Church have its separate gathering, its ecclesiastical laws, its ordained priests, its ritual, its ‘form of godliness’, but let it deny ‘the power thereof’ by leaving out the “three days’ journey”. Once more the demand is made, and once again the chain is lengthened:

“Go, serve the Lord your God: but who are they that shall go? And Moses said, We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we must hold a feast unto the Lord”
(Exod. x. 8, 9).

True Scriptural unity has ever been the target of Satan. If the *attractions* of the world from without do not avail, *distractions* from within may prove more effectual.

“And he said unto them, Let the Lord be so with you, as I will let you go, AND YOUR LITTLE ONES; look to it; for evil is before you. Not so, go now YE THAT ARE MEN, and serve the Lord” (Exod. x. 10, 11).

The distraction of a divided heart, the serving of two masters, the miserable failure of the attempt to make the best of both worlds, are suggested here. After further judgments, a yet further concession is made:

“Go ye, serve the Lord: only” (Exod. x. 24).

The presence of that ‘only’ is deadly. Shakespeare puts it—“but me no but’s”, and it were well that we met all attempts to evade the full truth as peremptorily.

“Only let *your flocks and your herds be stayed*, let your little ones also go with you”
(Exod. x. 24).

That is, bind the saint of God down to earth by the shackles of worldly possessions. The love of riches, the cares and riches of this age, the things that so easily entangle us. Moses replied:

“Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God. Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not an hoof be left behind; for thereof must we take to serve the Lord our God; and we know not with what we must serve the Lord, until we come thither” (Exod. x. 25, 26).

Demas was caught in this snare, so also were Ananias and Sapphira. In the parable of the Sower, the thorns represented the cares, riches and pleasure of this life. The evil is two-fold. While our possessions remain in Egypt, our hearts are likely to turn back there too. On the other hand we must be prepared to offer whatever the Lord shall demand. We may be prepared to offer money, but hold back time. We may be pleased to pray, but not to labour. That is a spirited expression it would do us good to repeat occasionally—*not an hoof!* Separateness must ever be offensive to the world, and will never be understood or tolerated.

Moses demanded that Israel should serve God:

In the wilderness.
A three days' journey.
All should go.
Not an hoof left behind.

Pharaoh suggested that they could serve their God just as well and with far less inconvenience if they either remained:

In the land.
Not very far off.
Only men went.
Flocks and herds left behind.

These four items teach us that true worship is connected with a pilgrim walk, is on resurrection ground, that it comprehends all saints, and embraces all we have and are. These four items fill out the word 'saint', anything less “comes short of the glory of God”.

No.35. The Lamb without blemish (Exod. xii.).
pp. 136 - 140

Nine plagues had descended upon Egypt, afflicting man and beast, and exposing the grossness of Egypt's idolatry and the utter failure of their gods. At the end of the ninth plague Pharaoh had brazenly told Moses that if he saw his face again he should die. Moses went out from the royal presence saying, "Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more" (x. 20). Nine separate solemn warnings had fallen upon deaf ears and hard heart. Before Moses entered into the presence of Pharaoh, the Lord had said:

"I am sure that the King of Egypt will not let you go, no, not by a mighty hand" (iii. 19).

When Moses was ready to leave Midian and return to Egypt, the Lord said:

"See that thou do all these wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine hand: but I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go" (iv. 21).

Light upon the vexed question of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is found in the record:

"But when Pharaoh saw that there was *respite*, he hardened his heart."

Again in ix. 34:

"When Pharaoh saw that the rain and the hail and the thunders were ceased, *he sinned yet more*, and hardened his heart."

It is not our intention to presume to defend the righteousness of God; Rom. ix. silences all replies against God. Some can only accept the teaching of Rom. ix. concerning Pharaoh if it could be allowed that God foresaw the salvation of Pharaoh at or before the reconciliation of all things. Rom. ix., however, cuts all arguments short, and leaves us and all men as clay in the hands of the Potter. Nevertheless be it noted that Pharaoh *sinned* when he hardened his heart "as the Lord had said". To return however to Exod. iv. 21-23 Moses was commanded to say to Pharaoh:

"Thus saith the Lord, Israel is My son, even my *firstborn*; and I say unto thee, let My son go that he may serve Me: and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even *thy firstborn*."

And so, as we have seen, plague after plague fell, revealing the longsuffering and the goodness of God which should have led to repentance. The destruction of the firstborn, though threatened first, falls only after nine plagues had revealed the obdurate character of Pharaoh's heart:

"Thus saith the Lord, About midnight will I go into the midst of Egypt, and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die" (xi. 4, 5).

Before the stroke falls, Israel is instructed concerning the Passover, the first great typical ordinance of redemption given to this people. It is a matter of great importance to realize that indissolubly connected with the Passover is the unleavened bread. The connection is maintained in the reference by Paul to this great chapter of Israel's history in the epistle to the Corinthians. How does he introduce this glorious type of redemption? Does he speak of it in chapter i., where he speaks of the gospel as the preaching of Christ crucified? No, neither does he refer to it in chapter ii. It is in chapter v., where he is dealing with moral evil in the assembly, that the Passover is brought to bear, and it is introduced by a reference to the unleavened bread:

“Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover hath been sacrificed for us, THEREFORE let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth” (I Cor. v. 7, 8).

Possibly, in our view, the Passover appears so great, so essential, that it overshadows the associated feast, but not so in the eyes of God. The sprinkled blood *outside*, and the unleavened bread *inside*, present a complete picture. This relation between the Passover and the unleavened bread is shewn by the structure:

Exodus xii. 1 - 20.

- A | 1, 2. The beginning of months.
- B | 3-11. The Passover.
- C | 12, 13. For I will pass through I will pass over.
- B | 14-17-. The Unleavened Bread.
- C | -17. For this day I brought you out.
- A | 18-20. The first month.

It will be noticed that the section is bounded by the reference to the month:

“This month shall be *unto you* the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you” (xii. 2).

Note the significance of the words ‘to you’. Dispensational changes among the redeemed have no application to the outside world. The dispensation of the Mystery and the *lo-ammi* condition of Israel make no difference either to the computation of time, or the attitude of God. It is a false inference that assumes that, because God is now acting in sheer grace to *the believer*, He is acting in sheer grace to *the outside world*.

It was not the first month in the calendar, the first month of the year was originally *Tisri*, corresponding to our October. The Jews still keep their New Year at this date, in spite of the definite change instituted at the time of their redemption, a sad evidence of their unregenerate condition. From the Autumn of falling leaf and fading flower we are called to Springtime with its parable of resurrection. In this change of time, made when the nation of Israel was born and redeemed, we have the great truth of regeneration. The two ‘musts’ of John iii. come to mind here:

“Ye must be born again” (7).
“Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up” (14).

Newness of life is the blessed fruit of redemption by blood. We may more carefully consider the further teaching of Exod. xii. in another paper; but the truth of the “beginning of months *to you*” should be no strange doctrine to any of our readers.

“A lamb”, “The lamb”, “Your lamb”, such is the suggestive progression in verses 3, 4 and 5, as they speak of the shadow and type of the Lamb of God. Surely in every heart there is the prayer that Christ shall become increasingly the great central and personal factor. Though from *A Saviour*, we may have passed to *The Saviour*, we cannot have rest until we can also say *My Saviour*.

“The whole congregation of Israel shall kill IT” (Exod. xii. 6). So merges the type, the many lambs, into one “it”, the one great Passover of God.

“Your lamb shall be without blemish” (Exod. xii. 5).

The Law in Leviticus is most particular, descending to minute details, that the holiness and perfection of the great Antitype should ever before the mind of the faithful:

“Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed that which is bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut” (Lev. xxii. 22-24).

All such must be set aside.

“Whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer for it shall not be acceptable for you IT SHALL BE PERFECT TO BE ACCEPTED” (Lev. xxii. 19-21).

The Lamb was to be taken on the tenth day of the month, and sacrificed on the fourteenth. This would give time and opportunity for careful inspection. Luke xxiii. contains the findings of those who examined the true Lamb of God, a seven-fold witness to His perfect character:

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| (1) Pilate | “I find <i>no fault</i> in this man.”
“I have found <i>no fault</i> in this man.” |
| (2) Herod | “No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him, and lo, <i>nothing worthy of death</i> is done unto Him.” |
| (3) Pilate | “What evil hath He done? I have found <i>no cause of death</i> in Him.” |
| (4) The Malefactor | “We receive the due rewards of our deeds, but this man <i>hath done nothing amiss.</i> ” |
| (5) The Centurion | “Glorified God saying, Certainly this was a <i>righteous</i> man.” |

Matt. xxvii. adds further evidence:

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| (6) Judas | “I have betrayed <i>innocent</i> blood.” |
| (7) Pilate’s Wife | “Have thou nothing to do with <i>that just man.</i> ” |

Scripture everywhere teaches and assumes the holiness and spotless sinlessness of Christ, the Lamb of God. If doctrine necessitates the tremendous statement that Christ

was 'made sin for us', it immediately adds "Who knew no sin" (II Cor. v. 21). If it is emphasized that Christ as Kinsman-Redeemer actually took our human nature it is careful to say that while He *actually* was made flesh, it was in the *likeness* of sinful flesh that He came (Rom. viii. 3). Before Peter says, "Who His Own self *bare* our sins", he writes of Him "Who did no sin" (I Pet. ii. 22-24) and in the same epistle Peter speaks of redemption as being by "the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (i. 18, 19).

If Heb. iv. declares that Christ was touched with the feeling of our infirmities and in all points had been tempted like as we are, it does not omit to add "*sin excepted*" (Gk. *choris* Heb. iv. 15).

There is need that every believer should not hold with no shadow of uncertainty that Christ was "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners". "It shall be PERFECT to be accepted." Such is the Lamb of God, such is our Saviour.

"And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you" (Exod. xii. 13).

The word 'token' will repay a little study. It first occurs in Gen. i. 14 "Let them be for *signs*". Gen. iv. 15 A.V. reads "The Lord set a mark upon Cain"; it should read "The Lord set a token for Cain, lest any finding him should kill him". It was a token for Cain's safety. The bow in the cloud is called 'the token of the covenant' (Gen. ix. 12) as also is circumcision (Gen. xvii. 11).

Many times the word translated 'sign' in Exodus is this word, and indeed this is its most frequent translation. "The blood shall be to you for a sign." The blood signified something. It signified life laid down:

"The soul (life) of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement by reason of the life" (Lev. xvii. 11 R.V.).

The blood atoned for 'YOUR SOUL' (LIFE), "BY REASON OF THE LIFE" in it. The blood posted upon the doorpost was a "sign" that redemption had been made. Nothing else was a 'sign', nothing else did the Lord 'see'. No genealogy showing direct descent from Abraham could be a 'sign', no promises, vows, prayers, nothing but the sprinkled blood.

The words "I will pass over you" must also be considered. As they stand, they give the mind the impression that the Lord 'passed over' the houses of Israel without smiting them, and went on to the houses of the Egyptians. In verse 23 however this idea does not seem fully to fit the statement there made:

"The Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you."

The 'passing over' here is synonymous with protecting. In I Kings xviii. 21 we meet the word in the question of the prophet "How long *halt* ye between two opinions". The idea of 'hovering' or 'suspense' suits the thought better than 'passing over' and leaving. Isa. xxxi. 5 says:

"As birds flying, so will the Lord of Hosts defend Jerusalem: defending also He will deliver it; and *passing over* He will preserve it."

The allusion to Deut. xxxii. 11 here seems clear:

"As an eagle stirreth up her nest, *fluttereth over* her young, *spreadeth* abroad her wings."

Instead of repeating the word 'fluttereth over', Isaiah goes to Exod. xii. for a synonym, and says "passing over". This gives us the blessed meaning of "passover". The Lord, like the eagle, spread abroad His wings, hovered over the house, and protected it from the destroyer that went through the land. Psa. xci. 4 expresses the feeling of *pasach* 'To pass over' without using the word.

"He shall *cover* thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust."

We would not suggest any alteration in the A.V., the words are too precious and have too sacred associations, but we can keep in mind the meaning as we read as being "When I see the blood I will PAUSE over you (not PASS over you)". "The two *side* posts and the *upper* door post" were sprinkled with the blood, but not the threshold, not the floor. The apostasy is characterized by "Trampling under foot the Son of God, and counting the blood common" (Heb. x. 29).

The Jews reckoned a double evening, the first from noon to three, the second from three until sunset. In Exod. xii. 6 the margin shews that the Passover Lamb was killed 'between the two evenings', which would be at three o'clock. Matt. xxvii. 46 shews that the Lord Jesus died at the ninth hour, and after that "when even was come" Joseph of Arimathea begged of Pilate the body. The sixth hour was noon, the ninth was three o'clock.

Even such a detail as the exact time was fulfilled. John xix. 36 draws attention to yet another feature which links type and Antitype together.

"These things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken."

Roman practice must give place to the sure word of prophecy. The Roman soldiers must bear their testimony together with the Centurion that 'this was a righteous man', for Psa. xxxiv. 20 speaking of the righteous says:

"He keepeth all his bones; not one of them is broken."

When David was led to see his sinfulness before God, instead of saying, "I am righteous" he said:

“Make me to hear joy and gladness, that the *bones* which thou hast *broken* may rejoice” (Psa. li. 8).

Unblemished in life, unbroken in death, God’s true Passover Lamb was *perfect* and in Him alone can we find redemption and acceptance. For a further and fuller examination of this expression “between the two evenings”, see *Life through His Name*, pp. 414-430. Also *The Passover Week* in the *Alphabetical Analysis*.

No.36. The Feast of the Unleavened Bread. pp. 144 - 151

We must now give attention to the associated feast of Unleavened Bread. Throughout Scripture the truth set forth by the Passover and the Unleavened Bread is constantly associated. Take for instance Eph. ii. 8-10 “For by grace are ye saved through faith not *out of* works”, this is the N.T. doctrinal presentation of the truth set forth in the sign of the sprinkled blood. “Created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*”: this is the equivalent to the Unleavened Bread. The blood, outside, of the unblemished lamb, calls for the unleavened bread within.

“And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it” (Exod. xii. 8).

In the law given subsequently in Exodus occurs this command:

“Thou shalt not offer the blood of My sacrifice with leavened bread” (Exod. xxiii. 18).

In Lev. ii. 11 we read:

“No meal offering shall be made with leaven.”

In the N.T., leaven consistently typifies evil. Matt. xvi. 6-12:

“Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees Then understood they how that He bade them beware of *the doctrine* of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.”

Luke xii. 1 adds the words:

“Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is *hypocrisy*.”

I Cor. v. 8 speaks of “the leaven of *malice* and *wickedness*”, contrasting it with the “unleavened bread of *sincerity* and *truth*”. Summing up the evil that had corrupted the simple faith of the Galatians, the Apostle says, “A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” (v. 9). Leaven therefore represents evil in doctrine and practice. It is the purpose of God that His children should be ‘without blemish’. As a result of the great Offering of Christ

they shall one day be presented “holy and unblameable and unproveable in His sight” (Col. i. 22).

Notice the basis of the exhortation of I Cor. v. 7:

“Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, *as ye are unleavened.*”

In Christ the Corinthians were ‘unleavened’. They are addressed as ‘saints’, but their walk was far from being ‘as becometh saints’. They could not make themselves holy, but being sanctified in Christ they can be urged to walk worthy.

Another associated meaning which Scripture attaches to the feast of Unleavened Bread is connected with the pilgrim character of those who first partook of it:

“Thus shall ye eat it (the lamb, the bread and the herbs), with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste” (Exod. xii. 11).

“And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders” (xii. 34).

“And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt and could not tarry” (xii. 39).

The feast of Unleavened Bread speaks of separation from Egypt, of a people who are not at home, whose hopes are beyond and above. It is evident that the observance of the feast of the Passover lamb alone was not sufficient memorial:

“Ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; FOR in this self-same day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: THEREFORE shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance for ever” (xii. 17).

Redemption saves *from* and saves *to*. The Passover not only saved Israel from the destroyer, but from further contamination with or service to Egypt. The Passover naturally led to the Red Sea and the wilderness. The lives of the people had been made ‘bitter with hard bondage’; this can be easily forgotten, as is seen in the case of Israel in the wilderness. There, when the experiences of the Passover and the Red Sea were things of the past, they remembered ‘the flesh pots’ and ‘bread to the full’ (xvi. 3).

“We remember (said they) the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick” (Numb. xi. 5).

That is what they ‘remembered’, six items! They soon forgot the wonders of their deliverance and the bitterness of their bondage. Therefore added to the unleavened bread was ‘bitter herbs’, ‘bitterness’ as the Hebrew really is. It is God Who appoints the bitterness of the pilgrim’s path. Israel met it at the beginning of their wilderness experience, and the first stage of their journey is named Marah, or Bitter. Let us accept these indications without murmuring, for they are sent in love to wean us from the flesh pots of Egypt, and to remind us of the bitterness of our former bondage. May we all rejoice in the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and experimentally realize the place and importance of the feast of the Unleavened Bread.

We have seen the emphasis which the close association of the Unleavened Bread with the Passover gives to the fact that redemption must always be manifested by separation from evil; that those who are 'called saints' should act as 'becometh saints'; that those who are 'unleavened' should put away the 'leaven of malice and wickedness'. This is the ideal, and nothing lower than this can have the sanction of the Word. The Scriptures, however, reveal the fact which everywhere presses upon us today, that the meaning and truth of the unleavened bread is often not practically realized.

"And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, beside children. *And a mixed multitude* went up also with them; and flocks, and herds, even very much cattle" (xii. 37, 38).

When Moses stood before Pharaoh he demanded that not only should the men go, but said he:

"We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go" (x. 9).

When the Exodus actually took place, it is found that in between the 'men and the children', their 'flocks and herds', is 'a mixed multitude also', or as the margin reads "a great mixture". The effect of this mixture is seen in Numb. xi. 4, "And the mixed multitude that was among them fell a-lusting"; that is what we might expect. There is however a sad echo of the 'also' of Exod. xii. 38, for Numb. xi. 4 continues:

"And the children of Israel also wept again, and said, Who shall give us flesh to eat? there is nothing at all, beside this manna before our eyes."

"This manna" is elsewhere called "angels' food", "bread from heaven", and is a type of Him Who is the Bread of life that came down from heaven. The influence of the mixed multitude is clearly seen. The heart is turned back to Egypt, and the things of God are lightly esteemed. Some of this mixed multitude were allied to Israel by marriage. This is no fancy, for we have at least one such alliance and its disastrous effect recorded in Lev. xxiv. 10:

"And the son of an Israelitish woman, *whose father was an Egyptian*, went out among the children of Israel."

The words 'went out among' seem to imply some definite purpose. We are told in Exod. ii. 11 that when Moses was grown:

"*He went out* unto his brethren and he spied an Egyptian smiting an Hebrew."

Here, however, we find, "This son of the Israelitish woman and a man of Israel strove together in the camp". To the fleshly lusts of Numb. xi., therefore, must be added the 'strife' of Lev. xxiv. Not only so, but the dreadful sin of blasphemy must be included:

"And the Israelitish woman's son blasphemed the name of the Lord, and cursed."

Instead of loving that Name, and revering it, this son of an Israelitish woman blasphemed, and blasphemy is the mark of Antichrist.

Neh. xiii. 1-13 shows how Israel, when returned from captivity, mingled with the Ammonite and the Moabite, and these are called 'the mixed multitude'. In Neh. xiii. 23, 24, Ashdod, Moab and Ammon are cited as nations which had intermarried with Israel, and Nehemiah draws a sad lesson from Solomon:

"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" (Neh. xiii. 26).

Ezra ix. 1, 2 likewise mourns over the fact that Israel had not:

"separated themselves from the people of the lands the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands."

Jehoshaphat was another king who had a good record, for he 'walked in the first ways of his father David, and sought not unto Baalim, but sought the Lord God of his father'. In the third year of his reign he sent princes and Levites with the book of the law of the Lord to teach in Judah. Yet like Solomon and like Israel of the Exodus he failed, for II Chron xviii. 1 says:

"Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honour in abundance, and joined affinity with Ahab",

and that 'affinity' was his ruin. It is interesting to note that *chathan*, 'to join in affinity', is translated "to be a son-in-law", "to make marriages", "father-in-law", and "mother-in-law", showing the closeness of the union between Jehoshaphat and Ahab.

Returning to Israel and the mixed multitude, we see the failure to put into *practice* the truth contained in the type of the unleavened bread. The Corinthians, we have seen, were 'called saints', and Christ had been made to them 'sanctification' as well as 'redemption'. They were 'unleavened' in Christ, but they had failed to realize their position. II Cor. vii. 1, summing up the argument of II Cor. vi. 14-18 where the unequal yoke and unholy fellowship is seen in all its ugliness, says:

"Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, PERFECTING holiness in the fear of God."

We can neither make nor merit holiness, but when the grace of God separates us by the blood of Christ (as of a lamb without blemish and without spot) from sin and death with its bondage and its bitterness that are worse than those of Egypt, then 'our reasonable service' must include this heart and life separation, the absence of which worked such disaster in the spiritual experience of Israel, of Solomon, of Jehoshaphat and of the Corinthians. This is 'perfecting holiness', or taking it to its logical conclusion.

"Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" (II Cor. vi. 17).

“THE SELF-SAME DAY” (Exod. xii. 40 - 42)

As one reads the book of Exodus, especially that part which deals with Pharaoh's opposition, the interplay of human fear and cupidity, of Divine forbearance and judgment, the long period of Israel's bondage, or the policy of the new king that knew not Joseph, all seem to move so naturally, cause and effect are so obvious, that the sovereign will and purpose of God is not apparent on the surface. Yet through all the years of Israel's changing fortunes, whether the inhuman hatred of Joseph's brethren, the famine that forced Jacob into Egypt, the dreams of Pharaoh, or the change of dynasty, God's great purpose was unfolding, and neither the premature advent of Moses, nor the obstinacy of Pharaoh altered the prearranged plan by so much as one day:

“Now the sojourning the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, EVEN THE SELFSAME DAY it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt. It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord” (Exod. xii. 40-42).

The sojourning of the children of Israel dates back beyond the birth of Jacob's twelve sons, and includes the pilgrimage of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. From the call of Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees, he became a 'sojourner', and all his children were sojourners too. Incidentally Exod. xii. says that they “dwelt in Egypt”, but this did not alter the fact that they were sojourners and away from the land of promise. Gal. iii. 17 gives the same period of time, namely 430 years, as covering the time that elapsed from the promise given to Abraham in Gen. xv. until the giving of the law from Mount Sinai, which took place soon after the Exodus from Egypt.

There is another period connected with the same event (the Exodus) that starts from another point, and covers a period of 400 years. This prophetic utterance is given in Gen. xv. 13-16, and it will be seen that not only did God speak of a definite period of time, but of the chief features that led up to the Exodus. Let us enumerate them:

- (1) “Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs (and shall serve them and they shall afflict them) 400 years.
- (2) And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge;
- (3) And afterward shall they come out with great substance.
- (4) In the fourth generation they shall come hither again.
- (5) For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.”

How are we to account for the fact that Gen. xv. speaks of a period of 400 years, whereas Gal. iii. 17 speaks of the same event as occupying 430 years? At the time of writing this article, the writer endorsed the explanation of *The Companion Bible* which makes the 400 years commence with the recognition of Isaac as the seed when Isaac was five years old. Since writing, however, a beloved fellow-helper has suggested a much simpler explanation which we gladly give in his own words:

This explanation (referring to that of *The Companion Bible* and also our own), I have always personally regarded as unsatisfactory. Surely Isaac was 'recognized as the seed' before his birth—“In Isaac shall thy seed be called”. Surely the point is that Gen. xii. 4 tells us that Abraham was

seventy-five when he left *Haran* (not *Ur*), where he had remained till the death of Terah. But Stephen (Acts vii. 1) says that the glorious God appeared to Abraham while he was still in *Ur*, before he went to live in *Haran*. If we reckon that the sojourning began (as Stephen implies) when Abraham left *Ur*, the five years are accounted for by the sojourn in *Haran*. Thus:

Departure from Ur	Abram = 70	0
Death of Terah and departure from Haran	Abram = 75	5
Birth of Isaac	Abraham = 100	25

		30
Sojourning of Seed		400

Total Sojourning until Exodus		430

We are grateful for this explanation and commend it to our readers.

The Scripture tells us that at the end of the 430 years, even *the self same day*, the children of Israel went out of Egypt. Such is the way that God keeps His Word, and carries out His purpose. We believe it to be a fundamental of dispensational truth that prophecy shall be fulfilled *literally*. The prophetic statements of Scripture concerning the Messiah which have found their fulfillment in the Lord Jesus Christ at His first coming have been fulfilled literally. His place of birth, His manner of life, His ministry, His death, burial and resurrection, have all been literal fulfillments of prophecy. Those Scriptures which concern Him that await their fulfillment at His second coming, these too, we most surely believe shall be likewise fulfilled to the very letter. How comforting it is to realize that “all are in the hand of God”! Habakkuk was assured that in spite of apparent delay:

“The vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, *wait for it* because it will surely come, it will not tarry” (Hab. ii. 2).

Job seemed to perceive this grand fundamental, when he said:

“If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer Thee: Thou wilt have a desire to the work of Thine hands” (Job xiv. 14, 15).

To the one who looks upon the Bible as a collection of ‘texts’, this article may not mean much, but to everyone who has learned to look upon the Scriptures as the unfolding of the purpose of the ages, every confirmation of the faithfulness of God in the fulfillment of His Word is a source of joy and peace:

“Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read; no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate” (Isa. xxxiv. 16).

How many readers could say, without referring to the chapter, with what subject the book of Exodus closes? Some may say the Tabernacle, and be partly right, but the actual closing reference is to the pillar of cloud and fire, “throughout all their journeys”.

In the book of Psalms the Exodus of Israel is several times epitomized, and among the features of that memorable time that are remembered is the fact that He who redeemed the people, led them out and on through sea and wilderness until they reached the land of promise. Notice the following:

“In the daytime also He led them with a cloud and all night with a light of fire” (Psa. lxxviii. 14). “And He led them on safely, so that they feared not; but the sea overwhelmed their enemies” (Psa. lxxviii. 53). He “guided (same word as *led*) them by skillfulness of His hands” (Psa. lxxviii. 72). “He spread a cloud for a covering; and a fire to give light in the night” (Psa. cv. 39).

So in Exod. xiii. 21, 22 we read:

“And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way: and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light: to go by day and night: He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night from before the people.”

Let us notice the following features:

(1) The leading was personal. “*The Lord* went before them.” When Moses rehearsed, before his death, the ways of the Lord with Israel, speaking of His leading he said, “So the Lord *alone* did lead him” (Deut. xxxii. 12). It is the Lord’s prerogative to lead His people, and the solemn statement of Moses here seems to suggest that all other ‘leading’ is nothing less than idolatry. This should give pause to any who rather freely use the expression ‘I felt led’. This personal presence of the Lord was clearly realized by Moses as being essential to the accomplishment of the Lord’s purpose:

“My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest. And he said unto Him, if Thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence” (Exod. xxxiii. 14, 15).

This presence of the Lord was manifested by an angel. “Behold Mine Angel shall go before thee” (Exod. xxxii. 34). So in Exod. xiv. 19, 20 we find:

“The angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them; and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these.”

The presence of the Lord, the leading of the Lord, is a great dividing line between the saint and the world. “As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God” (Rom. viii. 14). The leading may be by lowlier means that of an angel. Psa. lxxvii. 20 says, “Thou leddest Thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron”, yet though the means be more fallible, the Lord alone is the leader, whatever medium He may choose from time to time. The children of God today may not see visible signs of the Lord’s presence, nevertheless the Lord still leads His people, and largely uses the inspired Word. “Send out Thy light and Thy truth, *let them* lead me” (Psa. xliii. 3). We may be more certain that we ‘feel led’ when we are led by God’s own Word.

(2) The leading was adapted to the need. By day a pillar of cloud, but this would not have been visible by night, and so the Lord manifested His presence at night by means of

a pillar of fire. The experience of one time is not necessarily the experience of another. In the daytime and sunshine of life the Lord's presence will be manifested in one way. In the dark night of life's experience His presence, just as real, will be manifested in another way. Whatever the mode of manifestation, the Lord's personal presence is the blessed fact.

(3) Leading is a part of redemption. "HE TOOK NOT AWAY the pillar of cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people" (Exod. xiii. 22). Israel many, many times failed, so grievously indeed that they forfeited the land of promise and perished in the wilderness; nevertheless, the pillar of cloud went before them. This is the closing testimony of the book of Exodus. Coming where it does in the book (xl. 34-38) it reveals the reason why the presence of the Lord manifested in the pillar of cloud could remain. Exod. xl. speaks of the setting up of the Tabernacle, and Lev. xvi. 2 says:

"I will appear (or, I am wont to appear) in the cloud upon the mercy seat."

Numb. ix. 15-23 speaking of the same event says:

"And on the day that the tabernacle was reared up the cloud covered the tabernacle, namely, the tent of testimony; and at even there was upon the tabernacle as it were the appearance of fire until the morning, SO IT WAS ALWAYS."

Notice the way in which this closing statement of Exodus is introduced:

"So Moses FINISHED the work. THEN a cloud covered the tent" (Exod. xl. 33, 34).

The Lord's leading is one of the results of the Lord's redemption, one of the fruits of a finished Work. The Good Shepherd who gave His life for the sheep, as the risen One, leads them in green pastures for His name's sake.

(4) The pillar of cloud regulated all Israel's journeyings. "When the cloud was taken up from the Tabernacle, THEN AFTER THAT the children of Israel journeyed; and IN THE PLACE where the cloud abode, THERE the children of Israel pitched their tents" (Numb. ix. 17).

The time *when* and the place *where* is decided alone by the Lord. Further, we read, "whether it was *by day* or *by night* that the cloud was taken up they journeyed". The Lord's leading did not always conform to custom, nor to convenience, but day or night Israel had to be prepared to follow. "Or whether it were two days, or a month, or a year" that the cloud tarried, there in unquestioning obedience Israel had to remain (Numb. ix. 15-23). What a blessed condition to be in, to be led by the Lord! By day or by night, to Elim with its palm trees, or on into the desert, all is well if we are led by the Lord.

"And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what is in thine heart" (Deut. viii. 2).

"Lead me in a plain path, because of my enemies" (Psa. xxvii. 11).

No.37. Israel's passage through the Red Sea (Exod. xiv.).

**“Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously:
the horse and his rider He hath thrown into the sea” (Exod. xv. 1).**

pp. 196 - 199

The various references to Israel's passage through the Red Sea show that it was not only an experience which was necessary for Israel; a parallel may be found in the experience of the believer, and also in the future restoration of Israel. An appreciation of its place and meaning will give encouragement to the downcast, stimulus to the one who is seeking the crown or the prize, and an explanation of some of the baffling providences which make up the purpose of the ages.

As we learn in the Revelation, that the Beast, the False Prophet and Satan must be removed before the millennial kingdom can be set up, so Israel must see Pharaoh and his host dead on the sea shore before the kingdom can be inherited. This is emphasized in the prophecy of Israel's restoration recorded in Isa. li. 9, 10:

“Awake, awake, put on Thy strength, O arm of the Lord, awake as in the ancient days, in the generations of old. Art Thou not it that hath cut Rahab and wounded the dragon? Art Thou not it which hath dried up the sea, the waters of the great deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over?”

There is another interesting reference to Isa. xi. Here again the theme is that of Israel's restoration:

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand a second time to recover the remnant of His people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt and the Lord shall utterly destroy the gulf of the Egyptian sea; and shall shake His hand against the river (Euphrates) in the full force of His spirit, and shall smite it in the seven streams thereof, and make men go over dryshod. So shall there be an highway for a remnant of His people, who shall be left, out of Assyria: LIKE AS IT WAS TO ISRAEL IN THE DAY THAT HE CAME OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT” (Isa. xi. 11-16).

When the ransomed Israelites stood upon the sea shore and realized the deliverance that had been accomplished, together with the overthrow of their enemies they took up a song of triumphant thanksgiving. After speaking of the way the Lord had ‘triumphed gloriously’ they continued:

“The Lord is my strength and song, and He is become my salvation” (Exod. xv. 2).

This is exactly what follows the parallel of Exod. xiv. already quoted above. After speaking of the turning away of the Lord's anger Israel will continue:

“The Lord Jehovah is my strength and song: He also is become my salvation” (Isa. xii. 2).

These parallels are plain and need no comment. There shall not only be a New Covenant made with Israel which shall be infinitely greater than the covenant which the Lord made with them in the day that He:

“took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt” (Jer. xxxi. 32),

but there shall be a repetition of the Red Sea experience also. In the book of the Revelation the place of Pharaoh is taken by the Beast. The magicians that withstood Moses find their antitype in the False Prophet. The plagues of Egypt are repeated on a grander scale in the vials of wrath, and the song of Moses blends with the song of the Lamb.

“I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the Beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing THE SONG OF MOSES AND THE LAMB” (Rev. xv. 2, 3).

These extracts will show the place that the crossing of the Red Sea holds in prophecy. When reading Psa. lxxvii. we find that the Psalmist, being cast down and troubled, found strength and comfort in remembering that even such an obstacle as the Red Sea must give place before the word of God:

“I have considered the days of old, the years of ancient times Will the Lord cast off for ever? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Then I said, This is my infirmity, but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High” (Psa. lxxvii. 5-10).

What is it that the Psalmist recalls for his encouragement? He remembers that moment that Israel, hemmed in by the wilderness and threatened by the pursuing Egyptians, saw the Red Sea open before them:

“The waters saw Thee, O God, the waters saw Thee: they were afraid Thy way is in the sea Thou leddest Thy people like a flock” (Psa. lxxvii. 16-20).

We understand from Heb. xi. 29 that not only did the Lord open the Red Sea, but that Israel passed through “by faith”. The two phrases of the one act are expressed in the words of Exod. xiv. 13, 15:

“Fear ye not, STAND STILL, and see the salvation of the Lord.”

This is the Godward aspect.

“Wherefore criest thou unto Me? speak unto the children of Israel, that they GO FORWARD.”

This is the other side of the truth. We find many parallels to this same duality, Eph. ii. 9 declares that we are not saved ‘out of works’, and Eph. ii. 10 as strongly declares that we have been saved “unto good works”. Phil. ii. 12 says, “Work out your own salvation”, while Phil. ii. 13 follows by saying, “it is God that worketh in you”.

The reference already made to Rev. xv. will confirm the thought that the passage of the Red Sea was the first great act of overcoming faith on the part of Israel. Heb. xi. says, "By faith He (Moses) kept the passover" (Heb. xi. 28). "By faith they (Israel) passed through the Red Sea as by dry land" (Heb. xi. 29). There is a significant addition in the verse concerning the Egyptians. Israel were not the only ones who ventured to cross the bed of the sea. The Egyptians did so also. The *outward* act was the same, but there the semblance ceased, for Israel's act was *by faith*, the record of Heb. xi. 29 being:

"Which the Egyptians *assaying* to do were drowned."

In some way, not fully understood by us, this passage through the Red Sea united the people together with Moses as one:

"All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized *unto Moses* in the cloud and in the sea" (I Cor. x. 1, 2).

When the question of water baptism is under discussion, appeal is often made to various 'baptisms' ordained by Moses for the service of the Tabernacle. These 'washings' (*baptismos*) are said to have been 'carnal ordinances' and were 'imposed until the time of reformation' (Heb. ix. 10). Those believers who do not see the necessity for 'immersion' and consider that 'sprinkling' is all sufficient, will find in this same ninth chapter of Hebrews that the sprinkling of the people under the law, whether by blood or water is likewise considered obsolete (compare Heb. ix. 13 with Numb. xix. 17, 18). Before these 'carnal' ordinances were 'introduced' there had taken place a baptism which more clearly foreshadowed the baptism 'into Christ' than any ordinance afterward 'imposed' on them, namely the baptism 'unto Moses' that took place at the Red Sea, and the thing to be observed is that in every reference to this crossing of the Red Sea, *water is excluded!* All went over dry-shod. If we *must refer* to O.T. types when speaking of baptism and its place in this dispensation, the baptism of all Israel into Moses at the Red Sea but without water is surely the one to which we should turn.

Coming back to Exod. xiv. we observe that the salvation of the Lord, which Israel were to see that day, included not only their own deliverance, but the destruction of their enemy. Salvation in one sense is an accomplished fact; we are redeemed by the blood of Christ. Salvation in another sense is future; we are sealed unto the day of redemption. This future aspect of salvation involves the destruction of the power of death, and him who held the power, i.e. the Devil. The Beast, the False Prophet and the Dragon must be overcome before the saved possess the kingdom.

An equivalent to the Red Sea experience lies ahead of every dispensation division of God's purpose, whether of Church or earthly kingdom.

"Thanks be to God that giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. xv. 57).

No.38. Marah, Elim and Manna.
pp. 212 - 217

Stamped upon the whole course of the purpose of the ages is the lesson taught in our title *Marah before Elim*. It is found in the expressions “No cross, no crown”, and “Suffering before glory”. Man was created a living soul, and was of the earth earthy. In the resurrection, man shall possess a spiritual body, and bear the Image of the heavenly. The earthly period of man’s life is set in the school of experience and of the knowledge of good and evil. Israel, as we have seen, went down into the bondage of Egypt before they entered into possession of the promised land. In all cases, whether of creation, Israel, church or individual, the remedy for all ill is found in Christ.

As we read the song of Moses and the response of Miriam in Exod. xv., we feel the glow of triumph and the sense of victory. It is something in the nature of an anticlimax however that meets us in verse 21:

“And Miriam answered them, Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea and they went three days into the wilderness, and found no water.”

We are conscious that this would be a severe test. Three days’ journey in the vicinity of the Red Sea without water would be well-nigh intolerable, and by the end of the third day the sense of triumph that had burst forth into song became dimmed with the feelings of mistrust:

“And when they came to Marah, they could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they were bitter: therefore the name of it was called Marah. And the people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink?” (verses 23 and 24).

Here is the first murmuring of the people after leaving Egypt, a murmuring that was to grow and produce the fearful fruits of unbelief:

“The waters covered their enemies: there was not one of them left. Then believed they His words: they sang his praise. They soon forgot His works: they waited not for His counsel” (Psa. cvi. 11-13).

Here in this Psalm the transition is as sudden as it is in Exod. xv. The scene of Israel’s failure at Marah is said to be the result of forgetfulness. As remembrance of the bondage of Egypt and their deliverance from their enemies receded, so the sensual remembrance of the land of bondage revived. This people, who so quickly ‘forgot’ the Lord, could say:

“We *remember* the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick” (Numb. xi. 5).

This remembrance is fatal to the overcomer. Those whose remembrance is thus expressed perished in the wilderness. Lot’s wife could not leave the doomed city without

looking back. Her treasures were there. Paul, when pressing on with the prize in view, said:

“Forgetting the things which are behind I pursue” (Phil. iii. 13, 14).

Egypt with its fish and its onions and its garlick stands for the world and its seductions. Let us, who have been redeemed from the present evil age, seek to cultivate a sanctified forgetfulness, lest the things that have been left behind become a snare.

Forgetfulness led to impatience:

“They waited not for His counsel” (Psa. cvi. 13).

Surely if we keep in mind the way in which the Lord has saved us, doubt cannot rise. Unbelief grows only when we forget God. Remembering the Passover, the Red Sea, and the destruction of the enemy, Israel would have ‘waited’ instead of ‘murmuring’. The argument is expressed for us in the words of Rom. viii. 32:

“He that spared not his Own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?”

We shall most assuredly come to the waters of Marah before we cross the waters of Jordan and stand triumphant in the land of promise, and when we do, what shall we say? Shall we murmur? Yes, we shall if we forget the works of the Lord. If, however, we remember His mercy, we shall, in the midst of the sore trial (for bitter water at the end of a three days’ wilderness journey *is* a sore trial) realize that He is still faithful, and that a lesson for our higher good is to be learned. The Lord would have His children to understand that there is but one *sweetener* for the *bitterness* of the wilderness journey, and that is the cross of Christ:

“And the Lord shewed Him a tree, which when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet There He made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there He proved them” (Exod. xv. 25).

“*There He proved them.*”—Deut. viii. 2, 3 reveals the fact that the whole of the forty years in the wilderness with its many trials and calls for patience and trust, its privations and its sufferings, were all a part of the Lord’s leading “Thy God led thee”, and were ‘to prove’ the people in order to make them know that man does not live by bread alone. The lesson is the same for all who tread the pilgrim way. It is there in Hebrews for every partaker of the heavenly calling. It is there in Philippians for all who would, with the Apostle, count all things loss, and press on for the prize. Before Abraham received the promise with an oath he was ‘proved’, as we see in Gen. xxii. and Heb. vi.

The sweetening of the bitter waters by the tree is found to be a symbol of the healing of the nation.

“If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and will do that which is right in His sight, and will give ear to His commandments, and keep all His

statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee” (Exod. xv. 26).

Here is revealed the second of the Jehovah titles:

The first is JEHOVAH-HIREH (Gen. xxii. 14).
The second is JEHOVAH-ROPHEKA (Exod. xv. 26).

The great dispensational miracle of Acts iii. looks to the same end:

“Neither is there *the healing* (salvation) in any other” (Acts iv. 12).

None of the Lord’s dealings are arbitrary, all is for His glorious purpose. As soon as the lesson of Marah had been given, and the people ‘proved’, as soon as they realized that the waters of the wilderness must ever be bitter apart from the Lord their Healer, then the burning sand is exchanged for the delightful shade of Elim’s palm trees and the wells of Elim take the place of the bitterness of Marah. Here is completeness, twelve wells, one for each tribe. They can now anticipate the day when they shall:

“draw water out of the wells of salvation” (Isa. xii. 3).

So then, fellow pilgrims, remember that He who leads to Marah can also lead to Elim, and if it be that Marah shall be our experience, its bitterness shall become sweet if it but reveals, in Christ, the “Lord that healeth”. The Lord who knows the bitterness of Marah knows that:

“no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but rather grievous,
NEVERTHELESS AFTERWARD” (Heb. xii. 11).

If we could but remember those words ‘nevertheless afterward’ our Marahs would speedily give place to Elims, and the initial lesson of the wilderness would be ours. May we have grace at every Marah to look for the tree, which when cast in the waters *makes them sweet*.

The necessities of this life are frequently summed up under the phrase ‘bread and water’, to which we must add ‘raiment’ (I Tim. vi. 8). It will be found that in the pilgrimage of Israel, type of the earthly walk of all the Lord’s redeemed people, these three items come before us with some degree of prominence.

Water figures at Marah in Exod. xv., and again at Rephidim in chapter xvii. The question of the provision of bread for the pilgrimage occupies the whole of the intervening chapter xvi. The murmurers remember the flesh pots of Egypt and that they then did eat ‘bread to the full’ (xvi. 3), but the bread of Egypt must give place to the ‘bread of heaven’ for all those who walk the pilgrim’s way. It will be remembered that the hasty departure of Israel out of Egypt led to the institution of a new kind of bread:

“And the people took their dough before it was leavened” (Exod. xii. 34),

and this apparent accident was overruled to emphasize the lesson that the heavenly pilgrimage cannot be sustained with the bread of Egypt, and so the new food provided by God is called 'bread from heaven' (Exod. xvi. 4). Psa. lxxviii. 25 calls this bread "angel's food". Manna, the name given to this bread from heaven, first meets us in Exod. xvi. 15:

"And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, 'It is manna', for they wist not what it was."

It is usual to explain the word 'manna' by saying that it is the Hebrew word uttered by Israel as a question, 'What is this?' The Hebrew reads:

"When the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another *man-hu* for they did not know *man-hu*."

The A.V. gives an alternative meaning in the margin, reading:

"Or what is this? or it is a portion."

The Hebrew word *man* signifies a portion or a gift. Helen Spurrell's translation reads, "It is the gift, for they knew not its name". Aaron Pick in his *Bible Students' Concordance* reads MANNA, MON, a gift. The marginal note in Newberry's Bible is *man-hu*, i.e. *in Chaldee* 'what is it?' *in Hebrew* 'it is an appointed portion'. Parkhurst quotes from Bates in *Crit. Heb.* to the effect that:

"The children of Israel said *man-hu* this (is) a particular species, a peculiar thing, for they knew not what it was."

This comes under *manah*, "to distribute", and so includes the word "kind" of Gen. i. 11, 12, the idea referred to above of 'species' and also a distributed portion or gift. Urquhart's comment is:

"It is the name which has enshrined the surprise and joy of deliverance from death when it was picked up and tasted, the words of Moses flashed upon them and the heart of Israel was swayed as the heart of one man 'It is a gift'. It was a happy title, and the Scripture thankfully records it."

We believe the meaning of the word manna in Exod. xvi. is "It is a gift", but seeing that the commonly accepted rendering is fairly strongly held, we felt it necessary to show the authority we have for departing from the traditional meaning. We notice that this bread from heaven was a special provision for the wilderness:

"Until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan" (Exod. xvi. 35).

"And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten the old corn of the land; neither had the children of Israel manna any more" (Josh. v. 12).

During the days of our pilgrimage here the Lord provides for our spiritual needs to suit the circumstances, but we are ever to remember that when this life ceases, and we enter into the life to come, the blessings and mercies of the days of our pilgrimage will appear

small when compared with the exceeding riches of grace and glory that shall then be enjoyed. There is a sad addition to the story of Exod. xvi. in Numb. xvi. 6:

“But now our soul is dried away; there is nothing at all, beside this manna, before our eyes.”

“This manna”, the gift of God, the bread from heaven, angel’s food! To complete the sad evidence against these people we read in Numb. xxi. 5:

“Our soul loatheth this light bread.”

The word ‘light’ means ‘exceeding light’ and the word ‘loathe’ means ‘to be weary’ as Rebekah said:

“I am weary of my life because of the children of Heth” (Gen. xxvii. 46).

It is a sad thing when the heart grows weary of the Lord’s heavenly provision for His people, yet the same liability to turn in heart away from Christ to the things that have been left behind is not the malady only of a past generation. It is with us still. The man who could say he counted all things loss did so because of ‘the excellency of the knowledge of Christ’ and he could add:

“This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto the things which are before, I press” (Phil. iii. 8-14).

Those, on the contrary, who said ‘there is nothing at all besides this manna’ and who eventually sank so low as to ‘loathe’ and call ‘contemptible’ the bread from heaven, had prepared the way for this rebellious spirit by an unholy remembrance. Unlike Paul, who forgot those things that were behind, these said:

“We remember the fish the cucumbers, and the melons and the leeks and the onions and the garlick” (Numb. xi. 5).

They remembered the savouries, the tasty morsels, and were not satisfied with the simple fare of the heavenly pilgrimage: Is there no lesson here for ourselves? They forgot the bitterness of hard bondage which had caused the cry to reach heaven (Exod. ii. 23). This people said on another occasion:

“Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt” (Numb. xiv. 4),

but the inspired comment, given by Nehemiah, is:

“In their rebellion they appointed them a captain to return to THEIR BONDAGE” (Neh. ix. 17).

If at any time the old nature seeks to turn the face of the pilgrim back to the world he has left behind, it will call to remembrance the pleasures (the leek, the onion, the garlick), but will not remind of the awful bondage and bitterness. We are not left to the evident analogy of the type to show that the manna set forth the Lord Jesus, for with unmistakable directness He Himself has taught the lesson:

“Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.”

“Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness *and are dead*. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die.”

“I am that bread of life.”

“This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for the age” (John vi. 31, 48-50, 58).

Step by step we shall find Israel’s history unfolding the all-sufficiency of the Son of God for all things. His one Sacrifice as the great Passover was all sufficient for our deliverance. Identification with Him breaks the threefold dominion of sin, death and law. His cross makes every Marah sweet, and He, the great Gift of God, supplies all our needs unto the very border of the promised land. The experiences of the Exodus are to be repeated in the near future. The sore judgments of the Revelation echo the plagues of Egypt. In an earlier article we saw that the crossing of the Red Sea was in its turn a type of the future, and now we shall find that the miraculous supply of bread from heaven will be repeated:

“And to the woman was given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished” (Rev. xii. 14).

We draw attention to a clause in the prayer taught in the Sermon on the Mount, viz., “Give us this day our daily bread”. ‘Daily’ in Greek is *epiousios*, from *epi* = upon, and *ousios* = coming. The true rendering of the prayer therefore is, “Give us this day the bread which cometh down upon us”, i.e. the manna. We read of ‘the hidden manna’ in Rev. ii. 17. Some of the manna which fell in the wilderness was placed in the ark:

“That they may see the bread wherewith I have fed you in the wilderness, when I brought you forth from the land of Egypt” (Exod. xvi. 32).

The overcomer in Pergamos was strengthened by the fact that the God Who could sustain His children for forty years in the wilderness could once again give all needed supplies both spiritual and physical, and even though the edict should go forth that none should be allowed to buy or sell who had not the mark of the beast, even then the Lord would provide while witness was necessary.

Stored up in the Ark of the Covenant were three precious witnesses of the fullness of Christ: (1) the unbroken tables of the law, speaking of His perfect obedience, (2) the rod that budded, speaking of His undying priesthood, and (3) the golden pot that had the manna, speaking of His faithful provision throughout the whole of life’s pilgrimage:

“Jesus said, ‘I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst’.”

“Lord, evermore give us this bread” (John vi. 34, 35).

No.39. Amalek, type of the flesh.
Aaron and Hur, types of fellowship (Exod. xvii. & xviii.)
pp. 232 - 237

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

Coming to Isaac we find that he also had two sons—Esau and Jacob, and once again the type is clear. The epistle to the Hebrews provides explanation of the meaning of the typical character of these two sons. Two others must be included, viz., Moab and Ammon, both the children of Lot, and pre-eminently the children of the flesh. When we speak of these types of the flesh, Ishmael, Edom, Moab, Ammon and Amalek, we enumerate those foes of Israel who sought to bar the way and prevent their entry into the land of promise.

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

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

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

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

- (1) The provision of water.

In a country like Arabia water is precious, and its possession eagerly sought. Parallel cases may be found in Gen. xxi. 25, where we find Abimelech’s servants violently

taking away the wells of water from Abraham. Deborah's song includes a reference to this perennial cause of conflict:

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

(2) The tempting of the Lord by Israel.

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

Amalek was overcome by two means:

- (1) The intercession of Moses, plus the fellowship of Aaron and Hur.
- (2) The warfare under Joshua.

Bishop Hall's comment here is:

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

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

Three noteworthy features close the narrative:

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

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

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

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

The name *Jehovah-nissi* is the third Jehovah title to be revealed in Scripture. The first is concerned with the offering of Isaac (the great type of Christ and His redemption), *Jehovah-jireh*, “the Lord will provide”. A friend, whose judgment we hold in high esteem, says that *Jehovah-jireh* means “Jehovah appeared” (Gen. xxii. 14) but we can do no more at the moment than make the suggestion. The second is connected with the overthrow of the Egyptians (type of the world), *Jehovah-ropheka*, “the Lord that healeth thee” (Exod. xv. 26). The third title is connected with the destruction of Amalek (type of the flesh), *Jehovah-nissi*, “the Lord my banner” (Exod. xvii. 15). This title is the first of three that suggests the believer’s active appropriation:

“The Lord *my* banner” (Exod. xvii. 15).

“The Lord *my* shepherd” (Psa. xxiii. 1).

“The Lord *our* righteousness” (Jer. xxiii. 6).

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

“As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up” (John iii. 14).

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

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

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

The Companion Bible note reads:

“Surely the hand (lifted up) upon the banner of *Jah* (is to swear)”, etc.

The substitution of ‘banner’ for ‘throne’ is explained by Rotherham in his *Emphasized Version* as:

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

Rotherham does not endorse this suggestion, but translates:

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

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

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

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

"Edom shall be a possession."

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

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

We have seen that because Amalek's hand was laid upon the throne of the Lord, war was declared from generation to generation. Let us pursue this vital subject further. It will be remembered that After Saul had been king for some time, we read:

"So Saul took possession of the kingdom over Israel, and fought against all his enemies on every side, against Moab, and against the sons of Ammon, and against Edom and smote the Amalekites" (I Sam. xiv. 47, 48).

Following this general deliverance of Israel from their hereditary foes comes the more explicit command to:

"Smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not" (I Sam. xv. 3).

The story is well-known to us. Saul smote the Amalekites, but he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive. Saul and the people also refused to destroy the best of the sheep and the oxen, and 'all that was good'.

The flesh, the old man, typified by Amalek, is too often spared today. In the sight of God there is 'no good thing' in the flesh, but it is rare to find that believer who is so taught of God that he has reached the height of Phil. iii. and, making no comparison between the flesh cultured and the flesh manifestly depraved, repudiates it entirely and rejoices to stand beneath the Banner of the cross. Many who condemn Saul would be found sharing this so called 'good' thing of the flesh. Too often we add to our sin by hypocrisy. Saul said:

"The people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, TO SACRIFICE UNTO THE LORD thy God in Gilgal" (I Sam. xv. 21).

"In Gilgal"! The place where *the reproach of Egypt* was rolled away (Josh. v. 9), where the rite of circumcision which sets forth *the repudiation of the flesh* (Col. ii. 11) was solemnly carried out by all Israel before they set foot in the land of promise, there above all places would Saul offer the sacrifice of the flesh and dishonour the Lord. This was to go in the way of Cain. The very next thing that Samuel is instructed to do after this is to anoint David king (I Sam. xvi.). That the throne of the kings of Israel could be spoken of as 'the throne of the Lord' I Chron. xxix. 23 makes clear:

“Then Solomon sat on the *throne of the Lord* as king instead of David his father.”

The purpose of God foreshadowed in the earthly kingdom of Israel will be brought to a glorious conclusion by the Lord Jesus Christ. When He takes to Himself His great power and reigns, He will not rest until *all* enemies are abolished; there will be no sparing of Amalek then. Those readers who have grasped the significance of the two seeds (see Volume XIII, page 52, and the pamphlet *The Reconciliation of All things*) will perceive it in operation here, as Amalek, though descended from Abraham, was not counted as the seed, for that line came through Isaac and Jacob, whereas Amalek descended from Esau.

Mordecai and Haman.

One other occasion is given in Scripture to show the character of Amalek and to foreshadow the end. The book of Esther records that Haman was advanced by the king above all the princes that were with him, and that all the king’s servants bowed down before him. It further says that “Mordecai bowed not, nor did him reverence” (Est. iii. 2). Why was this?

“Haman was the son of Hammedatha the AGAGITE” (Esther iii. 1).

Haman was the descendant of one of the Amalekite kings, and Josephus (Ant. 11:6,5) calls him an Amalekite. What was this man’s attitude towards Israel?

“Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus” (Esther iii. 6).

As a result of Esther’s noble intervention Haman the Agagite is first compelled to do honour to Mordecai, and then to suffer the fate upon his own gallows that he had planned for the Jew. We cannot say that Haman was a descendant of that Agag who was spared by Saul, but typically we can see that in the sparing of one Amalekite in the early days of Israel’s kingdom, Saul jeopardized the whole nation under the reign of Ahasuerus. So must it be with the flesh.

“He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption” (Gal. vi. 8).

“Because the minding of the flesh is enmity against God” (Rom. viii. 7).

It certainly is extremely suggestive to read the genealogy of Mordecai in Esther ii. 5:

“Now in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew, whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, A Benjamite.”

Saul, who so signally failed concerning Agag, is of the same line as Mordecai, who so signally succeeded. Both were of the line of Kish, the Benjamite. Saul loses his kingdom, and David is sought out and anointed immediately after the failure of Saul concerning Agag. Mordecai, however, dispossesses the Amalekite, and succeeds to his office:

“For Mordecai the Jew was next unto king Ahasuerus, and great among the Jews, and accepted of the multitude of his brethren, seeking the wealth of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed” (Esther x. 3).

This foreshadows the purpose of the Lord and the happy results that will follow the casting down of all opposition and the introduction of that perfect day when God will be all in all. The throne of God and the purposes connected therewith have been assailed. Satan is the arch rebel, and the principalities and powers directly under him are the spiritual Amalekites of the dispensation of the Mystery. Just as Amalek barred the way towards the land of promise, so there are the opposing principalities and powers that bar the way to heavenly places. There our conflict lies. “We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities” (Eph. vi. 12).

This conflict of the age is set forth throughout Scripture under various titles. The Canaanites were to be utterly destroyed by the conquering Israelite. Each one may see in these ancient foes the sketch of his own. Each dispensation, too, has somewhat parallel marks. Blessed be God, Satan is to be overcome, and the words of Zech. xiv. 21 are to be understood in their fullest and highest sense:

“In that day there shall be no more Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts.”

Greater Riches than the Treasures in Egypt

No.1. All things ours, in Christ (I Cor. i. 30; iii. 21 - 23). pp. 123 - 126

In another series of articles, the typical history of Israel from the Exodus to the Jordan came before us as we considered the application to ourselves of the text:

“The house of Jacob shall possess their possessions” (Obad. 17).

In the present series we carry these typical lessons with us in heart and mind and survey those blessings which are ours in Christ, and ask ourselves as we do so, how far can we truthfully say that we “possess our possessions”? We are sure that God will abide faithfully by all His promises, but there is such a thing as apprehending that for which we have been apprehended of Christ Jesus (Phil. iii. 12).

The blessings that are ours through Christ can be considered under three headings:

- (1) *Blessings of Salvation.* Such would include: Justification, Sanctification, Forgiveness, Life and Peace.
- (2) *Blessings of our Calling.* Such blessings would be “dispensational” in character, and look to the sphere of blessing, the character of our calling, “Heavenly places” and “One Body” for example.
- (3) *Blessings in Service.* True service is rendered in newness of life, and accomplished by the power of the Risen Christ.

Two related passages in I Corinthians will open this series of studies by their very comprehensiveness, sweeping aside all human merit, and revealing unlimited blessing to be the believer’s portion in Christ Jesus.

The reader knows that the Corinthian Church was split up into coteries, one claiming Paul, another Apollos, another Cephas, and yet another Christ Himself as a party leader. The Corinthians moreover, being Greeks, placed a high value on human wisdom, and this the Apostle brings to the touchstone of the Cross. Although Paul uses strong language as he denounces the folly of these believers, he concludes his double attack upon “man’s wisdom”, not with invective or censure, but by revealing that all the time, if any man is in Christ, he already possesses all things including “wisdom” at its highest. Here are the two passages.

“Ye see your calling that no flesh should glory in His presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord” (I Cor. i. 26-31).

“Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s” (I Cor. iii. 21-23).

Here are “possessions” indeed, which as from a Pisgah of faith, spread themselves out before our wondering gaze. It will be observed that both passages open with a warning “That no flesh should glory in His presence”. “Let no man glory in men”, and this warning we must obey if we are to possess our possessions.

The English word “glory” is used in the N.T. to represent two very different concepts. It translates *doxa* “do all to the glory of God” (I Cor. x. 31), but it also translates *kauchaomai* “God forbid that I should glory” (Gal. vi. 14). It is the word *kauchaomai* that occurs in I Cor. i. 29, 31 and iii. 21. This word is allied with *aucheo* “to boast, please oneself”, which some lexicographers believe is connected with, if not derived from, the Greek word *auchen* “the neck”. The Psalmist says “speak not with a stiff neck” (Psa. lxxv. 5) and Isaiah speaks of those who were haughty, and “walk with stretched forth necks” (Isa. iii. 16). *Kauchaomai* is used by the LXX for the “triumph” of the wicked (Psa. xciv. 3) and for the “joyful” praise of the saints (Psa. cxlix. 5). So also in the N.T. the word can speak of “glorying” in men and in appearance or of “glorying” in the Lord. Salvation is by grace “lest any one should *boast*”, that is, boast in themselves. Yet the true circumcision “*rejoices* (or boasts) in Christ Jesus, and has no confidence in the flesh” (Phil. iii. 3). The Apostle was so sure that the whole testimony of the Word was against this boasting in self, that he combines the teaching of more than one O.T. passage under the saying:

“According as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord”,

a summary that not only appears in I Cor. i. 31, but which is repeated in II Cor. x. 17.

Putting aside therefore all foolish boasting, let us come close to the enumeration of blessings which the Apostle has said are all ours in Christ.

Before we can do justice to I Cor. i. 30, we are obliged to make a digression, because one small but important particle has not been translated in the A.V. of this passage. *Kai* is correctly rendered “and”, but the combination *te kai* demands something more.

In a number of passages, the translation “both and” is called for, and if these references are quoted, the reader may be the more willing to agree that something is missing in the A.V. translation of I Cor. i. 30.

“These servants gathered together both bad and good” (Matt. xxii. 10).

“All that Jesus began both to do and teach” (Acts i. 1).

“Both Herod and Pontius Pilate” (Acts iv. 27).

“Both gifts and sacrifices” (Heb. ix. 9).

The omission of the word “both” from any of these passages would be detrimental. There is a logical and internal relation between those things which are annexed by *te kai* ‘both and’, not only in the passages cited above, but in I Cor. i. 30. Translators may have found it difficult to use the word ‘both’ when translating I Cor. i. 30 but that does not justify ignoring the presence of *te kai*. There are other equivalents. “David *also* and Samuel” (Heb. xi. 32). “*Whether* they were men *or* women” (Acts ix. 2).

The word 'besides' can be employed in the passage before us and the truth maintained.

"But of Him, are ye in Christ Jesus, Who of God is made unto us, wisdom, besides righteousness, sanctification and redemption" (I Cor. i. 30).

It appears that the Corinthians were already possessed of the fact that righteousness, sanctification and redemption were theirs, what the Apostle would have them recognize was that in the self same way 'wisdom' too was theirs in Christ. This was a truth that would be somewhat humbling to a Greek, for the Greeks sought after wisdom, even as the Jews sought after righteousness, and alas, both sought it in the power of the flesh.

Paul has been at great pains to show that "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" is the Wisdom of God, despite even as the preaching of the cross is the Wisdom of God, despite the fact that in the eyes of the "wise" such a message is "foolishness". This question of wisdom and the natural man is pursued in the second chapter of I Corinthians, and in chapter iii. the carnality of those who said "I am of Paul", "I am of Apollos", is exposed. This leads at length to the close of the chapter which reintroduces the fact that all the spiritual possessions of the believer are found in Christ.

"For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I Cor. iii. 21-23).

Here are some of our 'possessions'. They are all ours. It is evident upon reading the two epistles, that the Corinthians were far from entering experimentally into this treasure, and it will be salutary to go over the ground now surveyed so that we too may learn what to avoid, and how these things may become our own, not only as they are ours already "in Christ Jesus", but in apprehension and life.

We shall have to give fuller heed to the repeated warning against 'boasting' or 'glorying' in men or the flesh. We shall have to ponder what is implied in the words 'Who of God is made unto us'. We shall have to deal separately with the great gifts, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. We shall need to consider what is implied in the words "All things are yours", and to examine carefully the list given in I Cor. iii. 22; a list that includes life and death, things present and things to come, and finally we shall have to give the most earnest consideration to the climax and the seal of all this teaching.

"And ye are Christ's: and Christ is God's."

To devote most precious and important aspects of truth, therefore, we must devote ourselves in subsequent studies.

**No.2. The setting of our key texts (I Cor. i. 30; iii. 21 - 23).
pp. 191 - 193**

In our approach to the N.T. and to the apprehension of all for which we have been apprehended of Christ Jesus, our attention was directed to the words of Paul in his letter to the Corinthians (I Cor. i. 30 and iii. 21-23). There is so much in these two passages, that we shall be compelled to halt and weigh them over in the balances of the Sanctuary before passing on to other and similar passages. Indeed we may well discover, that by the time we have considered these two passages, together with their parallels in other epistles, that there will be very little left to say. In order to appreciate the Apostle's conclusions as set forth in these two extracts from I Corinthians, we must acquaint ourselves with the context, then examine the A.V. translations and make any adjustments that fuller light and accurate scholarship indicates, and finally to consider each term or phrase as so many steps leading to the Divine goal. In the present study, let us endeavour to place Paul's conclusions in their true relation with the context.

The first Epistle to the Corinthians owes its origin, humanly speaking, to five allied causes:

- (1) The report of the household of Chloe.
- (2) A common report concerning their morals.
- (3) A letter from the Corinthians.
- (4) A special error in doctrine—the resurrection.
- (5) The collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem.

The epistle follows the order of these five features, chapters:

i. - iv.	deal with divisions in the church.
v., vi.	deal with immorality in the church.
vii. - xiv.	deal with the letter from the church.
xv.	deal with the subject of resurrection.
xvi.	deal with the collection for the saints.

The structure of the epistle follows this fivefold subdivision of theme, but puts the emphasis on certain features that might otherwise be overlooked.

I Corinthians as a whole

- A | i. 1-9. Waiting for the coming of the Lord.
B | i. 10 - iv. 21. "IT HATH BEEN DECLARED UNTO ME."
C | v. 1 - xiv. 30. The body, physically, spiritually, ecclesiastically.
B | xv. "I DECLARE UNTO YOU."
A | xvi. Maranatha. The Lord cometh.

It will be seen that after a salutation or introduction of the epistle to the church as a whole, with a stress upon the place that the hope of the Lord's return should have in their lives (I Cor. i. 7-9), the Apostle immediately plunges into the problems that threatened the spiritual life of the Corinthians by the words "it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you". We must not for a moment think of these members of the household of Chloe as tale-bearers, but rather that by dint of personal probing and questioning, Paul had unearthed the confused state in which the church of the Corinthians had been thrown by their divisions, their laxity of morals and their doctrinal errors.

The great Rabbi Hillel said "Many fathers, much strife", and Paul's own expression "Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers", seems to point to the cause of divisions among them. He feared that when he did come among them that there might still be "debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings and tumults" (II Cor. xii. 20). It had become evident that the coming of Apollos to them, instead of proving an unmixed blessing, had been used by the evil one to sow discord. Paul had designedly used simple language when among them, owing to their predilection to "excellency of speech and of wisdom" (I Cor. ii. 11), in order that their faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. As a result, some of the Corinthians, disappointed and possibly rebuffed by the Apostle's attitude, spoke of his personal appearance as 'mean' and of his speech as 'contemptible' (II Cor. x. 10). Apollos was mighty in the Scriptures, and fervent in spirit, and had been much blessed by the ministry of Aquila and Priscilla, so that he "helped them much which had believed through grace" (Acts xviii. 27). Apollos moreover was 'eloquent' *logios* and this gift may have been seized upon by some of the Corinthians as a weapon with which to beat Paul.

"Apollos, who had followed him, though an able man, was an inexperienced Christian, and not only by the natural charm of his impassioned oratory, but also by the way in which he entered into subtle refinements so familiar to the Alexandrian intellect, had unintentionally led them first of all to despise the unsophisticated simplicity of St. Paul's teaching, and next to give the rein to all the skeptical fancies with which their faith was overlaid St. Paul could not but see the most extravagant exaggerations of his own doctrines—the half-truths, which are ever the most dangerous of errors" (Farrar, *Life and Work of Paul*).

While naturally there was a Greek element in the church of Corinth, a company who could be reminded that they were "Gentiles, carried away by these dumb idols, even as ye were led" (I Cor. xii. 1), there was a strong Jewish section who also could be reminded by Paul "how that all our fathers were under the cloud and in the sea" (I Cor. x. 1, 2).

The Judaic Christians who came armed with 'letters of commendation' (II Cor. iii. 1) from the twelve at Jerusalem, would naturally be most acceptable to the Jewish section of the church, with the consequence that the emergence of a party that favoured Apollos, drove the Jewish section to range themselves under the name of Peter, or apparently as they preferred to call him, Cephas, avoiding even the Gentile name which the Lord had given to him. Already at Corinth there had been invidious comparisons made between the apostleship of Peter and of Paul, to which allusions can be found in both epistles

addressed to the Corinthians. Reluctantly, the Apostle wrote: "I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge are they Hebrews?" (II Cor. xi. 5, 6, 22), and so, added to those who raised the party cry "I am of Apollos", was sounded the equally mischievous cry "I am of Cephas".

Later, when he does refer to Apollos, he most nobly places Apollos upon an equal footing with himself saying:

"Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed I have planted, Apollos watered: but God gave the increase, so then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase" (I Cor. iii. 5-7).

"These things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes: that ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up FOR ONE AGAINST ANOTHER" (I Cor. iv. 6).

To such, Paul wrote the words already cited:

"Therefore let no man glory in men. For ALL THINGS ARE YOURS, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come: ALL ARE YOURS: and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I Cor. iii. 23).

No.3 XLII.58

No.3. The only ground of boasting (I Cor. i. 31; iii. 21 - 23). Volume XLII, pp. 58 - 60

In the preceding article we were concerned largely with the faction and division that raised the party cries 'I am of Paul, I am of Apollos' etc., and realized that this party spirit is in mind right through the section, Paul, Apollos and Cephas being mentioned by name in the closing verses of chapter iii.

'Glorying' or 'boasting' falls into two main groups, namely, those things in which the believer can boast, and those things in which he cannot or must not boast. Those references which do not fall under one or other of these categories will need to be considered separately.

(1) *Legitimate grounds of boasting for the believer.*

This list can be headed with the words of I Cor. i. 31:

"He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

The only true ground of boasting or glorying for a sinner saved by grace is expressed in the words of Gal. vi. 14:

“But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

It is the characteristic of the true believer that he is one that:

“Worships God in spirit, boasts or glories in Christ Jesus, and has no confidence in the flesh” (Phil. iii. 13).

This boasting, while it may be expressed in faltering tones here and now, will be fully expressed in the day of redemption,

“that I may rejoice, boast or glory, in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain” (Phil. ii. 16).

This relation of the apostle’s “boasting” in that day, with the faithfulness of those believers who came under his care, is more fully announced when he said:

“For what is our hope, or joy, or crown or rejoicing (or glorying)? Are not ever ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming?” (I Thess. ii. 19).

When the Apostle would bring the first great section of Romans to a conclusion, which he does in Rom. v. 1-11, he writes his exultant praise around three occurrences of *kauchaomai* thus:

- A1 | 1, 2. BOASTING in hope.
- B | 3-. Not only so.
- A2 | -3-10. BOASTING in tribulation also.
- B | 11-. Not only so.
- A3 | -11. BOASTING in God.

The interposition of the ‘glorying in tribulations also’ brings us to another aspect of truth. It must not be assumed from the rigorous denial of all grounds of boasting in self and the flesh, that Paul was austere or unsympathetic in his dealings with fellow believers—the opposite is the truth. He finds some grounds for thanksgiving in the opening salutation of the epistle to the Corinthians, even though the bulk of the epistle exposes such aberration and folly as to cause the Apostle to weep. After all that he has said to the contrary he said he would ‘boast’ in himself, but not in his prowess his wisdom, his success, but in his infirmities!

“He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for My strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me for when I am weak, then I am strong” (II Cor. xii. 9, 10).

He who could glory in tribulations and infirmities as did the Apostle, was no defeatist or cynic; he was an exultant believer delivered once and for ever from the vanity of self-justification, and could, from that standpoint, see that even his own acknowledged frailty but emphasized the power of Christ upon him. In much the same way, the same Apostle who resolutely set aside all boasting in self and in men, could punctuate II Cor. vii.-ix. with this boasting in the generosity of the Corinthian church.

“Great is my boldness of speech toward you, great is my glorying of you: I am filled with comfort, I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulation” (II Cor. vii. 4).

Other references to the same theme are II Cor. vii. 14; viii. 24 and ix. 3, 4. But in all this the discerning reader will see that there is no boasting in the flesh. To this end, the concluding verse of II Cor. ix. should be pondered. When he had said all that could be said about the liberality of the Corinthians and their magnificent response, he gives the whole passage a significant turn at the end by saying:

“Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable Gift” (II Cor. ix. 15).

Similarly when Paul said that he had whereof he could boast through Jesus Christ, it was ‘in those things which pertain to God’, which the context reveals to be the grace given to him as the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles (Rom. xv. 15-20). In like manner, in the self-same chapter of Galatians where he writes ‘God forbid that I should boast’ he says “But let every man prove his own work and then shall he have rejoicing (or a ground of boasting) in himself alone, and not in another. For every man shall bear his own burden (or allotted task, pack or load)” (Gal. vi. 4, 5).

(2) The Apostle has brought together a series of reasons to show that boasting in human merit, when the subject is related to sin and salvation, is entirely excluded.

Again we can head this list with quotations from the passages in Corinthians that are before us:

“That no flesh should glory in His presence” (I Cor. i. 29).

“Therefore let no man glory in men” (I Cor. iii. 21).

In his two fundamental epistles, namely Romans and Ephesians, while the dispensations differ and the sphere of blessing differs, they are in accord regarding the question of boasting in self. Having brought the great question of justification by faith without the deeds of the law to its triumphant conclusion in Rom. iii. 19-26, he puts the question and supplies the answer.

“Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith” (Rom. iii. 27).

In like manner, in Ephesians, he speaks of salvation and boasting:

“By grace are ye saved through faith: and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. ii. 8, 9).

The classic example of Abraham occupies a large portion of the opening section of Rom. i. 1 - v.11, and there we read:

“What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?” (Rom. iv. 1).

All that Paul has said is summed up in the words of I Cor. i. 29 “That no flesh should glory *in His presence*”.

It might be well if we remember that *enopion* “In His Presence” is translated “in His sight” in Rom. iii. 20:

“There shall be no flesh justified *in His sight*” (Rom. iii. 20).

The intensive form *katenopion* and its usage makes any boasting in the presence of God, excepting boasting in the Lord, impossible. The word occurs but five times. Two references deal with witness (II Cor. ii. 17; xii. 19), the remaining three with complete and unconditional acceptance.

“According as He hath chosen us in Him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame BEFORE Him” (Eph. i. 4).

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

What more fitting conclusion to an article like this can there be than the doxology of the epistle of Jude:

“Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless BEFORE THE PRESENCE of His glory, with exceeding joy, TO the only wise God our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominion and power both now and ever. Amen.” (Jude 24, 25).

No.4. “What Christ has been ‘made’ unto us” (I Cor. i. 30; iii. 21 - 23). pp. 218 - 220

The passage, I Cor. i. 29-31 that is before us in these studies, is bounded by the negative and positive aspects of ‘boasting’.

A | i. 29. “That no flesh should glory in His presence.” Negative.

B | i. 30. “But of Him.” What Christ is made unto us.

A | i. 31. “He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” Positive.

We have surveyed the usage and teaching of the words *kauchaomai*, *kauchesis* and *kauchema* ‘glorying’ and now must turn our attention to the core of the matter. “*What Christ has been made unto us.*” The blessings that are about to be enumerated, cover the ground of human need and Divine requirement—Righteousness and Sanctification, Wisdom and Redemption; and not only so, but all men, all things, and all states ‘whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come’. But the opening, and the closing of these two passages, taken together sound the next important note.

“Of Him” The origin “In Christ Jesus” The Mediator (I Cor. i. 30).

“Ye are Christ’s” The Mediator “Christ is God’s” The origin (I Cor. iii. 23).

First we must realize that the words “But of Him” are the blessed contrast with the failure of man that has been stressed in chapter i. and which is taken up again in chapter ii.

“For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe” (I Cor. i. 21).

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned” (I Cor. ii. 14).

“The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain” (I Cor. iii. 20).

Here are three passages from these three chapters, three out of many.

The word *sophia* “wisdom” is found sixteen times in chapter i. to iii. of Corinthians, while the word *sophos* ‘wise’ is found 10 times in chapters i. and iii. It is not surprising therefore that the Apostle reminds the Corinthians that Christ had been made unto them ‘wisdom’. The idea of Christ being “made” something for the benefit of His people, is expressed in the N.T. in two ways. The Greek word *ginomai* which means ‘to become’ and the Greek word *poieo* ‘to make’.

“For He hath made (*poieo*) Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin; that we might be made (*ginomai*) the righteousness of God in Him” (II Cor. v. 21).

This passage is of interest, not only and chiefly for the glorious doctrine it teaches, but because the two words *poieo* and *ginomai* are translated ‘made’.

“He was MADE sin”; “That we might be MADE the righteousness of God in Him”. The primary meaning of *poieo* is ‘to make’, and meet us in the LXX on the very threshold of truth, for it is employed to translate the Hebrew *bara* ‘create’. The one Hebrew word however that is translated more times in the LXX by *poieo* than any other is *asah* which is rendered in the A.V. ‘make’ 631 times, as for example Gen. i. 31, or Gen. ii. 2 where it is employed as an extension of the word *bara* ‘create’. When *poieo* is joined to nouns which indicate a state of condition, it signifies the author or cause.

“Mark them which *cause* divisions and offences” (Rom. xv. 17).

“So making peace” (Eph. ii. 15).

“Neither raising up the people” i.e. Neither making insurrection (Acts xiv. 12).

Poieo then comes to mean “to constitute or appoint”. “And He *ordained* twelve” (mark iii. 14). “God hath *made* that same Jesus Whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ” (Acts ii. 36). “And hast *made* us unto our God kings and priests” (Rev. v. 10). “Wherefore consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus; who was faithful to him that *appointed* Him” (Heb. iii. 1, 2). From this comes the sense “to declare one anything”, as “Making Himself equal with God” (John v. 18); “Whom makest Thou Thyself?” (John viii. 53); “Because He made Himself the Son of God” (John xix. 7). When John said of some that “they *made* God a liar” (I John i. 6), it is evident that no change in the Divine character is intended; it simply means that the effect of the action or attitude condemned had that tendency.

Christ therefore was 'made' sin in this sense. He was appointed, reckoned, and treated as though He were sin, while all the time it was absolutely essential that He should Himself "know no sin" otherwise He could never be the sin Bearer for others. In Deut. xxv. 1 the words "They shall condemn the wicked" reads, literally "They shall MAKE him wicked" which employs a figure of speech, meaning 'to declare' that he is so. The other term "that we might *be made* the righteousness of God in Him" employs the word *ginomai* 'to become'. That there is much in common between these two words, a reference to Gal. iii. 13 will reveal. There 'being made a curse for us' is very close to 'being made sin for us', but II Cor. v. 21 uses *poieo* whereas Gal iii. 13 uses *ginomai*. So we might compare Eph. ii. 13 with ii. 15. We "are made nigh" (*ginomai*), He "made peace" (*poieo*). Let us use the one English word 'become' in a few selected passages where *ginomai* is employed—it may help us.

"Who *became* of the seed of David, according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 4). "The circumcision *becomes* uncircumcision" (Rom. ii. 25). "I have *become* all things to all men" (I Cor. ix. 22). We might note that in II Cor. v., a little earlier than the verse we have examined, we read "behold, all things *are become* new" where *ginomai* is used. While *poieo* 'made' indicates that Christ was appointed to be sin for us in His great office of Sin-bearer, the word *ginomai* reveals that the believer 'becomes', "comes into existence" in the condition of being "the righteousness of God" in Him. *Ginomai* is used of creation (John i. 3; Heb. xi. 3) and of birth (Gal. iv. 4). It is used in the phrase "the body that shall be" (I Cor. xv. 37).

Let us carefully note the steps or links in the Apostle's argument as indicated by the prepositions employed in I Cor. i. 30. "But OF Him", *ek* out of, denoting origin, as in Rom. xi. 36, and I Cor. viii. 6 "But to us there is one God, the Father, OF Whom are all things". The first thing to recognize is that the blessings of the gospel originate or take their rise in God. The gospel preached by Paul is "The Gospel OF GOD". While it is true that the gospel is "of God" it would be no gospel or message of good news to sinful man, apart from Christ. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world"; "God so loved that He gave His only begotten Son". God, in heaven, could not redeemed "for as by man came death, by Man came also the resurrection of the dead". The whole doctrine of the Kinsman-Redeemer that permeates the O.T., cries aloud for "The Word made flesh", Emmanuel, God with us. Moreover, Paul does not say that these blessings are "in Christ" or "in Jesus" or "in the Lord" or even "in Jesus Christ". He uses the title "in Christ Jesus".

When all the revised readings are recognized it will be found that the title "Christ Jesus" does not occur in the epistle to the Hebrews, is never found in the epistles of Peter, James, John or Jude! One occurrence of this title is found in Acts, namely in the record of Paul's preaching (Acts xxiv. 24 R.V.), the remainder of the occurrences are exclusive to the epistles of Paul. The title is peculiar in that the order of the names is reversed. The emphasis is upon Christ, the One Who on earth bore the name "Jesus".

Some of the blessings that are found "in Christ Jesus" are:

- (1) Justification comes freely by grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Rom. iii. 24).
- (2) The law of the spirit of life makes free from the law of sin and death, and this law is “in Christ Jesus” (Rom. viii. 2).
- (3) Nothing can separate the redeemed from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus (Rom. viii. 39).
- (4) We have liberty in Christ Jesus (Gal. ii. 4).
- (5) We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. iii. 26).

In the Prison Epistles this title appears many times, and the reader would be wise to make a note of the R.V. text of these epistles. In addition to the occurrences found in the A.V. the following additional references to “Christ Jesus” should be noted.

Eph. i. 1, 20; iii. 1, 6; Phil. i. 1, 8, 26; Col. i. 1; iv. 12; II Tim. i. 1, 10; ii. 3; iv. 1.

Col. i. 28 should read “Christ” and not “Christ Jesus”. This means that there are nine occurrences of “Christ Jesus” in Ephesians, ten in Philippians, four in Colossians, twelve in II Timothy and two in Philemon—in all 37 references. It would manifestly be impossible to review these passages and note their special doctrinal teaching here. But to all who would ‘possess their possessions’ that examination appears to be essential.

No.5. “The Just for the unjust.” **pp. 238 - 240**

Ye have heard that it has been said, “An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil” (Matt. v. 38, 39). Commenting upon this passage we might also say “Ye have heard that it has been said, see how severe is the law of Moses, but see how merciful is the gospel of Christ”. But would such a comment be true? In the first place the Gospel of Christ is nowhere the subject of the Sermon on the Mount. At the time of utterance He had neither died nor risen again, neither had He at the time revealed that He must do so (Matt. xvi. 21). In the second place, the quotation we have given from the Sermon on the Mount, is one of seven that opens with some such words as “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old But I say unto you” (Matt. v. 21, 22, 27, 28, 31-34, 38-42). Do these passages announce a severe law and follow it by a gentler gospel?

The law said, that whosoever kills shall be in danger of the judgment, but what saith the Saviour? He said that if any one was even angry with his brother without cause he would be in danger of judgment! Here then the law of the Sermon on the Mount is more severe than the law of Moses! The same applies to the law of adultery. We must therefore adjust our view of the last passage where it speaks of ‘an eye for an eye’, and see that it was easier for a man to exact even-handed justice, an eye for an eye, than to submit to the severer demand of the Sermon on the Mount and resist not evil. In addition to all this, these seven utterances are preceded by the saying of Christ that He had not

come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil, and also that heaven and earth should pass away, but not one jot or one tittle of the law should pass unfulfilled. No interpretation therefore of the subsequent verses is valid that sets aside the law.

Let us now turn to the book of Leviticus and see the passage quoted by the Lord in Matt. v. 38:

“He that killeth a man shall surely be put to death, and he that killeth a beast shall make it good; beast for beast. And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him. Breach for breach; eye for ye, tooth for tooth; as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him again. And he that killeth a beast shall restore it; and he that killeth a man, he shall be put to death” (Lev. xxiv. 17-21).

This is ‘even handed justice’ which the Poet so clearly perceives ‘commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice to our own lips’. Nothing but a mawkish sentimentalism could ask of justice *less*, even as clear impartial justice could not exact *more*. There is no occasion to raise an outcry against the severity of the sentence “an eye for an eye”. What may we ask of the loser of the eye, shall he not have protection; should the spoiler not suffer an equivalent loss? No such sentimental outbursts are heard at the grocers and the bakers, when the customer is expected to pay the recognized price of the commodity, and what is sixteen ounces to the pound but the principle of “an eye of an eye”? And conversely, do we charge with meanness and lack of charity, when he demands that sixteen ounces to the pound? and what is this but the application of the principle “a tooth for a tooth”?

When we come to the N.T. and consider what the Saviour did when He “died the just for the unjust” we shall see that sixteen ounces to the pound have been rendered. The balance registers exact weight, whether the actual debtor placed the amount due in the scale, or whether a Surety provides the amount. The question of the provision of a substitute lies in the realm of Grace, the only place that it has in the realm of Justice is to see that the claim is met. We are inclined to put far too much emphasis upon the justification of the sinner who believes the Gospel, than the justification of the God Who forgives and accepts him in the Beloved. The epistle to the Romans stresses that the power of the Gospel consists in the fact that “Therein is revealed the righteousness of God” (Rom. i. 17), and that in the redemption and justification of the believer, God has been careful that from first to last the Gospel plan shall “Declare His righteousness, that He might be JUST and the JUSTIFIER of him which believeth in Jesus” (Rom. iii. 23-26).

The symbol of righteousness in the O.T. is either a balance or a plumb-line (Isa. xxviii. 17; Amos vii. 7-8). The same force, that of gravity, acts on both. The plumb-line hangs true, whatever the surroundings may be. The balance swings true, and is undisturbed by any claims of mercy or pity. Salvation must never be conceived as a scheme whereby Justice is circumvented. The full weight has been rendered, by whom is not the question. The wondrous plan of salvation, whereby a Substitute should willingly take the sinner’s place, where the claim of impartial justice should be fully met, where the basis of salvation should be righteousness, and that a “righteousness of God”, this

plan of salvation is entirely outside the province of mere Justice. Righteousness must be unheld, but Lord provides the way, and if that way be one of Sacrifice, then that Sacrifice will be offered without reserve.

Scripture does not enter into the question of how the Saviour satisfied the claim of justice, it simply affirms that salvation justifies both the sinner and the God of his salvation.

All that we have attempted in this survey is to establish the fact that the principle “an eye for an eye” has been honoured in our salvation, but honoured by a gracious Substitute. How this righteousness becomes ours, what it is to be justified by faith and all the associated doctrines of this blessed theme must be the subject of future meditations. Meanwhile let us return to our text:

“But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, Who of God is made unto us righteousness”
(I Cor. i. 30).

HEBREWS

Perfection or Perdition

No.17. What is meant by “tasting” death?

pp. 11 - 14

When we published this series on Hebrews in the early volumes of the *Berean Expositor*, we had several communications with the Rev. George Parker, of Honan, China, who wrote:

“You have not attempted sub-grouping of the seven-fold ascription of praise (Rev. v. 12), nor did Roe in 1834. I suggest:

Power.	
Riches	Solomon—King.
Wisdom	
Strength.	
Honour	Aaron—Priest.
Glory	
Blessing.	

The second pair, honour and glory, gives the clue.”

When these kingly and priestly functions are united we have no longer Solomon and Aaron, but the King-Priest of the Apocalypse, the Priest after the order of Melchisedec. The crowning with glory and honour (Heb. ii. 9) is the consecration of Christ as the Priest after the order of Melchisedec. “And no man taketh this HONOUR unto himself so also Christ GLORIFIED not Himself” (v. 4, 5). We shall find an allusion to this position in iii. 3: “for this Man was counted worthy of more GLORY than Moses, inasmuch as He Who hath builded the house hath more HONOUR than the house.” Thus we find Christ superior in honour and glory to both Moses and Aaron, and when we see Him crowned with honour and glory we are indeed considering Him Who is the Apostle (Moses) and High Priest (Aaron) of our profession.

It will be remembered that immediately following the revelation of the Lord’s approaching sufferings (Matt. xvi.), comes the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii.). In order to have “an entrance ministered richly into the *aiōnian* kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ”, the apostle Peter bids the believers of the dispersion remember the Transfiguration:--

“For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of His majesty. For He received from God the Father HONOUR and GLORY” (II Pet. i. 16, 17).

We pointed out previously that the “so great salvation” of which the Lord began to speak commences with His rejection, and is related more closely to the testimony of the second half of Matthew’s gospel than to the first. Those disciples who saw the rejection

of the King (Matt. xii., xiii.), could say after the Transfiguration, “We see not yet all things put under Him, but we see Jesus crowned with glory and honour”.

We now turn our attention to the close of Heb. ii. 9, “that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man”. How are we to understand the expression “taste death”? Is it merely a synonym for death itself? Some say so, but we distrust this interpretation of so many expressions as synonyms. We feel that there must be a clear reason why this word is used here, and therefore we turn to the Scriptures for light upon its meaning.

The word is translated in the A.V. “eat” three times, and “taste” twelve times. We shall never plumb the profoundest depths of the Scriptures “unto perfection”, but we shall never find them lapsing into the slightest approach to error or slovenly usage of language. That Homer may nod is proverbial; that the Scriptures are infallible is one of the first articles of faith. It is also the impression consistently gained by continual searching. We are not at all surprised therefore in the case of such divinely-arranged words to find that the first occurrence of the expression “taste of death” takes us back to the close of Matt. xvi., immediately before the record of the Transfiguration. There is one feature common to all passages referring to the Transfiguration in the Gospels: immediately before the reference is the statement concerning losing the soul for Christ’s sake. Now Peter’s epistles have as their theme present suffering followed by future glory. This is the lesson also of Matthew, chapters xvi. and xvii.

To John viii. 52 we need not refer, for the Lord said “see death” (verse 51) and we are not certain enough of those children of the devil (verse 44) to follow them here. That to “taste” does not mean to “drink” (Matt. xxvii. 34) show and thus in the figurative sense also, to taste of death need not necessarily mean to die. When the ruler of the feast “tasted” the water that was made wine, he certainly did not drink the entire amount which the Saviour had miraculously provided, and when the Lord said “none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper”, it is equivalent to the more modern colloquial phrase, “they shall not have a bit of it”. When Peter became hungry and would have ‘tasted’ he wanted a very little, not a full meal (Acts x. 10). Again, the phrase in Acts xx. 11 does not indicate what we call a meal. The curse under which the enemies of Paul bound themselves was not that they would not eat, but that they would not even taste food, so great was their enmity. Those who during this present evil age experienced in any measure the powers of the age to come are said to have “tasted” of the heavenly gift, and to have “tasted” the good word of God (Heb. vi. 4, 5). They *sampled* these things, but it will be true of them, as of the Queen of Sheba, that “the half has not yet been told”.

I Peter ii. 2, 3 is quite in line with the rest. The new-born babes, though feeding on the milk of the Word, have but “tasted” that the Lord is gracious. As they grow thereby and feed upon the stronger food, they will realize that blessed truth more. Every passage we have referred to leads us to draw distinctions between tasting and fully eating. Coming back to Matt. xvi. 28 let us notice how this helps us:

“Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His Kingdom.”

It is a difficulty with many that these men died before the Lord’s return. Now apart from all other factors in the true explanation, this difficulty is a fallacy. The Lord did not say “shall not die”, but shall not taste of death, *and He refers to what He had just been teaching them:*

“If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and *take up his cross*, and follow Me. For whosoever will save his life (soul) shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life (soul) for My sake shall find it” (24, 25).

This is surely “tasting” death. To take up the cross and to lose one’s soul—this, though not actual death, is tasting death. The disciples however were not permitted to suffer anything for their Lord until they had first of all seen the vision of His glory so closely connected with His decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem (Luke ix. 31). This word “decease” impressed Peter, for he uses the very same word immediately before he speaks of the Transfiguration in his second epistle. This time it was his own decease, but the link is there and visible. That bitter sorrow of soul “even unto death” experienced by the Lord in the garden of Gethsemane reveals the awful character of the taste of death to which Heb. ii. 9 refers, while the words “nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt” link it with Heb. v. 4-10. Who were they that were chosen to be near the Lord in this dread hour? *The very three* who witnessed the foreshadowing of His glory on the mount of Transfiguration. When the Lord tasted that bitter cup, He prayed:

“O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from Me, except I drink it, Thy will be done” (Matt. xxvi. 42).

As we stand upon this holy ground and witness that agony and bloody sweat, we see the Lord Jesus tasting death. How pointed therefore the words are to those who are exhorted to follow Him in this path of suffering when they are told, “He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted”. Temptation hung over that garden of Gethsemane, as is seen by the Lord’s words to His disciples. “Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation.” The garden of Gethsemane is no sentimental idea foisted upon Heb. ii. 9. This is seen by Heb. v. 7-9:

“Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared; though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the Author of *aionian* salvation unto all them that obey Him.”

How fully this agrees with Heb. ii. 9, 10. We have only to read on to verse 10 to complete the parallel:

“For it became Him, for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”

His sufferings therefore in this context are viewed as having an effect upon Himself, which is a thought distinct from that of Christ dying for the ungodly.

One more point we must notice; the words “for every man” are literally “on behalf of all”. There are some who take the word “all” in a universal sense, but we must remember that the word is always limited by the context. Salvation from sin is not in view, suffering in view of glory is the theme, and the word “all” refers here to the “many sons” who are being led along the pathway of the fellowship of His sufferings to the glory that shall be revealed.

Attention has been drawn to the parallels between Hebrews and Philippians, the epistle of “The Prize”. While we must not confuse the two sets of teaching, much light will be received if we remember that, although on differing planes, the ways of God with His people are actuated by similar principles, and all find their cause and goal in the same blessed Son of God.

**No.18. “We see not yet But we see” (ii. 6 - 9).
pp. 35 - 40**

We now commence section B | ii. 5-18 of the structure of the epistle, “The Son, Man, Seed of Abraham, lower than angels”. Here suffering and death are prominent, and the position of the Lord is “for a little lower than angels”.

We refer the reader to the structure of Heb. ii. 5-18, which is set out in the article dealing with Eph. iii., on p.4 of Volume XLI. It so happens, that these two sets of studies, written a year or more apart, draw together in these adjacent issues.

At first we were inclined to cancel this article on Heb. ii., but by so doing we should have ruined the exposition of Hebrews as a whole. On the other hand the fact that the Apostle did not hesitate to go over the same grounds in three different epistles, reminded us of his own words:

“To write the same things to you, to me is not grievous (slothful or idle), but for you it is safe (or makes for certainty)” (Phil. iii. 1).

It may be, that where the argument set forth in one article appears inconclusive, the second approach may make the matter clear. And we are sure that the intensely sacred and important nature of the subject justifies any effort on the part of both writer and reader.

We therefore ask the indulgence of the reader as we try to preserve intact, both sets of expositions, in view of possible reproduction in book form in the future.

We have already drawn the reader's attention to the fact that the miracles of the early church were called 'the powers of the coming age', and it will be seen that the statement quoted above, following immediately upon the reference to the signs and wonders, emphasizes this the more.

A more remote connection which it is important not to miss, is that the "so great salvation" is in fact all that is implied in the words "the world to come", concerning which, said the apostle, he was speaking. "The world to come", as we have seen, is literally "the habitable (world) about to be". In the original the word "habitable world" is *oikoumene*. This word has occurred already in Hebrews, being used in i. 6. It is used of the Roman Empire (Luke ii. 1; Acts xxiv. 5). This is in line with secular usage, Polybius and Plutarch using it in this way. The LXX in a similar manner uses the expression *he oikoumene hole* ('the whole habitable') for the Babylonian Empire (Isa. xiv. 17). Alexander's Empire is called *he oikoumene* (Ælitan, V.H. 3,29). This combined testimony makes it appear very probable that the term must not be applied to the whole "world" as we know it, but to that portion which will become the final sphere of Nebuchadnezzar's sovereignty as pictured in the great image of Dan. ii. The word is still further limited in its usage in such a passage as Acts xi. 28, for Josephus speaks of a famine in Judea at that time, and not to one of world-wide extent. It is used three times in the Revelation:

"I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which is about to come on the whole habitable world, to try those who dwell on the earth" (iii. 10 not AV JP).

"Satan, the one who is deceiving the whole habitable world" (xii. 9 not AV JP).

"Which go forth to the kings of the whole habitable world to gather them together unto the war of that great day of God Almighty" (xvi. 14 not AV JP).

These kings appear to be those which are connected with the Beast, and are kings of the "civilized" part of the earth. Now what do we learn by thus restricting the meaning of the word *oikoumene*? Surely this, that the great salvation, which is connected with overcoming and being made perfect, has to do with the initial phase of the future kingdom, when it will be necessary to rule the nations with a rod of iron (see Rev. ii. 26, 27). Parallel also is the blessing of Rev. xx. 4, "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years". The wonderful change indicated in Isa. xi. is at first limited to Israel's land:

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all *My holy mountain: for the earth* shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea" (verse 9).

Isa. lxxv., which repeats part of Isa. xi., links the creation of the new heavens and the new earth with a newly-created Jerusalem. Isa. lx. 1-3 makes a distinction too:

"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: but the LORD shall arise upon THEE, and His glory shall be seen upon THEE. And the Gentiles shall come to THY light, and kings to the brightness of THY rising."

What redeemed Israel will be in relation to the other nations, those who partake of the “great salvation” will be to the remnant of Israel. Further teaching concerning this word *oikoumene* will be brought forward when we consider chapter iii.

There is, possibly, a glance backward in Heb. ii. 5. If we put a little stress on the “world *to come*”, the question will at once arise whether angels ruled over the world in any period of the past? Satan is called in Scripture “the prince of this world”, “the prince of the power of the air”, and “the god of this age”. There are also others who are called “the world rulers of this darkness” (Eph. vi. 12). Michael the Archangel stands for Israel, and angels carry out Divine commissions from the time of Abraham right through the Scriptures, except during the dispensation of the Mystery. There is evidence of an inductive character which makes one feel that angels had much to do with this world before Adam and the creation associated with him. Be this as it may, angels are not the appointed rulers of the world to come:

“But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?” (Heb. ii. 6).

There is a strangeness in the manner of the Apostle’s reference. Why did he not say “DAVID, in the eighth Psalm”, or “as it is written in the eighth Psalm”, or “as it is written in the book of the Psalms”, or even “as the Scripture testifieth”? If we turn back to chapter i. we shall find similar vagueness; verse 5 simply says “for unto which of the angels”, etc.; verses 6 and 7 simply have “He saith”. Right through these verses, which are composed mainly of quotations, there is not a single reference to chapter, verse or book. In chapter ii. 12 the only word used is “saying”, and in verse 13 “and again”. At last in chapter iii. 7 we have a reference to Scripture, and the speaker is mentioned by *name*. Quoting from Psa. xcv. the writer says “Wherefore AS THE HOLY GHOST saith”. When this Psalm is quoted again (in iv. 7) then the apostle says “saying by David”. *The reason is that by then his special object has been attained.* “GOD hath spoken” (i. 1), “the LORD hath spoken” (ii. 3); all other names, such as David and Moses, or Psalms and Law, are but the agents in “sundry times and divers manners”. The important thing is that these quotations are from the Word of God.

In the second place, of course, the apostle was writing to those who were very familiar with the Scriptures, and who would not need continual reference to chapter and verse for their guidance. Had he been writing to Gentiles only recently brought to the knowledge of the Word, he would doubtless have followed the mode of reference found in Romans. But here he says:

“Thou madest Him a little lower than the angels; Thou crownedst Him with glory and honour, and didst set Him over the works of Thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet” (Heb. ii. 7, 8).

The writer does not refer to every particular in his quotation, but centres his exposition upon one or two essential features. His first item is the subjection of all things under the feet of the Son of man, namely:

- (a) As to its universality.
- (b) As to its fulfillment.

(a) *Its universality:*

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

How similar this mode of reasoning is to that in I Cor. xv. 27:

“But when He saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted, which did put all things under Him.”

Its universality in the one case is proved by the word “all”, which leaves “nothing” that is not put under Him; its universality in the other case is proved by one obvious exception—God Himself. All, whether principality, or power, heavenly, earthly or subterranean, must be subjected unto Him.

In I Cor. xv. the “all” includes enemies, which are to be “destroyed”. This fact will prevent us from reasoning that since all are to be subject beneath His feet, all must necessarily be saved. In I Cor. xv. death as the last enemy is to be destroyed; in Heb. ii., the devil, the holder of the power of death, is to be destroyed, so the parallel is completed. Before passing to the second feature of this Psalm, the apostle makes another observation upon the subjection of all things:

“But now we see not yet all things put under Him” (ii. 8).

This constituted a real difficulty at the time. The Messiah had come, but the long promised kingdom had not yet been set up. Peter confesses that the subject was accompanied by difficulties, but he certainly did not endorse the words of the scoffers who said, “Where is the promise of His coming?” The Lord was not slack concerning His promise, but the writings of Paul, in which were things hard to be understood, contained the explanation of this apparent delay, while, so far as the dispensational position of the Hebrews is concerned, it was true that “now we see not yet all things put under Him”. The dispensational viewpoint of the Mystery put things in a different light. *At the very same time* that Paul could confess that prophecy had become temporarily held up (Heb. ii. 8), he could personally be rejoicing in a peculiar fulfillment of this same promise (Eph. i. 22, 23):

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

By this statement we do not intend to teach that Hebrews and Ephesians were written at the same time or about the same subject! Universal headship has not yet been taken by the Lord, but headship over all things *to the Church* is His position now. What He *will be* universally, He is *now* in mystery. What He will be in heaven and in earth is anticipated now in the super-heavenlies. We however are dealing with Hebrews, not Ephesians, and the point of view there is “we see not”. Not until the seventh angel sounds shall the mystery of God be consummated in the universal sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The second feature of Psa. viii. is the reference to man being made a little lower than the angels. The reader's attention is drawn to the series "IN ADAM", article No.4 in Volume XXXVII. Rom. v. 14 supplies the link:

"Adam who is the figure of Him that was to come",

and I Cor. xv. 45-47 supplements:

"The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam a life-giving Spirit
The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second Man is the Lord from heaven."

Psa. viii. looks back to the first and forward to the second Man. Viewing Adam in his frailty and fall the Psalmist says, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" Viewing man in the person of the Lord from heaven, he sees the crown of glory and honour placed upon One Who will never fail or forfeit. The apostle's eye is not fixed upon frailty and forfeiture, but upon honour and glory—"but we see Jesus", "consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession" he writes; rather than think of Moses and Aaron, "look off unto Jesus"; rather than to the cloud of witnesses enumerated in chapter xi., consider the end of the conversation of those who have spoken unto you the word of God—"Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and unto the age" (xiii. 8).

- (1) We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels.
- (2) We see Jesus, crowned with glory and honour.

Both the A.V. and the R.V. read, "a little lower than the angels", and place in the margin, "a little while inferior to", "for a little while lower". The element of time does not enter into Heb. i. 4 where is shown the superior dignity of the Son in virtue of His inherited name. This influences the interpretation of Heb. ii. He Who now is infinitely above angels achieved that glory by humbling Himself, suffering and dying. It is as important to the right understanding of the crown of glory and honour that we see the depth of the Lord's humiliation, as it is to the right understanding of His excellent glory that we realize His position at the right hand of God. In both cases angels are taken as the standard of comparison, for their position remains unchanged, whereas man fallen in Adam will be exalted in Christ, and so cannot be so easily compared.

The Psalmist does not glory in the exalted position of man. He does not bid us look at his excellency, only just a little lower than angels; he rather considers man's low estate, saying, as he looks abroad upon the creation, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" The humiliation of the Lord was for a purpose:--

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil for verily He took not on Him the nature of angels" (Heb. ii. 14-16).

The argument is parallel, and is Paul's own explanation. This we can readily follow by referring to the structure. In both cases it leads to Christ, either as the *archegon* or the *archiereus*, and in both capacities He is set forth as One Who has suffered. Phil. ii. 6-13 is a passage to which all readers should prayerfully refer.

With what does the writer link the words “for the suffering of death”? Does he intend us to understand that the Lord was made a little lower than the angels that He might suffer death? or does He mean that Christ was crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death? If we read it that Christ was crowned with glory as a result of His death, we shall have a difficulty in the conclusion of verse 9, “that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man”; He was not exalted to taste death, but was humbled. The grammar of the apostle’s phrase considered alone and without the context, favours the following as the meaning:

“But we see Jesus crowned with glory and honour, Who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, so that He by the grace of God might taste death for every man” (ii. 9).

With this agrees Heb. x. 5:

“Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me.”

But while this translation appears to conform to the requirement of grammar, we cannot help feeling how fully the alternative rendering fits the theme of the epistle.

Phil. ii. 8, 9 links the death of the cross with the glorious exaltation, and with the Name above every name, which immediately attracts attention to Heb. i. 4. Heb. xii. 2 also links the suffering and cross very definitely with the exaltation at the right hand of the throne of God. The whole driving thought of the epistle is that endurance now is necessary to obtain that *aionian* glory and that *so great* salvation. By transposing the order of the words and placing the reference to the glory immediately after the reference to Jesus, we may be more *grammatical*, but we have nevertheless taken a liberty with the way in which the apostle by Divine guidance arranged his sentence, and have robbed ourselves of the very ambiguity he intended.

The Lord did not take hold of angels, He took hold on the seed of Abraham. He was made flesh and received a body that thereby He might suffer the death of the cross. By that very act of humiliation, however, He inherited a more excellent Name than the angels, beneath whose dignity and nature He had voluntarily stooped; and therefore by reason of the suffering of death, we see Jesus crowned with glory and honour.

**No.19. "All of one."
pp. 49 - 54**

"For it became Him, for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings" (Heb. ii. 10).

Instead of simply saying "God" or "The Father", the apostle uses the title "Him for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things". There is a reason for this which it is important to observe, and it comes out again in chapter xi. There the statement is simpler, and will enable us to perceive the underlying principle here in verse 10:

"For it is necessary for him who comes near to God (a special term) to believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them who diligently seek Him" (xi. 6).

Three statements are here, which placed beside ii. 10 will illuminate that passage:

"It was becoming."	"It is necessary."
"Him, for Whom and by Whom are all things."	"He is."
"Perfecter."	"Rewarder."

The doctrine of reward is as primal and absolute as the very existence of God. "He is", "He is a rewarder". The words of chapter ii. 10 are an expansion of this. He Who IS, is the Creator Whose creation has been arranged with a view to His own glory. He Who is a rewarder of the diligent seeker, plans also the pathway to glory, "Perfect through suffering". Instead of counting the idea of reward as strange, and proudly saying, "Virtue is its own reward, we ought to do right for right's sake" (which is perfectly true), we should be more Scriptural, and fundamentally more true, if we saw in the framing and enforcing of all law whatever, that reward is essential, and that suffering is of purpose. So the words are introduced by *eprepe*, "It is becoming".

Prepei is used again in vii. 26, when the essential suitability of Christ as High Priest is spoken of; also in Matt. iii. 15, where it was fitting and proper that the Son of God should fulfil all righteousness. It was therefore in the way of the nature of things that God, Who had made all things for Himself, in leading many sons to glory, should perfect their Captain through sufferings. The idea of a suffering Messiah was repugnant to the Jew by reason of the traditions of the elders, but the apostle shows that the "taste of death for every man" was most fitting and proper. The path of suffering to glory must not be counted as though some strange thing had happened; it is according to plan. By this acknowledgment we do not pretend to know the solution of life's mystery, we only know that there is one.

The last words of verse 9 are sometimes quoted to prove that Christ died for every man and therefore is the Saviour of every man. The passage does not teach this. We saw previously that the "tasting" of death did not mean death itself, but the sufferings which

preceded it, and that this tasting of death did not have redemption in view, but glory. There is no word for “man” in the original, and the word “all” has reference to the “many sons” who were being led on to glory through suffering.

Christ is their Captain and Joshua is the type. That this is so, the words in iv. 8 will shew. “For if Jesus had given them rest”, where the margin says, “*i.e. Joshua*”. Hebrews is NOT dealing with Moses and the passover redemption from the land of Egypt, but with Joshua and the survival through the rigours of the wilderness to the triumphal entry into the land of promise. The wilderness is the setting of the book, not Egypt. A saved people are addressed, and they are not urged to believe and be saved, but to go on unto perfection.

Christ is called the Captain again in Heb. xii. 2, and that once more in connection with perfecting and suffering; the “Author (captain) and Finisher (Perfecter) of faith” (not of “our” faith). There He is seen leading the van of the great company who overcame through faith and obtained promises. The “so great salvation” is for those who have been perfected, just as is the Prize in Phil. iii. It is written again:

“And having been perfected (by the things which He suffered, verse 8), He became the author of *aionian* salvation unto all them that obey Him” (v. 9).

In connection with sufferings, Christ as Captain sets us an example, for He:

“Hath also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps” (I Pet. ii. 21).

“Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind” (I Pet. iv. 1).

It is well to consider Him, lest we grow weary and faint in our minds. It is in this sense that we see Him as “the Forerunner for us”, Who has entered beyond the veil. The Hebrew believers had endured a great contest (*athletis*) of sufferings (Heb. x. 32, same word for suffering *pathematon* as in ii. 10); which, said the apostle, had great recompense of reward.

The perfecting of faith (I Thess. iii. 10; Heb. xii. 2), the perfecting of love (I John ii. 5), and the perfecting of holiness (II Cor. vii. 1) cannot be accomplished apart from suffering. Faith will be tried (Gen. xxii.), love will be called upon to suffer long and endure all things (I Cor. xiii.), holiness will cause separation from much that is attractive.

We are heirs of God, if sons; but we are *joint-heirs* with Christ if so be we suffer with Him (Rom. viii. 17). Present affliction is temporal in duration and light in comparison with the *aionian* weight of glory which it works out for those who are exercised by it, and whose eyes see beyond the temporal and the visible. “The fellowship of His sufferings” is a necessary prelude to the fellowship of His glory.

“Weeping may endure for a night, But joy cometh in the morning” (Psa. xxx. 5).

To catch the meaning of the concluding portion of Heb. ii. (verses 11 to 18), we must first of all see it as a whole, apart from details:

“ALL OF ONE.”

- A | 11. Oneness in Sanctification.
- B | 14. Oneness in nature. He partook.
- C | 14-16. Oneness in death and deliverance.
- B | 17. Oneness in nature. He was made like.
- A | 18. Oneness in temptation.

This simple balance sweeps aside the idea entertained by some that “all of one” refers to Adam, or to God. Verse 10 speaks of two parties, “many sons” and the “Captain”. The perfecting of the Captain can only bear upon the many sons if they are united in some way. Verse 11 says they are, both Sanctifier and sanctified, “all of one”.

What therefore happens to the Captain is communicated to the host. We must remember the limitations imposed upon the scope of “all” by the word “sanctified”. “All of one” does not here speak of the human race although Luke traces the genealogy of Christ back to Adam, and Paul uses the same expression (*ex henos*) in Acts xvii. 26 when he speaks of “every nation of men”. Neither does the passage speak of redemption from sin and its penalty. The Exodus, so far as Hebrews is concerned, is already accomplished. The union here is with “the things which accompany salvation”. The Israelites were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea *after redemption*. This oneness is limited to sanctification. We must therefore seek a true meaning for this term before we can appreciate the teaching of this passage.

Hagiazo “to sanctify”—occurs seven times in Hebrews. It is therefore a keyword and carries an important message:

Sanctify

- A | a | ii. 11. He that sanctifieth. The one perfected through suffering.
- b | ii. 11. They that are sanctified.
- B | ix. 12-14. Blood of bulls . . . flesh.
- Blood of Christ . . . conscience.
- C | x. 9, 10. The will of God The offering of The body once.
- B | x. 14. Perfected for ever (cf x. 1) by One Offering.
- A | b | x. 29. The blood wherewith He was sanctified.
- a | xiii. 12. The people sanctified by His blood, without the gate.

Sanctification is uppermost in Heb. i. 3 *where purification* for sins, and *not* redemption is the aspect of truth presented. This aspect is sustained in ix. 12-14 where the blood of goats and bulls is linked with the ashes of an heifer, which were not used as a “ransom” or for “redemption”, but for sprinkling the unclean, and results in a *sanctification*, or the purifying of the flesh which had come into contact with *some form*

of death. Christ's *sanctification* cleanses the conscience from *dead works*, the spiritual counterpart. Heb. x. 10 and 14 cannot be understood apart from the earlier verses.

The word translated "continually" in x. 1 is the same as is rendered "for ever" in verse 14, and should in both cases be translated "unto perpetuity". Chapter x. 1, 2 should be rendered:

"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year make the comers thereunto PERFECT UNTO PERPETUITY. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because the worshippers, *once having been cleansed*, should have had *no more conscience of sins.*"

Verses 10 and 14 are the answer to this, just as verse 14 is the answer to verse 13 in chapter ix. Chapter x. 29 speaks of the awful possibility of counting the blood wherewith He was sanctified unholy, and of doing despite to the Spirit of grace, which is opened up in an intensely practical way in the verses that follow, where the drawing back from suffering and trial is a parallel. The last reference shows the Captain of our salvation suffering outside the gate. The oneness between Sanctifier and sanctified is expressed in the words:

"Let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come" (Heb. xiii. 13, 14).

These last words are full of light for us as to the underlying idea of this sanctification. The pilgrim character, the wilderness pathway, the whole theme of race and crown is involved in the word. Its association with "perfection" or maturity would teach students of Philippians that much. See also another link between sanctification and pilgrim character. Those who are sanctified suffer the spoiling of their goods knowing that in heaven they have a better and an enduring substance. They have here no continuing city, but seek one to come. Like Abraham:

"They desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore *God is not ashamed* to be called their God: for He hath prepared for them a City" (xi. 16).

"Both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause *He is not ashamed* to call them brethren" (ii. 11).

Hagiotēs and *hagiasmos* in Heb. xii. 10 and 14 speak of holiness as the outcome of the Father's discipline, without which no man shall see God.

Hagios, apart from its occurrences in the expression "the Holy Ghost", comes in iii. 1, "holy brethren", who are immediately named "partakers of the heavenly calling", a statement which illuminates the meaning of "holy brethren" here. In vi. 10 and xiii. 24 it is used for "the saints" without qualification.

Hagion in its ten occurrences is used to denote the Sanctuary or the Holiest of all, either in the Tabernacle in the wilderness or the true Tabernacle, "heaven itself". The sanctification of the epistle to the Hebrews is linked with the wilderness and the Tabernacle, not the kingdom and the Temple, and with the heavenly Jerusalem, not the

earthly (see xii. 22). It is associated with purification from death; it leads outside the camp, it shares the reproach of Christ, and counts it greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. The Offering that accomplishes our sanctification was made “through the eternal Spirit”, but sanctification of the Spirit is *never once mentioned in Hebrews*. It is always connected with the sufferings of the Captain of our salvation and His once-offered Sacrifice for the purification from sins and uncleanness. It is utterly valueless as an aid to exegesis simply to string together the occurrences of the word “sanctify” regardless of their origin or context. The word here, as we have seen, has a special shade of meaning which is closely related to the theme of the epistle. It does not mean every saved one by virtue of salvation, as it probably does in Rom. i. 7. It is the title of *the many sons who*, through suffering, are going on to glory. It is closely associated with the Captain and Perfecter of faith, Who for the joy set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God. It is a necessity in view of the *aionian* salvation and inheritance.

The element of overcoming is often passed over in Heb. x., but it is there, and there with a purpose. It immediately precedes the reference to the perfecting of the sanctified, “from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool” (verse 13). Such sanctified ones the great Captain is not ashamed to call brethren. The three quotations that follow in Heb. ii. are designed to show the close association of Christ and His people.

This is particularly so in the second one where Christ uses the words, “I will put my trust in Him” (ii. 13). There we see Him trusting, in the days of His flesh, and it is there we find the oneness with Him in this sanctification by suffering.

No.20. Him who had the strength of death (ii. 14, 15). pp. 69 - 72

“For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also, in like manner, partook of the same; in order that by means of death He might render powerless him having the strength of death, that is the devil, and might set free those who by fear of death were all their life held in bondage” (Heb. ii. 14, 15 not AV JP).

The words of verse 11, “all of one”, here receive fuller explanation. Those who were sanctified and called His brethren were partakers of flesh and blood, and were also held in bondage by the fear of death. The Lord too, their Redeemer, became partaker of the same nature, submitted Himself to death, and rendered the devil powerless. Had the passage meant merely to indicate the Lord’s sympathy with our frailty, flesh alone would have been used. “Flesh and blood” stand for human nature without reference to its deeds. In other words, the Captain of our salvation became a real man “in like manner”, “not in show, nor in appearance, but in truth” (*Chrysostom*).

“The children” are first described as to their natural state, “common sharers of flesh and blood”; then, as to their moral and dispensational condition, “held in bondage by fear of death”. The Saviour is first described as to His natural state, “He partook of the same”, and then as to the moral effects, “He rendered powerless the devil” and delivered His brethren.

Three passages should be read in conjunction with these verses. Rom. viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7, 8; Heb. x. 5-7, and their contexts noted.

“God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh” (Rom. viii. 3).

“Was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man” (Phil. ii. 7, 8).

“When He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me” (Heb. x. 5-7).

The section of Romans which contains viii. 3 commences with v. 12, and reveals the entry of death. Here it is spoken of as exercising dominion, “Death reigned by one”. The dominion of sin and death is the theme of Rom. vi. 9-14. The law of sin and death is uppermost in Rom. vii. 21-25. Rom. viii. 2 introduces the other law which indicates deliverance, “For the law of the spirit of LIFE in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death”. This was accomplished by Christ assuming our nature, the result being “that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit”. The context speaks of life (verses 6, 10-13), our deliverance from the bondage of corruption (15-23), a bondage which is ever related to “fear” (15).

The statement that Christ was made in the likeness of sinful flesh is here chiefly connected with the practical out-working of truth, of triumph over death, of “life because of righteousness”, of “life and peace” as a result of being “spiritually minded”. The passage speaks moreover not only of being heirs of God by virtue of being sons of God, but of being **JOINT HEIRS WITH CHRIST** by virtue of suffering together with Him (17, 18). The goal is that Christ should be “the firstborn among many brethren” (29). Here we read of having “the spirit of Christ”. In Phil. ii. we read of having “the mind of Christ”, of working out our own salvation with fear and trembling, of being finally fashioned like unto the body of His glory (iii. 21). We have also a close connection with Hebrews:

“Who, being in the **FORM OF GOD**” (Phil. ii. 6).

“Who being the brightness of His glory, and the **EXPRESS IMAGE** of His Person (Heb. i. 3).

“He was made in the likeness of men” (Phil. ii. 7).

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same” (Heb. ii. 14).

“And being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death” (Phil. ii. 8).

“That through death He might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. ii. 14).

“Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a (the) name which is above every name” (Phil. ii. 9).

“Who for the joy set before Him endured the (a) cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (Heb. xii. 2).

“Being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they” (Heb. i. 4).

“Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do (work on account) of His good pleasure” (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

“Make you perfect in every good work, in order to do His will, doing in you that which is well pleasing in His sight” (Heb. xiii. 21 not AV JP).

The third reference (Heb. x. 5-7) we have already had occasion to examine when dealing with the word “sanctified”. There we read of the Lord laying aside His glory, the moment of His *kenosis* or self-emptying (Phil. ii. 7); and just as He left the glory that was His before the world was, to enter by human birth that path of suffering, we hear Him say:

“Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a BODY HAST THOU PREPARED ME LO, I come to do Thy will, O God” (Heb. x. 5-7).

We are allowed by wondrous grace to hear the words with which the Lord of life and glory voluntarily partook of the same flesh and blood as the children of men, that in the body thus prepared for Him He might learn obedience by the things He should suffer, and, being made perfect through suffering, lead many sons to glory.

Before we attempt to explain our verse, we must examine another item. The Lord submitted to death, not only that Adam’s sons might live again (I Cor. xv. 22), but that “He might render ineffective the one having the strength of death, that is the Devil”. What is this strength of death? Here we are not viewing atonement, for Christ offered Himself in all aspects of His sacrifice “unto God”. This is directed to the Devil. The Devil possessed this strength, and we must seek from the Word the meaning of the expression. *Kratos* is used in Eph. i. 19 of resurrection, “according to the energy of the *strength* of His might”, and in vi. 10 of its practical application to the believer, “Finally, my brethren, be empowered in the Lord and in the *strength* of His might”, this empowering being in view of the conflict with spiritual wickedness in heavenly places.

It will be remembered that (evidently) at the time when Moses was to appear with Elijah on the mount of Transfiguration, “Michael the archangel, when contending with the Devil he disputed about the body of Moses” (Jude 9). It will be remembered that the Transfiguration came into prominence in our investigation into the meaning of the expression “taste of death” of Heb. ii. 9, and Peter in his epistle of suffering in view of glory introduces it in the first chapter. It is the vision of the *overcomer*. Death is spoken of ten times in Hebrews. In v. 7 we are taken to the garden of Gethsemane and there the Lord:

“in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up both prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him Who was able to save Him out of death, and was heard for His piety” (not AV JP).

This passage, the reference following the cluster in Heb. ii. (9, 14 and 15), carries with it the same sense that is more dimly seen there, namely, death, as viewed in connection with suffering and glory, obedience and perfection, *aionian* salvation, and the so great salvation. Here also, as in Heb. ii. 17, the High Priesthood of Christ is introduced (v. 6). The next reference to death (vii. 23) speaks of the priesthood of the sons of Aaron in contrast. The last reference is of great help to us in our endeavour to understand the peculiar meaning of death in Heb. ii. 14, 15. In Heb. xi. 5, the chapter of overcomers, sons who are led on to glory and perfected through sufferings, but not yet perfected in resurrection, we read of Enoch, who by faith “was translated that he should not see death”. When we turn to iii. 17, 18, we read of the tragedy of the wilderness:

“But with whom was He grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned (those who sinned), whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware He that they should not enter into His rest, but to them that believed not?”.

Those in Heb. ii. were all their lifetime held by the “fear” of death. In chapter iv. 1 we read *immediately* after hearing of those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness:

“Let us therefore FEAR, lest, a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it.”

In writing of the wilderness to the Corinthians, the apostle says:

“Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were DESTROYED OF THE DESTROYER” (I Cor. x. 10).

When a believer was handed over to Satan by Paul it was for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit might be saved. Parallel with this is I Cor. iii. 15, “He shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire”. This too is the one great theme of Hebrews.

“But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition (destruction, the destruction of the flesh, the two Greek words used come together in I Cor. x. 10), but of them who believe to the saving of the soul” (Heb. x. 39).

The death of Christ was effective in rendering ineffective him who had the strength of death. By His one Offering the “sanctified” (Heb. ii. 11; x. 14) are “perfected” for ever.

The deliverance is like that from a legal opponent (Luke xii. 58), or from the grip of a disease (Acts xix. 12), or from the authority of darkness (Col. i. 13). It is not the word that indicates deliverance from sin in the gospel sense of the word. It is from the power of some one into whose hands, or under whose authority we have come. The connection between the believer’s “perfecting”, expressed in Colossians and Philippians as circumcision, with antagonistic principalities and powers, is indicated in Col. ii. 10-15, and their association with “reward” is seen in ii. 18. The death and the deliverance of Heb. ii. must be related to the overcoming, the crown, the prize, and it is against this “strength of death” the believer is ranged as he presses along the path, and to which he is delivered should he so sadly fail as did those who tempted God in the wilderness.

The Captain of our salvation is the TRUE JOSHUA under Whom we shall enter into the rest that remaineth.

**No.21. Propitiation and the Pilgrim (ii. 16 - 18).
pp. 88 - 93**

The passage before us is confessedly difficult, and there are a number of ways in which the language of the apostle can be construed. The A.V. renders Heb. ii. 16 thus:

“For verily He took not on *Him the nature* of angels; but He took on *Him* the seed of Abraham.”

The words printed in italics reveal the point of the problem, and the A.V. margin translates the verse as follows, omitting the italicized words, and telling us that the Greek reads:

“He taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold.”

What the A.V. puts into its margin, the R.V. places in its text. The student will discover that there is a great variety of opinion among the commentators and the following is a fair presentation of their differing views.

Parkhurst in his Lexicon says:

“The text therefore means that Christ, when He came to redeem us, did not assume a glorious, awful and angelic appearance, but, etc., etc.”

This is promptly denied by his Editor who follows with a note:

“There appears little ground for assigning this sense to *epilambanomai*. Ernesti says that the ancient Greek church always interpreted the verb in this place *to assist*.”

Moses Stuart disposes of the A.V. idea of the *nature of angels* by saying that both *usus loquendi* and context is against this meaning:

“For the apostle had just asserted above that Jesus took on Him a *human* nature, and it would be a mere repetition.”

Moses Stuart thinks it means “to aid”. Dr. Owen proceeds by lengthy argument and characteristic subdivision to prove the meaning to be “*assumo, accipio*, to take unto, or to take upon”, and that:

“The apostle teacheth us by it, that the Lord Christ took to Him, and took on Him, our human nature of the seed of Abraham.”

The idea of “relieving” or “helping” it fitly expressed by *antilambanomai* (Luke i. 54; Acts xx. 35; I Tim. vi. 2), but the writer of Hebrews passes by this word. The reader is probably no wiser by all this than before, and we have endeavoured to indicate the exceedingly ambiguous results of past scholarship in elucidating this passage. We shall therefore be justified in saying, that as there is no agreement among the learned themselves, we must turn once more to the Fountain-head. One writer complains that the other usages of the word “to take hold” do not help him; the reason seems that they do not help *his idea* of what it means. Let us examine the word afresh, *epilambanomai*.

Matt. xiv. 31	“Stretched forth His hand, and <i>caught</i> him.”
Mark viii. 23	“He <i>took</i> the blind man by the hand.”
Luke ix. 47	“And Jesus <i>took</i> a child.”
Luke xiv. 4	“He <i>took</i> him, and healed him.”
Luke xx. 20, 26	“ <i>Take hold</i> of His words.”
Luke xxiii. 26	“They <i>laid hold</i> upon one Simon.”
Acts ix. 27	“But Barnabas <i>took</i> him.”
Acts xvi. 19	“They <i>caught</i> Paul and Silas.”
Acts xvii. 19	“They <i>took</i> him.”
Acts xviii. 17	“The Greeks <i>took</i> Sosthenes.”
Acts xxi. 30, 33	“They <i>took</i> Paul.”
Acts xxiii. 19	“ <i>Took</i> him by the hand.”
I Tim. vi. 12, 19	“ <i>Lay hold</i> on eternal life.”
Heb. ii. 16	<i>The passage under consideration.</i>
Heb. viii. 9	“I <i>took</i> them by the hand.”

An impartial examination shews that the word is colourless. There is no moral meaning inherent to it.

We have already observed that the A.V. italics make Heb. ii. 16 a somewhat needless repetition. May there not be some meaning which has been on the surface all the while? We believe there is. There is a footnote in the *Emphatic Diaglott* which reads, “For truly it”, i.e. the fear of death, or death itself, “does not lay hold of, or seize on angels, but of the seed of Abraham it does lay hold” (*Theolog Ref.* and *Kneeland*). Those of our readers who are not conversant with the original must know that “he” or “it” is contained within the verb *epilambanomai*, and *epilambanetai* means equally *it*, as well as *He*, takes hold. Let us look at the structure again, verses 14-16 are included together there under one member:

C | 14-16. Oneness in death and deliverance.

This member is made up of parts, and we can test the congruity of this new suggestion here.

- C | 14-16. |
 - A | The death of Christ.
 - The destruction of the Devil who had the strength of death.
 - A | The deliverance of those subject to bondage of fear of death.
 - The seed of Abraham laid hold of by fear of death.

With the exception of the fourth line, the emphatic word is *death*. If the A.V. reading be retained it introduces a discordant note. If the idea of “assisting” be adopted it harmonizes with “deliverance”, but has no relation with the emphatic word “death”.

What has Scripture to say about angels and death? Luke xx. 35, 36 says:

“But they which are accounted worthy to obtain that age (the very pith and marrow of Hebrews) and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: NEITHER CAN THEY DIE ANY MORE, FOR THEY ARE EQUAL TO THE ANGELS” (not AV JP).

If the seed of Abraham, and flesh and blood, were laid hold of by the fear of death and thereby brought into bondage, Christ’s becoming flesh and delivering them from that bondage is a fitting sequel.

“Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest” (Heb. ii. 17).

We have already seen that the Lord Jesus “tasted death”, and in the garden of Gethsemane His soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death. Three times He prayed with reference to that awful cup. Heb. v. 7 tells us that He was heard for His piety. There is a direct connection between Gethsemane and the Melchisedec priesthood of Christ in Heb. v. It is an expansion of Heb. ii. 16-18. Since Christ has come and died and risen again, such words as II Tim. i. 10 can be written:

“Our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who hath on the one hand rendered death powerless (same word Heb. ii. 14) and on the other hand illuminated life and incorruptibility through the gospel.”

Those who once were subject to bondage can now look death in the face and say, “O death, where is thy sting?”

“For which reason it behooved Him to be made like to His brethren in all things (*kata panta*), in order that He might be a merciful and a faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, with a view to making a propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted” (Heb. ii. 17, 18 not AV JP).

“All things” here is *panta*, a word liable to much abuse. For although it may seem a very forceful argument to say emphatically, “God says all things, and that does not admit of exception”, we find that this very epistle interprets its own language for us, and definitely teaches that “all” does not necessarily mean “all” in our sense of the word.

Heb. iv. 15 returns to the theme of Heb. ii. 17, 18:

“For we have not an High Priest Which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but One having been tempted in all points (*kata panta*) like (see ii. 17) as we are, SIN EXCEPTED” (not AV JP).

This is important. The temptations referred to in the epistle to the Hebrews in which Christ so fully shared, like the temptations of Abraham (Gen. xxii.) and the children of Israel in the wilderness, were trials of faith, *not temptations to sin*; thus the “all points” are by no means universal.

The word *homoioo* “to be made like”, gives us *homoiotos*. This comes in the parallel verse (iv. 15), where we read that Christ as the high Priest was “in all points tempted like as we are”. The actual wording is *pepeirasmenon de KATA panta KATH’ homoioteta*, “having been tempted according to all things according to a likeness”. Heb. vii. 15 contains the only other occurrence of the word in the New Testament. The fact that the Saviour stooped not only to our humanity, but to endure its trials and its sorrows, is emphasized as one of the chief of His high qualifications as the true, merciful and faithful high Priest. His work here is twofold. In the things pertaining to God, expiation for sins of the people; in the things pertaining to His people, succour for those who are tempted. The *hilaskomai* (“reconciliation” in A.V.) gives us the *hilasterion* of Heb. ix. 5, “the mercy seat” of which Paul said he could not then speak particularly. If we remember that he makes a similar statement regarding the Melchisedec priesthood of Christ (v. 11), we shall perceive that the subject before us is fuller and deeper than we at first might suppose.

In the doctrine of Romans, the mercy seat figures in iii. 25, “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation”, but the subject is not exhausted by justification. The mercy seat bore the cherubim of GLORY, and was the very visible throne of God in the Tabernacle.

There, the Lord said, He would meet with Moses and commune with him. The epistle to the Romans, with its emphasis upon justification, sees the blood-sprinkled mercy seat resting upon the ark which contained the unbroken tables of the law. The epistle to the Hebrews sees the same blood-sprinkled mercy seat, but while it recognizes the teaching of the preservation of the tables of the law, it finds the necessity of “finding fault” with the old Covenant in a way which is parallel with, though different from the setting aside of the law in Romans. Moreover, Hebrews takes account of the other articles which were covered by that mercy seat, and indeed speaks of them before mentioning the tables of the Covenant, viz., “the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron’s rod that budded” (ix. 4).

The manna speaks of wilderness provision. In Christ as High Priest the believer finds all that the golden pot of manna means. The epistle to the Hebrews is essentially the book of the wilderness and the pilgrim, and in pressing on to perfection, the wilderness experience is repeated. The believer learns that man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Faith, not sight, is his characteristic. The rod that budded speaks of a living Priesthood. This too is emphasized in Hebrews:

“And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of DEATH: but this Man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable (intransmissible) priesthood. Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever LIVETH to make intercession for them” (vii. 23-25).

Manna from heaven for all our needs, an ever-living High Priest to save to the uttermost, this is vitally connected with the thought of the propitiatory and the propitiation of Heb. ii. 17. The LXX commonly renders the Hebrew word *kopher* propitiation. This word gives us “atonement” in the A.V. The great Day of atonement is the type which is in view in Heb. ix.

It will be noticed that the idea of cleansing or purifying is prominent in that chapter. First we have the cleansing of the conscience by the blood of Christ as the antitype of the ashes of the heifer. Then we have the cleansing by the blood, the patterns of heavenly things and the heavenly things themselves being thus cleansed. The opening section of chapter ix. speaks of the high priest who went into the holiest alone once every year, not without blood. This is an evident reference to Lev. xvi., and the Day of Atonement. The closing section speaks of the Lord Jesus as the true high Priest:

“For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the (a) second time WITHOUT SIN unto salvation” (Heb. ix. 24-28).

While the “second time” indicates the Second Coming of the Lord, the meaning which is to be attached to the expression here is the fulfillment of the type in Lev. xvi. Not until the high priest had gone in beyond the veil with the blood of atonement and had appeared the *second time* did the people, typically, enter into the “so great salvation” of Hebrews.

When we look at the context of Heb. ii. 17 we observe that it is covered by the thought of “sanctification” (ii. 11). The only aspect of Christ’s sacrificial Work which is given in that grand summary of Heb. i. 3 is that of “purification” or “cleansing” (as in Heb. ix.).

The sufferings of Heb. ii. 9 are connected with perfecting and glory, delivering from the fear of death, and making propitiation for sins. Here, in Heb. ii. 11 we have the Offering of Christ “sanctifying”. In Heb. x. 14 we get to the farthest extreme, where we read that “by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that ARE SANCTIFIED”.

This is what is intended in Heb. ii. 17, 18. First He sanctifies (ii. 11), then He perfects (ii. 17, 18). Here the perfecting work is seen beginning; we shall trace it through its various processes until we read the Hebrews equivalent to the prize of Phil. iii., viz., “the spirits of perfected righteous ones” (Heb. xii. 23). This perfecting of the sanctified is the theme of the book, and merely to lift out a verse, as so many do (x. 14), is practically to misquote it, for it is not usual for an evangelical or protestant speaker, when using Heb. x. 14, to teach the “perfecting” of those *already* sanctified, but to buttress up some anti-Romish doctrines, truth in its way, but not the truth of that verse.

It will be noticed that ii. 18 leaves us with the thought of “succour in temptation”, and not “salvation from sin”. Babes are “unskillful”, i.e., “untested” or “untempted”, but perfect ones have their senses “exercised”. The pilgrim journey is one beset with temptations, but all for the good of the tempted. The Lord will never fail them; perfect sympathy exists between the great High Priest and the tried saint. He Himself has suffered being tempted; He can succour those who are tempted. Failure therefore is simply lack of faith, not lack of provision. This we shall see more clearly when we enter upon the examination of chapters iii. and iv.

To summarize. The four steps towards perfection are:

- First: Sanctification.
- Second: Realization of the oneness existing between the risen Lord and His people.
- Third: Consciousness that the one who had the strength of death can no longer hold us in bondage.
- Fourth: That complete provision, both for sins on the one hand (Lev. xvi. deals with the sins of a people *already* redeemed and separated), and for wilderness temptations on the other hand, has been made in Christ.

While some of the figures used may not fit the church of the One Body, the blessed realities of the figures used are for all saints in all times.

“If we walk in the light the blood cleanseth us from all sin We have an Advocate He is the propitiation” (I John i. 7 to ii. 1, 2).

**No.22. “In all points tempted like as we are” (iv. 15).
pp. 104 - 109**

We have seen already that the outstanding characteristic of those addressed in Hebrews is that of the pilgrim. He has here no continuing city. He confesses by his attitude to life that he is a “pilgrim and a stranger”. Like Abraham, he is willing to dwell in a tent, while waiting for the city which hath foundations. In chapter iii., the teaching draws its local colour from the wilderness journey of Israel, and we have already expressed our conviction that the temptations of Heb. ii. 18 are those which beset the believer as he presses on to maturity with the possibility of the prize before him. In Heb. iv., this question of temptation is revived, and we feel it will be helpful to anticipate that passage and deal somewhat exhaustively with the words of Heb. iv. 15:

“In all points tempted like as we are”,

before entering into the third chapter with its “temptation in the wilderness” (Heb. iii. 8). The subject is of universal interest. No dispensational differences of calling or sphere exempt the believer from the pressure and allurements of the surrounding world, and this must be our excuse, if one be needed, for this diversion.

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

How are we to interpret the words “in *all* points”? How are we to understand the sequel “yet without sin”? How does this passage influence our understanding concerning the sinlessness of the Man Christ Jesus?

There have been those who have argued that the presence of the words “in *all* points”, implies the inclusion of every temptation which besets mankind, and, in consequence, have been driven by the irresistible force of logic to affirm that He must therefore have had a “fallen nature” even though He actually “did no sin”. The seriousness of the subject should be felt by all. To most of our readers, the teaching that the Saviour had a “fallen” nature would come as a shock. Moreover, the believer himself is involved for he cannot be unmoved by the consequences of the examination of the words “tempted in *all* points like as we are”. In order therefore to disclose the scope of the argument that contains these pregnant words, we must repeat the outline of the epistle to the Hebrews and, following that, an examination of other passages where the words “tempt” and “temptation” are used, so that, if possible, we may arrive at a Scriptural understanding both of the range of temptation indicated in Heb. iv. 15, and the meaning, origin and different forms of temptation as indicated by the usage of the word in Hebrews and in other parts of the New Testament.

The scope of any passage of Scripture is indicated by its literary structure and we must anticipate our studies a little here, and lift out from the structure of the epistle as a whole two corresponding members, because in them are found every occurrence of the words “tempt” and “temptation” found in the epistle.

B Heb. iii. - vi. ON TO PERFECTION. “The Profession.” (<i>Homologia</i>) (iii. 1; iv. 14).	Let us come boldly Examples of unbelief Perfect v. babes. No renewal unto repentance Senses exercised Crucify afresh the Son
B Heb. x. 19 - xii. 25. BACK TO PERDITION. “The Profession.” (<i>Homologia/eo</i>) (x. 23; xi. 13).	Let us draw near Examples of faith Sons v. firstborn No place for repentance Discipline exercised Trodden under foot the Son

There can be no question but that these two sections very closely correspond with one another, and if they contain all the occurrences of “tempt” and “temptation” that are found in the epistle to the Hebrews, then those temptations *must* be intimately related to the ideas of “perfection” and “perdition”; with “going on”, or with “drawing back”. When we come to consider the smaller portion of Hebrews that contains the passage under review, we discover that its historic background is the story of Israel’s *failure in*

the wilderness; a failure to “go on unto perfection”, with which the words “tempt” and “temptation” are closely interwoven.

Hebrews ii. 17 - iv. 16

A | ii. 17 - iii. 1. TEMPTED, Succour, Profession.

B | iii. 2 - iv. 11. “IF” -- The TEMPTATION.
“IF” -- They TEMPTED ME.

A | iv. 12-16. TEMPTED, Help, Profession.

It will be seen that Heb. iv. 15 is an integral part of this larger context, and no interpretation is therefore valid that ignores or contravenes the general direction of the teaching of the larger context. A “profession” is in view, something to “hold fast”, something involving trial and self-denial, something that may be lost. Further, with the structure before us, it is impossible to isolate Heb. iv. 15; we must keep in mind the temptation mentioned in chapter ii.

“Your fathers tempted ME” (Heb. iii. 9), said God. Now whatever questionable views we may entertain concerning the temptation to which our Lord was subjected in the days of His flesh, no such thoughts are possible when we consider the words “Your fathers tempted ME”. It is not only repugnant to common sense, but contrary to positive Scripture, that God can, by any possibility, be “tempted” to, or by, evil. “God cannot be tempted with evil” is the categorical statement of Holy Writ (James i. 13); consequently we are immediately faced with a fact concerning “temptation” that must influence our views of Heb. ii. 18 and iv. 15.

If we had continued the quotation of Heb. iii. 9 we should have read, “When your fathers *tempted* Me, *proved* Me, and *saw My* works forty years”. “Proved” is *dokimazo*, “to test, try as a metal”. This meaning is borne out by the passages in Heb. xi., “By faith Abraham, when he was TRIED (*peirazo* ‘tempted’), offered up Isaac” (verse 17). Shall we say that God tempted Abraham to sin when He made the great demand concerning Isaac? God forbid: Scripture positively declares that God never tempts man to sin (James i. 13), and a reading of Gen. xxii. reveals that this “temptation” was a “testing” of Abraham’s faith, “Now I know that thou fearest God, *seeing* thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from Me” (Gen. xxii. 12).

The context of the references to temptation in Heb. ii. and iv. introduce such words as “succour”, “sympathy” (“cannot be *touched with*”) “infirmities”, but we can scarcely speak of “sympathy” and “infirmities” when we speak of “sin” as it appears in Scripture.

The word translated “succour” (Heb. ii. 18) and “help” (Heb. iv. 16) occurs once more in Heb. xiii. 6, “So that we may boldly say, The Lord is my Helper”. This is associated, not with “sin” or “forgiveness”, but with the promise that the believer would never be forsaken and in connection with “what man shall do” *unto us*, not what we might inadvertently do *ourselves*.

Another word which occurs in Hebrews must be included in our examination and that is the word *peira*. This occurs twice in Hebrews:

“By faith they passed through the Red Sea as by dry land: which the Egyptians *assaying* (making the *attempt*) to do were drowned” (Heb. xi. 29).
“Others had *trial* of cruel mockings and scourgings” (Heb. xi. 36).

In neither passage can the idea of “tempting” be discovered. In the first passage “attempt” gives good English and incidentally reveals that in our own mother tongue the word “tempt” means a “trial” or an “attempt”. The second reference (Heb. xi. 36) is but a variant of the word translated “tempted” and needs no comment.

To complete the tale of occurrences of *peirazo* in Hebrews, one more reference must be included. In Heb. v. 13 we find the negative, *apeiros*, where it is translated “unskillful”, which accords with the classical rendering “untried” and “inexperienced” and with the LXX usage.

“Surely they shall not see the land, which I swear to their fathers; but their children which are with Me here, as many as know not good or evil, every inexperienced (*apeiros*) youth, to them will I give the land” (Numb. xiv. 23 LXX).

The reader will recognize the influence of this LXX rendering in Heb. v. 13, 14, where the unskillful “babe” is contrasted with the “perfect” or mature, who discerns “good and evil”.

As they stand, the words “yet without sin” in Heb. iv. 15 suggest to the English reader “yet without sinning”, as if our Lord was actually tempted to steal, to murder, to commit adultery, but resisted. We only allow ourselves to write this in order to bring this doctrine and its consequences into the light, for there is no necessity so to translate or interpret the words *choris hamartias*. In his Lexicon, *choris* is rendered by Dr. Bullinger “apart; asunder”. It comes from *chorizo* “to put asunder”, “to separate”, as in Matt. xix. 6 and Rom. viii. 39. In Hebrews itself we read concerning the Saviour, that He was “holy, harmless, undefiled, *separate* (*chorizo*) from sinners” (Heb. vii. 26).

Dr. John Owen quotes the Syriac Version of Heb. iv. 15 as reading “sin being excepted”; J. N. Darby and Rotherham read “sin apart”, “apart from sin”.

The positive witness of the epistle to the Hebrews as a whole, and of this expression in particular, is that the temptation referred to in the words “tempted in *all* points” relates to the *testings and trials of the pilgrim on his journey through the wilderness of this world, as he presses on to perfection*; it does not refer to, or include, those temptations to sin which are only possible to those who have within them the effects of the Fall.

Our examination of the usage of the words “tempt” and “temptation” in the epistle to the Hebrews leaves us without any doubt but that the apostle had in mind the temptations that beset “pilgrims and strangers” in maintaining their “confession” or “profession”, and that the words “Tempted in all points like as we are” are limited to that aspect of truth. It would be neither fair nor sound exegesis to suppose that there is no other aspect of this

subject in the Scriptures. In order, therefore, to present the teaching of the Word as completely as possible, let us consider further aspects of this theme.

As we have commenced with an epistle addressed to the Hebrews, let us continue with the epistles of The Dispersion, namely, that of James and those of Peter, and see whether these introduce a different line of teaching from that of the epistle to the Hebrews.

“MY brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations” (James i. 2).

It would be strange indeed if the believer who fell into all manner of temptations to *do evil*, should count it “all joy”, but it is clear that temptation of this kind is far from the mind of James, for he immediately goes on to say, “knowing this, that the *trying of your faith* worketh patience” (James i. 3), and, like the epistle to the Hebrews, associates this tempting, or trying, with “perfection”—“Let patience have her *perfect* work” (James i. 4). Those who are perfect (mature) will,

“Receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love Him”
(James i. 12).

The introduction of the words “approved” and “crown” brings the passage into line with the epistle to the Hebrews.

James now turns to the aspect of temptation that arises from, and leads to sin.

“Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man” (James i. 13).

If these words be taken literally, we are immediately faced with a problem, for we get the two contrary statements: “Neither tempteth He any man” (James i. 13), and “God *did* tempt Abraham” (Gen. xxii. 1). But this is the case only if the words be taken literally, for the reader of the Scriptures will probably be aware that throughout the Old and New Testaments there appears a figure of speech called *Ellipsis*, or Omission, and that in many passages the sense is found by supplying by repetition a word that has already gone before. If in James i. 13 we repeat the governing clause, “with evil”, all will be clear. “Let no man say when he is tempted (to do evil things), I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man (with evil).” This, however, is negative; the positive follows, “But every man is tempted (to do evil things) when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed” (James i. 14).

Returning to the positive teaching of James i. 14, let us note its bearing upon the text, “He was tempted in all points like as we are”. It is one thing for a congregation to stand and say, “We are all miserable offenders”, and quite another for one member to stand and publicly confess that he is a “thief”. In the same way it is one thing to quote the passage from Heb. iv., which says that Christ was tempted in *all points* like as we are, and quite another to be specific and say that Christ was actually tempted to steal. What is it that causes the presence of an unprotected pound note to be a temptation to a man? Is it an *outside* temptation or is it something *within*? It is difficult, without a feeling of

irreverence, for us to bring our Lord into this controversy; let us therefore take a step down and cite two fellow-beings as examples.

First, the “chief of sinners”, Paul, the apostle. Is it conceivable that, had Paul entered a synagogue and found the place unattended, the presence of a piece of money lying uncollected would be the slightest temptation to him? Our answer must be “no”. The second example, dear reader, is yourself. Were you to come into a place of worship and discover that the offering had not been taken charge of by the treasurer, would that be a temptation to you to steal? You rightly repudiate the thought. Why? Because the grace of God and the gift of the new nature make temptation of that kind virtually impossible.

So we return to the Lord Himself. As He had no corrupt and depraved nature, He could never be “led away” by lust and enticed and, that being the case, no amount of emphasis upon the words “in all points” can ever teach the evil and destructive doctrine we have been considering. The very presence of temptation to *sin* pre-supposes *evil already within*. He, the Saviour, could mingle with publicans and sinners and remain undefiled. Contrary to all law, He could *touch* a leper and remain immune. We might as well consider that a sunbeam gathers contamination by shining on a rubbish heap as that, even in the presence of the most gilded opportunity, Christ could be tempted to sin.

Turning to the other Circumcision epistles we find that Peter alone uses the word *peirasmos*, translated “temptation”, and that three times.

“Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold *temptations*” (I Pet. i. 6).

If it were needed, the fullest confirmation of this interpretation is contained in I Pet. iv. 12.

“Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery *trial* which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings; that, when His glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief” (I Pet. iv. 12-15).

The remaining occurrences of the words “tempt” and “temptation” are Matt. iv. 1-4; Matt. vi. 13; which should be read in the light of Rev. iii. 10 and Matt. xxvi. 41. None of these passages speak specifically of sin, but rather the attach upon simple trust.

No.23. The Profession of the heavenly calling.
pp. 126 - 128

The first word of Heb. iii. is *hōthen*, which properly means “from whence”. The idea intended by its use here may be expressed by saying, “Seeing that things are thus” (as indicated in Heb. i. and ii.), “then I ask you to consider the One Who is both Apostle and High Priest of our profession”. The title High Priest is one which most believers will associate with Christ, but how few realize His equal glory as THE Apostle!

One of the special aspects of the Gospel according to John is to set before us Christ as the Apostle and High Priest. John’s Gospel is divided into two sections, the first being the outer and public ministry (i.-xii., Apostle), the second the inner or private ministry (xiii.-xxi., High Priest). Both sections begin with a reference to His “own”. He came to *His own*, and *His own* received Him not”. “Having loved *His own* which were in the world, He loved them unto the end”. Here in this thirteenth chapter we see the Apostle and High Priest.

“Jesus knowing that He was COME FROM GOD”—The Apostle.
“And WENT TO GOD”—The High Priest (xiii. 3).

This is repeated in the wonderful seventeenth chapter:

“Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast SENT”—The Apostle.
“I am no more in the world I COME TO THEE”—The High Priest (xvii. 3, 11).

The fact that Christ was the *Sent One* is the burden of the Gospel. It is *aionian* life to recognize Him as the *Sent One* (xvii. 3). The disciples are marked by the knowledge that Christ was the *Sent One* (8). The oneness of the Father, the Son, and the saint, so marvelously indicated in verse 21, is with the object that the world might believe that the Father *sent* Christ. This is repeated with added words, all reminding us of Heb. ii., “That they may be *perfected* into one, and that the world may know that Thou hast *sent* Me” (23).

It was no new thought to the Hebrews that Messiah should be the Apostle, or the *Sent One*. In Isa. xlvi. 16 and lxi. 1 the Hebrew equivalent is used. According to Isa. xix. 20, the exodus from Egypt is to be repeated: “He shall send them a Saviour, and a great One, and He shall deliver them. And the LORD shall be known to Egypt”. Moses was evidently a “sent one” or an “apostle”.

“Come now therefore, and I will *send* thee unto Pharaoh.”
“This shall be a token unto thee, that I have *sent* thee.”
“I AM hath *sent* me unto you.”
“The LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath *sent* me unto you” (Exod. iii. 10, 12, 14, 15).

It is possible that Moses had the promised Messiah in view when he said to the Lord, "Send, I pray Thee, by the hand of Him Whom Thou wilt send" (Exod. iv. 13). The immediate result of this continued hesitancy on the part of Moses is the mention of Aaron, destined to be the High Priest. Moses apparently forfeited this office, and instead of holding the office both of apostle and High Priest, this was now to be shared with his brother. Great as Moses was, and great as every Jew held him to be, all must confess who know the truth that He who combined the two offices in His one Person was greater. Thus it is that Moses is introduced in chapter iii. Christ has already been seen as greater than angels.

He is now seen as greater than Moses: then greater than Joshua, greater than Aaron, and greater than all the offerings of the law.

Christ is here called the Apostle and High Priest of our "profession". What is the idea contained in the word "profession" (*homologia*)? Hebrews uses the word three times:

"The Apostle and High Priest of *our profession*" (iii. 1).

"Let us hold fast *our profession*" (iv. 14).

"Let us hold fast the *profession* of our faith" (x. 23).

Seeing that it is the profession of faith, the word indicates something which is subsequent to faith, parallel with "the things which accompany salvation". We view Christ here not as Redeemer, but as Apostle and High Priest of our profession. This profession is further illustrated by use of the cognate *homologeō*.

"These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and CONFESSED that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth" (Heb. xi. 13).

"Let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come. By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving praise (CONFESSING) to His name" (Heb. xiii. 13-15).

Here the two references emphasize the stranger and pilgrim character of this profession of which Christ was Apostle and High Priest. For this other-worldly character see I Tim. vi. 12, 13:

"Fight the good fight of faith (fight is the same word 'race' as in Heb. xii. 1) and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses (witnesses, same word as Heb. xii. 1) Christ Jesus, Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession."

It is evident by the balance of the words that the "good fight" is parallel with the "good confession"; and seeing that the "fight" is the same as the "race" of Heb. xii., the titles "Apostle and High Priest of our profession", and "The Captain and Perfecter of faith", have much in common. As the Captain, He was the Apostle, the Sent One. As the Perfecter, He was the High Priest, Who went back to God. The "profession" being the profession of "faith", is another view of the particular aspect of faith exhibited in Heb. xi.; in other words the whole theme revolves around the idea of pilgrim walk and perfecting. The holy brethren are exhorted to "consider" Christ as the Apostle and

High Priest of their profession. In close association with the final reference (x. 23) recurs the word “consider”. This time, however, the exhortation is to “consider one another” in view of the approaching day.

These holy brethren are addressed as “partakers of the heavenly calling”. It is essentially in harmony with the perfecting of the pilgrim character, that those addressed should be called “partakers of the heavenly calling”, and that heavenly calling needs no further exposition than is given in Hebrews itself to make its scope and position clear to us.

Heavenly

- A | Partakers Now. |
 - a | iii. 1. Partakers of heavenly calling.
Now Christ not ashamed.
 - b | vi. 4. The heavenly gift.
- B | Place: The Tabernacle.
 - c | viii. 5. The shadow of heavenly things.
 - c | ix. 23. The heavenly things themselves.
- A | Partakers Then. |
 - a | xi. 16. The better country, a heavenly,
Then God not ashamed.
 - b | xii. 22. The heavenly Jerusalem (Holy City).

If we trace the teaching associated with this word, we are led on through participation of the “gifts”, which were anticipations of the age to come (ch. vi.), and from the shadow to the real Tabernacle “heaven itself”, to the heavenly country, and heavenly Jerusalem. Heb. xii. 18-21 speaks of Moses, verses 22, 24 of “Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant”. Connected with the latter is the perfecting of those who were sanctified. There we see them, “the church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven”. These are associated with “the spirits of perfected righteous ones” and the “innumerable company of angels”. How any can confuse such a description with the right hand of God *above* all principality and power is beyond our understanding. So far as we are concerned we see a decided difference from the words used, and keep it so.

It was the consciousness of this heavenly calling that supported Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, enabling them to “confess that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth”. As we have pointed out before, there is a close parallel of principle between Hebrews and Philippians, and the consciousness of the high calling in Phil. iii. enables the believer there to count all things loss, making the same confession of faith and to hold loosely “earthly things”.

Let us remember what is connected with “confessing to His name” (Heb. xiii. 13-16) and the many passages which link suffering with future glory.

**No.24. “Whose House are we IF” (iii. 2 - 6).
pp. 152 - 156**

When the apostle wished to lead the Hebrew believers to appreciate the excellency of Christ, he first drew attention to the difference that must be realized between God speaking “by the prophets” and God speaking “in Son”. He then proceeds to speak of the excellent name of Christ as compared with angels, and again the emphasis is, “Thou art My Son”. In chapter iii. the apostle approaches the tenderest spot in the Hebrew mind, the place and honour of Moses. In the Jewish hymns for the Sabbath come the words:

“Thou calledst him Thy faithful servant, and didst put a glorious crown on his head when he stood before Thee in Mount Sinai, etc.”.

The Scriptures themselves emphasize the isolated dignity of Moses:

“I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put My words in His mouth whosoever will not hearken unto My words which He shall speak in My name, I will require it of him” (Deut. xviii. 18, 19).

Deuteronomy xxxiv. 10 adds:

“There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the LORD knew face to face.”

When the apostle spoke of the angels he did not hesitate to show their inferiority to Christ, but when he speaks of Moses, he is careful to bring forward the highest commendation which Scripture affords. Christ was faithful, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. The reference is to Numb. xii. 6-8 where the Lord severely reproves the attitude of Aaron and Miriam, saying:

“If there be a prophet among you, I the LORD will make Myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all Mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the LORD shall he behold.”

There can be no question that in all the range of Old Testament history no name could mean so much to a Hebrew as that of Moses. The apostle had to overcome this reasonable prejudice, and show them One Who was greater than Moses, inasmuch as the New Covenant of spirit and life was greater than the Old Covenant with its ministration of death. In the first case he would bid them consider the essential difference between Moses and Christ. Moses was a part of the house over which he ruled, but Christ was the actual Builder of the house Himself. This of necessity spoke of the greater honour of Christ, but in verse 4 the arguments are brought forward which form the climax of his testimony in Heb. i. 1, 2.

“For every house is builded by some man; but He that built all things is God” (Heb. iii. 4).

There can be no purpose served by this statement unless the writer intends the Hebrews to understand that *Christ was God*. Verse 3 demands this meaning, and the fitness of verse 4 is only preserved if we believe it to refer to the Person of Christ. In Heb. i., after having spoken of the high dignity of the Son, he leads on to the same point:

“Unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth” (i. 8-10).

Whether the “all things” of iii. 4 be taken to refer to the creation at large, or in a more restricted sense to all the dispensations, including the Mosaic and the Gospel, Christ is the Builder.

The Apostle now proceeds to another feature. Moses was faithful as a SERVANT in all his house, but Christ as a SON over His own house. Not only is there the contrast between Servant and Son, but between Moses IN, and Christ OVER, the house. Further, the added words “Over His own house” confirm the interpretation of verse 4 of Christ.

The reason for this carefully debated point is revealed in verse 6. This house over which Christ as the Son presides has infinitely more glory than Moses in the house of which he formed a part, and it represents a special people who are now to be named and described. “Whose house are WE”, the “we” being the holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling of iii. 1, and the many sons who are being brought to glory (cf. ii. 10). Their peculiar characteristic is now added, and enforced by historical example.

“Whose house are we, IF we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end” (iii. 6).

This finds its echo in verse 14:

“For we are made partakers of Christ, IF we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end.”

These two passages are followed by almost identical words, which is a more forcible reason why we should compare them together. Following verse 6 we read:

“Wherefore, (as the Holy Ghost saith, Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, AS IN THE PROVOCATION forty years I was grieved I swear They shall not enter into My rest). Take heed, brethren, LEST” (iii. 7-12).

Following verse 14, we read:

“While it is said, Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, AS IN THE PROVOCATION with whom was He grieved forty years? to whom swore He that they should not enter into His rest? Let us therefore fear, LEST” (iii. 15 - iv. 1).

The whole context of chapters iii. and iv. makes it impossible that that “house” of iii. 6 can mean “the church” as we know it. In the case of the church, there can be no “if”, and the figure of Israel in the wilderness can by no system of interpretation set forth that church whose standing is in pure grace. So also the parallel expression “partakers of

Christ”; this too refers to something which is in addition to redemption. The word “partakers” is the same as that which is rendered “fellows” in Heb. i. 9. The idea in these passages is that of association with Christ in “the joy that was set before Him”, the “oil of gladness” being that of exultation or extreme joy. Heb. iii. 1 places no “if” against the statement that those addressed were “associates of the heavenly calling”. The association with Christ, however, is different. Rom. viii. 17 contains a parallel with these two conceptions.

“And if children, then heirs; heirs of God” (parallel with Heb. iii. 1).

“And joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together” (parallel with Heb. iii. 14).

We shall find that the teaching of this epistle focuses upon the few verses with which chapter xii. opens. The exhortation is “so run that ye may obtain”.

Chapters iii. and iv. are bounded by the word “confession”:

“Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession” (iii. 1 R.V.).

“Let us hold fast our confession” (iv. 14 R.V.).

It is evident that the Hebrew believers were exhorted to consider Christ as an Example in the matter of this “confession”. A somewhat parallel double occurrence is I Tim. vi. 12-14 where Timothy’s “good confession” is associated with that of Christ before Pontius Pilate. The word contains an element of danger and opposition, and the exhortation is to hold it fast unto *the end*. The one great feature which is singled out by the apostle in the case of Christ Himself is that He “was FAITHFUL” (Heb. ii. 17; iii. 2). Therefore within the bounds set by iii. 1 and iv. 14 will come some further teaching, example, exhortation, encouragement and warning, such as will, by the grace of God, help the tried believer to hold on his way.

The one characteristic of Christ which the Hebrew believers were called upon to consider was *His faithfulness*; the one great warning which follows is that against *unbelief*:

“Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of UNBELIEF, in departing from the living God” (iii. 12).

“So we see that they could not enter in because of UNBELIEF” (iii. 19).

“The word preached did not profit them, because they were not united by FAITH to them that heard” (iv. 2 margin).

The great example is “the provocation”. This word comes from *pikraino*—‘to be bitter’, and illuminates Heb. xii. 15, 16, where another type for the believer’s warning (Esau) is closely linked with a ‘root of bitterness’. The great ‘text’ of the writer in these two chapters is taken from Psa. xcv., which he introduces with the solemn words, “As the Holy Ghost saith”.

It is evident that we must know something of this ‘provocation’ on the part of Israel if we would profit by the Scripture before us. In Numb. xiv. we have the record. Caleb

and Joshua had urged upon the people a confident faith in the Lord with respect to the entry into possession of the land of promise.

“But all the congregation bade stone them with stones And the Lord said unto Moses, How long will this people PROVOKE ME?” (Numb. xiv. 10, 11).

Their provoking was largely due to their unbelief, for the passage continues, “How long will it be ere they believe Me?” The Lord threatened to disinherit and smite the people, but upon the prayer of Moses He said, “I have pardoned according to thy word”. The people therefore were a *pardoned people*. But does this mean that they did go up and *possess* the land? No, for after pronouncing the gracious pardon the Lord added:

“But as truly as I live surely they shall not see the land neither shall any of them that provoked Me see it” (Numb. xiv. 21-23; see also II Sam. xii. 10-12; Psa. xcix. 8).

Here we see the difference between “Hope” and “Prize”.

In Numb. xiv. 22 the Lord declares that already this people had tempted Him *ten times*. *The Companion Bible* gives the ‘ten times’ as follows:

- (1) At Red Sea (Exod. xiv. 11, 12).
- (2) At Marah (Exod. xv. 23, 24).
- (3) Wilderness of Sin (Exod. xvi. 2).
- (4) About manna (Exod. xvi. 20).
- (5) About manna (Exod. xvi. 27).
- (6) At Rephidim (Exod. xvii. 1-3).
- (7) At Horeb (golden calf) (Exod. xxxii.).
- (8) At Taberah (Numb. xi. 1).
- (9) At Kibroth Hataavah (Numb. xi. 4).
- (10) At Kadesh (Numb. xiv. 2).

Each occurrence should be carefully studied, as each brings to light some ground of provocation and forfeiture. One of the most frequent expressions in this series is that the children of Israel “murmured”. It will be remembered that in Philippians, the Epistle of the PRIZE, the exhortation is:

“Do all things without *murmurings* and disputings: that ye may be the sons of God, without rebuke” (ii. 14, 15).

In I Cor. x. also, this feature is brought forward:

“Neither *murmur* ye, as some of them also *murmured*, and were destroyed of the destroyer” (verse 10).

Murmuring may seem a small thing, but it is the seed of unbelief that departs from the living God. On one of the occasions, that of Numb. xi. 4, it was the *mixed multitude* that led Israel astray—the type of those “whose God is their belly, who glory in their shame, who mind earthly things” (Phil. iii. 19). Israel murmured at the heavenly provision of manna, saying “Our soul loatheth this light bread” (Num. xxi. 5).

Psa. lxxviii. reveals that unbelief was at the bottom of this rejection of heavenly food—“Because they *believed not* in God”; “Their heart was not right with Him” (verses 17, 18, 22, 25, 37). In the dealings of God with His people *after* salvation, the principle remains true that “Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap flesh spirit”; for in Numb. xiv. 28, 29 we read:

“As ye have spoken in Mine ears, so will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness which have murmured against Me.”

The very sending of the spies into the land of promise was an act of provocation to the Lord. “We will send men before us” (Deut. i. 22). He allowed them their own way in the matter, but the result was that “they brought up an evil report”. Ezek. xx. 6 definitely tells us that the Lord Himself had “espied” the land for them, but Israel did not believe Him.

It is comforting to know that while “Some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses” (Heb. iii. 16), for Caleb and Joshua wholly followed the Lord and are blessed examples of those who by patience and continuance inherit the promises. We should give earnest heed to these things, so that we may in our turn “press according to a mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus” (Phil. iii. 14).

No.25. The Apostle and High Priest of our profession (iii. 1). pp. 172 - 178

When we quote a passage of Scripture we are not at liberty to alter its wording, lest we appear to hold its teaching lightly or have unworthy views of its inspiration. We therefore have quoted Heb. iii. 1 as it is written. But is the Lord Jesus Christ the High Priest of OUR profession? Yes, surely if we are Hebrews, but does this apply to Gentiles, and particularly Gentiles saved under the dispensation of the Mystery? We can only answer such a question if the Scriptures, either by some positive statement, or as a result of comparing one epistle with another, provide sufficient material.

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

References to the necessity of a sacrifice for sin are not limited to any one epistle. Paul's epistles, both before Acts xxviii. and after, contain many such references, yet never throughout the course of his ministry as *God's appointed Preacher, Teacher and apostle of the Gentiles*, does he ever use the word "Priest" or "High Priest", either of the believer or of his Lord! But, when he comes to write the epistle to the Hebrews, he breaks entirely new ground, using the word "Priest" fourteen times, a number that we have already noticed earlier in this series, "Great Priest" (*megan*), once (Heb. x. 21); and "High Priest" seventeen times, and so interwoven with the theme of Hebrews is this thought of "Priesthood" that the teaching of chapters v. and vii. to x. demand continual reference to "priests", while chapters ii. to ix. and xiii. necessitate continual reference to the "High Priest".

Words are counters, they are index fingers; their inclusion or exclusion from any reasonable piece of writing indicates its general trend. Any treatise, letter or book dealing with such matters as war, finance, religion or logic would of necessity include certain specific terms and exclude others, and if the treatise, letter or book were of the length of either Hebrews or Ephesians, the subject matter of the title could be deduced from a collation of the distinctive words employed. If the theme of Hebrews necessitated the constant use of the words "Priest" and "High Priest", that fact would go a long way to indicate the character of its teaching. If to this it is added that Ephesians contains neither of these words, that additional fact would go a long way to indicate that the essential theme of Ephesians differed from Hebrews. Further, if it is observed that in the whole of Paul's other writings (thirteen epistles) there is not one occurrence of the word "Priest" or "High Priest", the evidence for the difference between his apostolic ministry as covered by the thirteen epistles and this letter to the Hebrews is still further increased, and when we remember that the same writer, Paul, is responsible for the use, or non-use, of these words, and that the use, or non-use, is controlled not only by Paul's reasonableness, and faithfulness, but by inspiration of God (II Tim. iii. 16; II Pet. i. 21), then the evidence for the difference in calling and sphere of Hebrews and Ephesians becomes overwhelming.

Before we can appreciate the use or non-use of the word "Priest" in these epistles, it will be necessary to consider the testimony of Scripture concerning the office of the Priest and its relation to Israel and the nations. The epistle to the Hebrews itself provides evidence that long before Israel's time, the idea of priesthood was entertained by the nations, for Melchisedec was a "King-Priest" at the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 18-20). There is much to be said concerning the Melchisedec priesthood (Heb. v. 11), but the present is not the time for it. There were priests in Egypt in the days of Joseph (Gen. xli. 45) and in Midian in the days of Moses (Exod. ii. 27), yet, out of the 725 occurrences where the word *kohen* is translated "priest", at least 700 refer to the priesthood of Israel. If under the law of Moses the offering of sacrifice and the building of an altar are the work of a priest, this was by no means the case before the introduction of the "law of commandments and carnal ordinances" introduced after the breaking of the tables of stone of the Covenant at Sinai.

Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice, yet he was no priest. Noah offered a burnt offering upon an altar, and distinguished between clean and unclean animals (Gen. viii. 20). Job, too, as the head of his family “sent and sanctified his children” and “offered burnt offerings” on their behalf (Job i. 5). Upon his entry into the land of promise Abraham also “built an altar, and called upon the name of the Lord” (Gen. xii. 7, 8), and is seen arranging the sacrifices at the time of the great promise (Gen. xv. 9-21). Isaac built an altar (Gen. xxvi. 25), and Jacob built an altar at Shechem (Gen. xxxiii. 20), and another at Bethel, by the command of God (Gen. xxxv. 1-7), and last, but by no means least, *the great sacrifice of the Passover* was offered by the head of each family, no priest being mentioned or necessary. In the Scriptures priesthood is not introduced by Divine command until the consecration of Aaron and his sons, recorded in Exod. xxix. Before that consecration, priests are mentioned in Exod. xxix. 22 and 24, but these seem to have occupied the same sort of position that was given to David’s sons as recorded in II Sam. viii. 18, where the words “chief rulers” is the Hebrew word *kohen*, or to Zabud in I Kings iv. 5, where the words “principal officer” is the Hebrew word *kohen*. This unusual use of the word *kohen*, ordinarily translated “priest”, appears to hark back to the primitive idea contained in the root-meaning of the word, which signifies either “to represent oneself, or to present something or someone else” (J.M.A. in the *Com. Bib. Dict.*). It is a matter of Scriptural testimony and not of inference or deduction, that the only priesthood recognized in Israel under the law of Moses was the Levitical priesthood, of which the high priest’s office was given to the family of Aaron, and the priesthood to the tribe of Levi (Heb. v. 4; vii. 5, 14).

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

come under the dispensation of the Mystery; they find all, and more, in their ascended Head than Israel can find in their King-Priest.

Having seen that the office of the high priest is limited to the calling and profession set forth in this epistle to the Hebrews, and having seen that in Christ our Head, the One Mediator, we have all and more than all the priests of Israel or the Melchisedec priesthood can provide, we turn to the epistle to the Hebrews to learn the precious lesson, realizing that, while all Scripture may not be ABOUT US or written TO us, all Scripture is profitable and written for our learning. Those who were holy brethren and partakers of the heavenly calling are here called upon “to consider Him”.

First the “heavenly calling” must be considered, *epouranios* “heavenly”. This word is found but twice in the LXX, once in Psa. lxxviii. 14, where it stands as a title for the “Almighty”, and once in some MSS of the LXX in Dan. iv. 23, where we read “The heavens do rule” (26 A.V.). In the Apocrypha the word occurs but once, in 2Macc. 3:39, where it speaks of “Him Who has His dwelling in the heavens”. When we turn to the New Testament we find the word in the Gospels and the epistles some twenty times, of which number of occurrences Hebrews uses six. There we find:

“Partakers of the heavenly calling.”

“Tasted of the heavenly gift.”

“The example and shadow of heavenly things.”

“The heavenly things themselves.”

“A better country, that is, an heavenly.”

“The heavenly Jerusalem” (Heb. iii. 1; vi. 4; viii. 5; ix. 23; xi. 16; xii. 22).

This word *epouranios* provides an opportunity which we must not miss. Those who use a concordance use a most helpful instrument, but at the same time we should be warned, that an indiscriminate or mechanical use of a concordance can *mislead*. Here is a case which bears very closely upon our calling. We have from time to time affirmed that the phrase *en tois epouraniois* occurs five times in Ephesians and that it occurs *nowhere else*. The reader who consults his concordance, turns up the word *epouranios*, sees the five occurrences in Ephesians listed side by side with those in I Corinthians & Hebrews and decides that we are untrustworthy teachers, and without more ado sets aside the claim of Ephesians to be that of a unique calling, and yields to those who assure him that such are the claims of *ultra-dispensationalism* (an intentionally frightening term calculated to deter the timid or untaught), and so another believer is turned aside in his quest for truth. We have never said that the adjective *epouranios* “heavenly” occurs only in Ephesians; rather the phrase translated “*in heavenly places*” occurs only in that epistle, a very different statement. In spite of what has been said elsewhere, *en tois epouraniois* does not occur in the LXX. If we would understand the heavenly calling of Heb. iii. 1, the remaining occurrences of the word “heavenly” must be examined. “The heavenly gift” is associated with “holy spirit” (the gifts) and “the powers of the age about to be” (Heb. vi. 4, 5). The Levitical priests “serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished by God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount” (Heb. viii. 5). This argument continues throughout chapters viii. & ix. and reaches its conclusion in chapter ix. 23, 24:

“It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. ix. 23, 24).

These two references to the Tabernacle are followed by two to the Heavenly City or Country.

“Now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly.”

“But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem” (Heb. xi. 16; xii. 22).

The heavenly calling of Heb. iii. 1 is therefore that which all of like faith with Abraham and the other witnesses to faith in Heb. xi. share, the New Jerusalem, the heavenly country and city being its sphere. The church of the One Body finds its sphere of blessing “where Christ sits at the right hand of God”, a sphere distinct from the Heavenly City which will eventually come down from God out of heaven. In connection with the participation in this heavenly calling, the Hebrews are called upon to “consider the Apostle and High Priest of their profession, Christ Jesus”. *Katanoeo* “consider” occurs fourteen times in the New Testament and about twenty times in the LXX of the Old Testament where it translates the Hebrew *bin, nabat, sakal, shamem, tsaphah* and *raah*. These Hebrew words respectively mean understand, regard, understand as the result of wisdom, to be astonished, watch and behold. In all these terms, patient, careful regard is implied. Our English word “consider” comes from “watching the stars”, *sideris* being the Latin for “star”.

“There is most caution in *considering*; most attention in *regarding*. Consideration is employed for practical purposes; *reflection* for matters of speculation” (Crabb).

The scope of the consideration enjoined in Heb. iii. 1 may be estimated by the other occurrence of the same word:

“Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works” (Heb. x. 24).

This consideration embraces the apostle, the High Priest, and one another in its embrace, the Redeemer and the redeemed, the Captain and His followers, and is far removed from mere curiosity and academic interest. In Heb. vii. 4 the apostle directs our attention to Melchisedec saying:

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

Here the attention is turned from the true High Priest Himself to His most exalted type, Melchisedec. Again our attention is drawn to Christ, this time as the Author, the Captain, as the word is translated in chapter ii., and the Finisher and Perfecter, the Beginning and the Ending, and related to the race set before Him, the endurance of the cross, the Overcomer.

“Consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds” (Heb. xii. 3).

And lastly we read “The end”.

“Considering the end of their conversation. Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever” (Heb. xiii. 7, 8).

The object of consideration in Heb. iii. 1 is Christ in His two great offices (1) The Apostle, (2) The High Priest of their profession. It comes as something of a surprise to many to discover that Christ is THE Apostle, and while we have referred to this before, it will be well for us to get a clear idea of the import of the term.

APOSTLE. The word has come straight from the Greek into the English language, but it is not, except for this adoption, an English word. Its meaning must be sought in the original language of the New Testament, where it is found under the form *apostolos*. This word is used both in the Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint (a translation generally indicated by the sign LXX, and so designated in our pages), and in classical or common Greek used outside the Scriptures.

In classical Greek *apostolos* meant “a messenger, ambassador or envoy” and, in later usage, “the commander of a naval force”. This rather limited meaning of the word is further seen in the use of *stolos*, “a fleet ready for sea, a naval squadron or expedition”. In the LXX *apostolos* occurs in I Kings xiv. 6 in the phrase, “I am sent to thee with heavy tidings”, where “sent” translates the Hebrew *shalach*, which immediately connects with such missions as that of Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 13), Moses (Exod. iii. 14), and Isaiah (Isa. vi. 8); and generally with the bearing of “tidings”, whether of deliverance or judgment. The composition of the word is simple. *Apo* is a preposition, and, like nearly all prepositions, carries with it a sense of motion, direction or rest. In this case the translation “from” indicates origin, motion and direction. *Stello* is the verb “to send”, and so an apostle is one “sent from another”.

Apostello the verb is used of the “sending forth” of the twelve (Matt. x. 5); of John the Baptist (Mark i. 2; John i. 6); of preachers generally (Rom. x. 15); of angels (Heb. i. 14); and of Paul (Acts xxvi. 17). There is, however, one other occasion where *apostello* and *apostolos* are used, that gives all subsequent apostles and messengers their true and only authority. Both words are used of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is pre-eminently “The Sent One” (I John iv. 9, 10, 14); He is pre-eminently “The Apostle”.

“Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus” (Heb. iii. 1).

Here therefore is revealed the character of the solemn office denoted by the title “apostle”. Here Paul’s insistence on the use of the word “me” in II Tim. ii. 2 is carried back to another and higher use of the pronoun, “He that receiveth you receiveth ME” (Matt. x. 40) and, through Him, to the ultimate source of all authority, God Himself.

In the very opening of His public ministry, the Saviour spoke of the apostolic character of His mission:

“The Lord hath *anointed Me* to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath *sent Me* to bind up the broken hearted” (Isa. lxi. 1; cf. Luke iv. 18).

He spoke of Himself as One Whom the Father had “sanctified and sent” into the world (John x. 36), and in the great prayer of John xvii. He said:

“Sanctify them through Thy truth As thou hast *sent Me* into the world, even so have I also *sent* them” (John xvii. 17, 18).

Over and over again in John’s Gospel we meet this word “sent”.

“God *sent* not His Son into the world to condemn the world” (iii. 17).

“He Whom God hath *sent* speaketh the words of God” (iii. 34).

“The same works that I do, bear witness of Me, that the Father hath *sent Me*” (v. 36).

The reference here in Heb. iii. 1 to the office of apostle arises out of the superiority of Christ to the angels, with which both chapters i. and ii. are occupied, but the actual verbal link between these two passages may not be perceived by the English reader.

Of the angels, the apostle said:

“Are they not all ministering spirits, SENT FORTH (*Gk. apostello*) to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” (Heb. i. 14).

Angels were “apostles”, but we are not called upon to “consider” them; our eyes are turned away to consider Him. In Heb. iii. 2-6, Christ the Apostle is also compared with Moses, even as in succeeding chapters, Christ the High Priest is compared with Aaron and with Melchisedec.

No.26. Moses, a servant; Christ, a Son (iii. 2 - 6).
pp. 187 - 190

It is evident that the apostle is pursuing his theme, namely, the superiority of Christ, the Son, above angels and all other intermediaries, but the reader may not realize that, in the mind of any familiar with the LXX, the word *apostello*, as used in Exodus, links angels and Moses together:

“The LORD God of your fathers *hath sent* me unto you” (Exod. iii. 15).

This verb is used in verses 10 and 14 also. After the Exodus from Egypt and while Israel were in the wilderness, God said:

“Behold, I send (*apostello*) an Angel before thee if thou shalt indeed obey his voice” (Exod. xxiii. 20-22).

Of all the names that were revered by Israel, none were more held in honour than Moses and Abraham. Paul, who had intimate acquaintance with the traditional beliefs of his fathers, knew that any attempt by any teacher to dethrone Moses from the place given to him would be resisted, and any doctrine thus introduced would be doomed to failure. We need not turn to the writings of the Rabbis for this, for we read:

“Thou art his disciple; but we are Moses’ disciples.”

“We know that God spake unto Moses: as for this fellow, we know not from whence he is” (John ix. 28, 29).

“We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us” (Acts vi. 11, 14).

To which we add, from Hebrews itself:

“He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy” (Heb. x. 28).

“Moses was faithful in all his house” (Heb. iii. 2). This is the testimony of Numb. xii. 7 “My servant Moses is faithful in all Mine house”. The apostle now introduces a comparison that places Christ far above Moses:

“For this man was counted worthy of MORE GLORY than Moses” (Heb. iii. 3).

We have but to turn to II Cor. iii. 6-11 to have the apostle’s own comment on this comparison.

OLD COVENANT -- MOSES.

NEW COVENANT -- CHRIST.

Letter killeth	Spirit giveth life
Glory done away	Rather glorious
Condemnation—glory	Righteousness—exceed in glory
No glory in this respect	By reason of the glory that excelleth
That done away is glorious	Much more that which remaineth is glorious
We are changed from glory	To glory
The face of Moses iii. 13	The face of Jesus Christ iv. 6
Veiled iii. 13, 14.	Unveiled iii. 18.

We know more or less how the apostle will proceed. He will go “from glory to glory”. He will honour the law, the types, the names of Moses and Aaron, but he will faithfully point out where the Old Covenant failed and where the New succeeds. Christ therefore according to II Cor. iii., as well as Heb. iii., has “more glory” than Moses. In II Corinthians, this was because of the infinite superiority of the New Covenant, here, in Hebrews, Paul has another purpose in view, although related, as we shall find later, with this same New Covenant. Here he says that the greater glory of Christ over Moses, is “inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house. For every house is builded by some one; but He that built all things is God” (Heb. iii. 3, 4).

“This Man” (Heb. iii. 3). The apostle draws attention by the use of “this”, “this man” or “these”, to prophets, priests and offerings in this epistle, setting the old over against the new, and thereby magnifying the Son of God in all His mediatorial offices.

“God Who spake in time past by the prophets, hath in THESE last days spoken unto us by His Son” (Heb. i. 1, 2).	PROPHET
“For THIS MAN was counted worthy of more glory than Moses” (Heb. iii. 3).	APOSTLE
“For THOSE Priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by Him that said unto Him, The Lord sware order of Melchisedec” (Heb. vii. 21).	KING
“But THIS MAN, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood” (Heb. vii. 24).	PRIEST
“For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that THIS MAN have somewhat also to offer” (Heb. viii. 3).	PRIEST OFFERING &
“But THIS MAN, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God” (Heb. x. 12).	SEATED

While the word “house” in Heb. iii. 2-6 is the Greek *oikos*, the apostle avoids the use of *oikodomeo* “to build” in Hebrews. There must be some reason for this, for *oikodomeo* and its compounds are of frequent employment by Paul in his other epistles. If the reader should call to mind the passage in Heb. xi., where it says of the Heavenly City “Whose builder and maker is God”, he will find that the word translated “builder” is the Greek word *technites* “artificer”; or if the words of Heb. ix. come into mind “not of this

building”, there the word translated building is the Greek *ktisis* “creation”. The word translated “build” in Heb. iii. 3, 4 is *kataskeuazo*, *skeue* is the “tackling” of a ship (Acts xxvii. 19). *Skeuos* is a “vessel” and in Hebrews “the vessels of the ministry” used in the Tabernacle erected by Moses (Heb. ix. 21). So in Heb. ix. 2 the word “made” *kataskeuazo* is used of the Tabernacle, and after speaking of the candlestick, the table and the shewbread, the golden censer, the ark and the mercy seat, the apostle says:

“Now when these things were thus ordained” *kataskeuazo* (Heb. ix. 6).

In Exod. xxvii. 19 and xxxvi. 7 *kataskeue* is used in the LXX for the “vessels” and the “stuff” of the Tabernacle. We have no need to range the universe to discover what “house” it is that is *thus* built in Heb. iii. 2, 3 and 4; the house that Moses built, which is incomparably less in glory than the house that Christ built, refers particularly to the Tabernacle made after the pattern in the mount, which is what Moses erected, as contrasted with the “true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man” (Heb. viii. 2). The avoidance by the apostle of any use of the word *oikodomeo* “to build” is significant. Those to whom Hebrews is written are visualized as pilgrims. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are spoken of as “tent dwellers”; here they have “no continuing city”; they look for one to come.

“He that built all things is God” (Heb. iii. 4).

“This verse has been a kind of *offendiculum criticorum* in past ages, and has never yet, in any commentary which I have seen, been satisfactorily illustrated if the verse be entirely omitted, and the third verse be immediately connected with the fifth, there seems to be nothing wanting, nothing omitted that is at all requisite to finish the comparison which the writer is making The amount then of the reasoning seems to be: ‘Consider that Christ, as *Theos* and the former of all things, must be the Author too of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, which glory belongs to Him, not only in His mediatorial office, and as being the Head of a new dispensation, but also as the Founder both of this and the Jewish dispensation in His divine character; while Moses is to be honoured only as the head of the Jewish dispensation, in the quality of a commissioned superintendent, but not as author and founder” (Moses Stuart).

Kataskeuazo is not used in the New Testament Scriptures of creation, and it is beside the mark to bring heaven and earth as the “all things” of Heb. iii. 4 into the argument. The divine command to Moses was “See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount” (Heb. viii. 5) where the words “all things” must be limited to the Tabernacle which Moses was about to erect. In two passages in Hebrews the A.V. leads the reader to think of the creation of “the world”, where the original speaks of “the ages” Heb. i. 2 and xi. 3. The reader should be aware of this tendency on the part of the A.V., and for the sake of clearness we indicate the several words that are thus translated “world”, and hope that the survey of the examples will fully justify the diversion.

World—kosmos	“From the foundation of the world” (Heb. iv. 3; cf. ix.26). “He condemned the world” (Heb. xi. 7). “Of Whom the world was not worthy” (Heb. xi. 38).
World— <i>aion</i> (age)	“By Whom also He made the worlds” (Heb. i. 2). “The powers of the world to come” (Heb. vi. 5).

“Once in the end of the world” (Heb. ix. 26).

“The worlds were framed” (Heb. xi. 3).

World—*oikoumene* (habitable word, prophetic earth). “When He bringeth in the First begotten into the world” (Heb. i. 6).
“For unto the angels hath He not put into subjection the world to come, whereof we speak” (Heb. ii. 5).

In Heb. ix. 26 it will be observed that both *kosmos* and *aion* are translated “world”, which is misleading, coming as they do in the same verse. Heb. i. 10 has made it abundantly clear WHO it was that created heaven and earth, there is no need to bring that subject into the argument of Heb. iii. 1-6. The contrast is between Moses, as a *servant*, and Christ as a *Son*, for the Son has already been addressed as Lord and God. Again there seems to be an intended selection of the word used for servant here. It is *therapon*. This word is taken from Numb. xii. 7, 8 where the Lord’s dealing with Moses is contrasted with His dealings with lesser prophets.

“My servant (LXX *therapon*) Moses is not so, who is faithful in all Mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth.”

While *therapeuo* is generally rendered serve or minister in the LXX, one passage reveals its inclination to medical and healing service.

“Mephibosheth (who was lame on his feet, ix. 3) had neither dressed (*therapeuo*) his feet” (II Sam. xix. 24).

In the New Testament *therapeia* is rendered “household” twice (Matt. xxiv. 45; Luke xii. 42) and “healing” (Luke ix. 11; Rev. xxii. 2). *Therapeuo* occurs forty-four times in the New Testament and is translated “cure” five times, “heal” thirty-eight times and “worship” once. The word is never translated “serve”, the one occurrence “worship” being the nearest approach to this meaning (Acts xvii. 25). It does not seem possible, with this insistence upon a healing ministry, to eliminate entirely that thought when speaking of Moses as a *therapon*. Moses did not “serve” as a slave, his work was neither that of a manual labourer, nor of an artisan. He was engaged in holy things, and with the spiritual health of Israel. Israel’s ultimate restoration is likened to “healing” (Isa. vi. 10), and “the Salvation” (*soteria*) of Acts iv. 12, looks to verse 9 where the words “made whole” are the translation of *sozo*. Physicians would form a part of the entourage of a great house, and Herodotus says when speaking of Egypt, “Every great family as well as every city must needs swarm with the faculty”. It will be remembered that the priest had to deal with leprosy and pronounce a man clean or unclean. This service of Moses, gracious as it was, is placed over against the position of Christ, Who as the Son was over His own house. This ministry of Moses was:

“For a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after” (Heb. iii. 5).

Thus, also, after describing the Tabernacle, its service and its furniture, the apostle says:

“The Holy Ghost this signifying a figure for the time then present until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 8-10),

which is immediately followed by a reference to the greater and more perfect Tabernacle over which Christ presided as the High Priest of good things to come (Heb. ix. 11). At verse 6 of Heb. iii., the apostle turns from the house built by Moses to the house ruled over by the Son and says “Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end”. This new facet of truth we must now consider in our next article.

No.27. The Provocation. **pp. 206 - 212**

Chapters iii. and iv. are bounded by the word “confession”:

“Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession” (iii. 1 R.V.).

“Let us hold fast our confession” (iv. 14 R.V.).

It is evident that the Hebrew believers were exhorted to consider Christ as an Example in the matter of this “confession”. A somewhat parallel double occurrence is I Tim. vi. 12-14 where Timothy’s “good confession” is associated with that of Christ before Pontius Pilate. The word contains an element of danger and opposition, and the exhortation is to hold it fast unto *the end*. The one great feature which is singled out by the apostle in the case of Christ Himself is that He “was FAITHFUL” (Heb. ii. 17; iii. 2). Therefore within the bounds set by iii. 1 and iv. 14 will come some further teaching, example, exhortation, encouragement and warning, such as will, by the grace of God, help the tried believer to hold on his way.

The one characteristic of Christ which the Hebrew believers were called upon to consider was *His faithfulness*; the one great warning which follows is that against *unbelief*:

“Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of UNBELIEF, in departing from the living God” (iii. 12).

“So we see that they could not enter in because of UNBELIEF” (iii. 19).

“The word preached did not profit them, because they were not united by FAITH to them that heard” (iv. 2 margin).

The great example is “the provocation”. This word comes from *pikraino*—‘to be bitter’, and illuminates Heb. xii. 15, 16, where another type for the believer’s warning (Esau) is closely linked with a ‘root of bitterness’. The great ‘text’ of the writer in these two chapters is taken from Psa. xcv., which he introduces with the solemn words, “As the Holy Ghost saith”.

It is evident that we must know something of this ‘provocation’ on the part of Israel if we would profit by the Scripture before us. In Numb. xiv. we have the record. Caleb and Joshua had urged upon the people a confident faith in the Lord with respect to the entry into possession of the land of promise.

“But all the congregation bade stone them with stones And the Lord said unto Moses, How long will this people PROVOKE ME?” (Numb. xiv. 10, 11).

Their provoking was largely due to their unbelief, for the passage continues, “How long will it be ere they believe Me?” The Lord threatened to disinherit and smite the people, but upon the prayer of Moses He said, “I have pardoned according to thy word”. The people therefore were a *pardoned people*. But does this mean that they did go up and *possess* the land? No, for after pronouncing the gracious pardon the Lord added:

“But as truly as I live surely they shall not see the land neither shall any of them that provoked Me see it” (Numb. xiv. 21-23; see also II Sam. xii. 10-12; Psa. xcix. 8).

Here we see the difference between “Hope” and “Prize”.

In Numb. xiv. 22 the Lord declares that already this people had tempted Him *ten times*. *The Companion Bible* gives the ‘ten times’ as follows:

- (1) At Red Sea (Exod. xiv. 11, 12).
- (2) At Marah (Exod. xv. 23, 24).
- (3) Wilderness of Sin (Exod. xvi. 2).
- (4) About manna (Exod. xvi. 20).
- (5) About manna (Exod. xvi. 27).
- (6) At Rephidim (Exod. xvii. 1-3).
- (7) At Horeb (golden calf) (Exod. xxxii.).
- (8) At Taberah (Numb. xi. 1).
- (9) At Kibroth Hataavah (Numb. xi. 4).
- (10) At Kadesh (Numb. xiv. 2).

While we must honour those who have taken God at His Word, and have collected “ten” occasions in the history of Israel’s wanderings where they “tempted” the Lord, we must remember that there were other occasions both before and after Numb. xiv. 22 when Israel provoked the Lord by their unbelief, and which form an essential part of those Scriptures which have been written for our learning. Meribah (Exod. xvii. 7) was repeated (Num. xx. 7-13) with disastrous results to Moses himself (see verse 12). I Cor. x. enumerates some of the “provocations” of the wilderness, and introduces that most extraordinary testimony to the fact that Christ was before His incarnation “The Lord God” of Israel:

“Neither let us tempt CHRIST, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents” (I Cor. x. 9).

Dr. John Lightfoot says “The nation of the Jews delighted mightily in the number TEN, both in sacred and civil matters. A synagogue consisted not but of ten men at least, and the number of those who comforted the mourners after the burial of the dead, consisted of ten at the least. “Peradventure *ten* shall be found there” (Gen. xviii. 32), said Abraham and apparently reached the minimum. Jacob complained of his treatment at the

hand of Laban saying “Your father hath deceived me, and changed my wages *ten* times” (Gen. xxxi. 7). Are we to take the number “ten” literally in such a statement as:

“And when I have broken the staff of your bread, *ten* women shall bake your bread in one oven” (Lev. xxvi. 26)?

When Elkanah in his endeavour to comfort his wife said: “Am not I better to thee than *ten* sons?” (I Sam. i. 8), does anyone believe that his intention would be expressed the more or the less had he said “eleven” sons, or “nine”? Why “ten loaves” or “ten cheeses”? (I Sam. xvii. 17, 18). Are we expected to count the occasions when the “comforters” of Job had reproached him “ten times”? (Job xix. 3). To these examples we may add the “ten days” and the “ten times better” of Dan. i., the “ten men” of Amos vi. 9 and Zech. viii. 23.

The provoking of the Lord by Israel is introduced in Heb. iii. as an extension or illustration of the exhortation given in verse 6,

“Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end”,

the reference to the “provocation” being introduced by the word “wherefore” and concluded by the warning:

“Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God” (Heb. iii. 12),

and the conclusion in verse 14 balances the introduction of verse 6 thus:

- A | 6. Whose house are we, IF we hold fast
the confidence and rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.
- B | 7-11. Psalm xcv. quoted “They shall not enter into My rest”.
- C | 12, 13. Take heed. Heart of unbelief.
- A | 14. We are made partakers of Christ, IF we hold fast
the beginning of our confidence stedfast to the end.
- B | 15-18. Psalm xcv. quoted “They should not enter into His rest”.
- C | 19. So we see. Unbelief.

Psalm xcv. is made much of in this passage, and calls for examination. The fourth book of the Psalms (see *The Companion Bible*), commences with the Psalm of Moses, and corresponds with the fourth book of the law, Numbers, the book of Israel’s wandering in the wilderness. Psa. xc. refers to those of responsible years who had rebelled against the Lord, declaring that their children had been led out of Egypt only to die in the wilderness. Psa. xci. speaks of those very children who were preserved throughout the wilderness dangers and entered into the land of promise under Joshua, when all those of the latter generation were dead.

“Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of men” (Psa. xc. 3).

While there may be a spiritual application of these words, they refer in the first place to Numb. xiv. 28-30:

“As truly as I live, saith the LORD, as ye have spoken in Mine ears, so will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness; and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upward, which have murmured against Me, doubtless ye shall not come into the land, concerning which I swear to make you dwell therein, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun.”

Psa. xci., however, is the fulfillment of the succeeding promise of verses 31-34:

“But your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, them will I bring in, and they shall know the land which ye have despised Your children shall wander in the wilderness forty years after the number of the days in which ye searched the land and ye shall know My breach of promise.”

So in Psa. xc. 9 we read:

“For all our days are passed away in Thy wrath: we spend our years as a tale that is told.”

But in Psa. xci. 7-16 we read:

“A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand: but it shall not come nigh thee with long life will I satisfy him, and shew him My salvation.”

And so Psa. xcv. takes up the story, and calls upon Israel to hear the voice of the Lord and not to harden their hearts as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness. Let us remember that in Numb. xiv., where this great provoking is recorded, those who were thus doomed to wander and to die in the wilderness were A PARDONED PEOPLE (Numb. xiv. 20). Those who were warned about the evil heart of unbelief were “holy brethren”. Hebrews is not dealing with the gospel of initial salvation; it deals with believers who, though delivered from their spiritual Egypt, united with Christ as were Israel when they were “baptized into Moses”, partaking of the blessings of the wilderness provision “bread from heaven” yet, like those who were intimidated by the report of the ten spies, lost their place in the land of promise. We observe in I Cor. x. :1-5:

“That ALL were under the cloud, and ALL passed through the sea; and were ALL baptized unto Moses did ALL eat the same spiritual meat; and did ALL drink of the same spiritual drink but with MANY of them God was not well pleased.”

In the immediately preceding context of these words, the apostle had said:

“They which run in a race run ALL, but ONE receiveth the prize. So run, that ye may obtain” (I Cor. ix. 24),

and Heb. xii. picks up the thread and continues:

“Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the Author and the 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” (Heb. xii. 1, 2).

The exhortation of Hebrews is “Let us go on unto perfection” (Heb. vi. 1), and this is implied in the words of Heb. iii. 14 (cf. Heb. iii. 6):

“If we hold the BEGINNING of our confidence stedfast unto the END.”

Going on unto perfection implies reaching a goal, going on to the end, finishing the course, touching the tape. Perfection and its associate words are all derivations of the root *tel* which gives us *telos* “the end”. This will be made more evident when the exhortation to go on unto perfection is before us, but it should ever be kept in mind. Unless we clearly distinguish between Hope which is ours by gift in grace, and which can neither be won nor lost, and Prize and Crown which is associated with running a race, pressing on, enduring to the end, a prize that even Paul himself when writing to the Philippians was not sure of attaining, we shall make sad havoc of the teaching of Hebrews. Throughout the epistle, those addressed are already looked upon as “holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling”. The wilderness experiences of Israel were the experiences of the REDEEMED. Those who forfeited entrance into the land included Moses himself, and surely Moses was a saved man!

We conclude this article with an extract from No.14 of this series entitled *The Hope and the Prize* found in Volume VIII, pp.87-89, which bears upon the epistle to the Hebrews. We have referred the reader many times to the epistle to the Hebrews as illustrating the principle, though not dealing with the same prize that obtains in Phil. iii., and once again we draw attention to that epistle in order that we may see a parallel and an illustration.

In Heb. v. 8-12, and vi. 1 the apostle writes:--

“Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and having perfected, He became unto all that obey Him the author of *aionian* salvation; named of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec, of whom we have many things to say and hard of interpretation, seeing ye are becomes dull of hearing; for when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you what are the elements of the beginning of the oracles of God Wherefore *leaving* the word of the beginning of Christ, *let us go on* unto perfection.”

There we have a parallel with the “forgetting” and the “stretching out to” of Phil. iii.

The historical illustration supplied by Hebrews is found in chapters iii. and iv. The failure of Israel in the wilderness is largely connected with their fickleness of memory. While it could have been written of them after the mighty redemption from Egypt, “they soon *forgat* His works”, we find that they “*remembered* the fish which they did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick” (Num. xi. 5), and accordingly after the spies had made their report, and after they had seen the bunch of grapes from Eshcol (note the contrast to fruits [viands] of Egypt) “they said one to another, Let us make a Captain, and let us return into Egypt”. It is significant that the word “Captain” in the LXX is the same as that name of Christ in Hebrews, and the contrast is vitally connected with the two attitudes of mind expressed in

“leaving” and “going on unto”, “forgetting” and “stretching out to”. The Israelites’ failure to “leave” and “go on” was used by the apostle to impress his teaching in the epistle to the Hebrews, and it will have the same effect in the epistle to the Philippians.

(Hope8 and Prize, 87-89)

We quote again, a further extract, this time from No.21, found in Volume IX, pp. 118, 119.

Many have a difficulty regarding this subject by reason for failure to distinguish clearly *Prize* from the *Hope*. In an early article of this series we endeavoured to draw the distinction between “the Hope”, and “the Prize”, and said, “There can be no greater contrast than that of Ephesians and Philippians in their point of view. Ephesians teaches *boldness with confidence*, because there the question has entirely to do with being accepted in the Beloved; Philippians speaks of *fear and trembling*, because it has reference to the service, the running, and the contest of the believer subsequent to his perfect acceptance in Christ”. The “Hope” does not figure in the epistle to the Philippians; the very word is used only by the apostle there with reference to himself. Phil. i. 20, his hope of deliverance and faithful testimony; ii. 19, 23, his hope of sending Timothy to the Philippians. To have misgivings therefore about the “hope”, when reading Phil. iii. about the “Prize” is an evidence of failure to discern the things that differ. The hope of the believer is that of being with the Lord in glory and of sharing in the resurrection. This is a part of redemption; unto this every member of the One Body is sealed and pledged by the Holy Spirit “until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory”. No conditions are attached to the hope, no fears are expressed regarding its attainment, and no efforts are called for to qualify for it.

The prize forms no integral part of the unity of the Spirit, but the “one hope” does (Eph. iv. 4). A crown that may be won, may be lost, and the glory of reigning with Christ is directly connected with “enduring”, whereas living with Him is simply the outcome of “having died with Him”, a participation which is the joyous reckoning of every believer (II Tim. ii. 11-13). When the hope of the one body is spoken of in Col. iii. we do not read, ‘when Christ the righteous judge shall appear’, but “when Christ who is our *life* shall appear, then shall we appear with Him in glory”, and here, in Colossians, is exactly the same argument that we found in II Tim. ii. 11, “ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God”. The apostle who wrote these inspired words, who so fully taught the perfect acceptance of the believer in the Lord, did not entertain any doubt regarding the hope when he penned the, “if by any means” of the prize. To be exercised in mind as to any question of worthiness regarding the Hope, and to assume certainty with regard to the Prize and the Crown, are alike to be shunned.

(Hope9 and Prize, 118, 119)

**No.28. The Sabbath, the Sword and the Sympathy (iv. 9 - 16).
pp. 227 - 232**

In chapters iii. & iv. the words *katapausis* and *katapauo* (“rest”) occur eleven times, and the one reference in iv. 9 where the word *sabbatismos* is used, makes twelve in all. It is evident therefore that this “rest” is an essential subject. In the first case the entry into the land of promise was typical of the rest that remaineth to the people of God, for it is used directly in connection with Israel in the wilderness. That it was not the actual “rest”, but a type only, may be seen from Heb. iv. 8:

“For if Joshua (Jesus A.V.) had given them rest, then would He not afterward have spoken of another day”,

which the Lord did in David’s time, as is seen in Psa. xcv. Not only is the rest here spoken of likened to the entry of the faithful overcomer into Canaan, it is also likened to the Sabbath day rest of the week in creation:

“For He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all His works” (Heb. iv. 4).

The structure of Heb. iv. 1-13 will help us to see the chief features of the passage and guide us in our study.

Hebrews iv. 1 - 13

- A | 1, 2. | a | Let us therefore fear, lest
 - b | Any come short.
 - c | Not united by faith.
 - d | The Word of hearing.
- B | 3, 4. Nature of this rest. After works, e.g., Creation.
- C | 5, 6. It remaineth (*apoleipo*)—a rest.
- D | 7. David.
- D | 8. Joshua.
- C | 9. There remaineth (*apoleipo*)—a rest.
- B | 10. Nature of this rest. After works, e.g., Creation.
- A | 11-13. | a | Let us therefore labour, lest
 - b | Any fall.
 - c | Example of unbelief.
 - d | The Word of God.

The A.V. of iv. 2 reads “not being mixed with faith” and gives in the margin “*Because they were not united by faith to*”. The R.V. reads “But the word of hearing did not profit them, because they were not united by faith with them that heard”. This reading turns our attention to the great division that came about after the return of the spies. Israel did not join with Caleb and Joshua in their triumphant faith, but with the unbelievers and the complainers.

With regard to the nature of this “rest” both verses 3, 4 and 10 look back to Gen. i. and ii., where we are told that God rested upon the seventh day after the completion of the six days’ creation. The believer is said to rest “from his works as God did from His” when he enters into this “rest that remaineth”. Verse 9 departs from the usual word for rest to give us its full and perfect meaning:

“There remaineth therefore a *Sabbatismos* (a Sabbath rest) to the people of God.”

There is one further feature that demands attention, and that is the statement made in iv. 3:

“Although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.”

“The foundation (*katabole*) of the world” is an expression that has been carefully examined in *The Berean Expositor*, and the translation “The overthrow of the world” has been adopted instead of the A.V.

This “overthrow” we find indicated in Gen. i. 2:

“And the earth became without form, and void”,

the six days’ work which follow being the preparation of the earth as a platform for the outworking of the plan of the ages. When the writer of Hebrews wished to speak of *laying* a foundation, he uses the verb *themelioo*, Heb. i. 10, and not *kataballo*. The question that comes to us as a result of this is:

“In what way does this reflect upon the believers to whom the apostle addressed his words, for their rest is likened to the seventh day rest of God” (see Heb. iv. 3, 4, 10)?

A little wider study, we think, will help us to appreciate the apostle’s meaning. In iv. 1 he writes:

“Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it”,

and in iv. 11 he adds:

“Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.”

Now we are already acquainted with the fact that the grand exhortation of Hebrews is to “go on unto perfection”, *perfection* being the doctrinal equivalent of *the rest that remaineth*. So therefore in Heb. vi. 1 we read:

“Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine (word of the beginning) of Christ, let us go on unto perfection.”

This “perfection” we see to be the parallel with the “rest” of chapter iv. by observing the second half of chapter vi.:

“Things that *accompany* salvation” (9).
“The full assurance of hope unto the end” (11).
“Followers of them who through faith and patience *inherit* the promises” (12).
“And so, after he had patiently endured, he *obtained* the promise” (15).

In iv. 3 we read of works that were done since the overthrow of the world, and in ix. 25, 26 we read that Christ did not offer Himself often as the High Priest who entered the most Holy Place yearly with the blood of another, for in that case He must have suffered often since the overthrow of the world.

The work of the six days’ creation is brought into line with the work of redemption, as indeed it was a part. The rest that remaineth unto the people of God is a rest which follows completed work. The epistle will go on to develop the twofold character of this rest. It will first of all show it to be the result of the great finished Work of Christ Whose one Offering caused the oft-repeated sacrifice of the law to “rest” (*pauo* = cease) from being offered (Heb. x. 2). And secondly it will show it to be the result by grace of that faith which obtained promises and was the substance of things hoped for. Sabbath *succeeding* work is not gospel, *it is reward*. “Let us labour therefore” while we at the same time rest in the finished Work of Christ.

It is tolerably certain that in the book of the Revelation the Lord Jesus Christ enters into His office as the great King-Priest, “after the order of Melchisedec” (see Psa. cx.). This brings the Apocalypse and the epistle to the Hebrews into line. The fact too that both books treat of the overcomer and the New Jerusalem will add to this sense of similarity. We have been considering the “rest that remaineth unto the people of God” and in Revelation that rest is materialized. There too we have the words:

“Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them” (Rev. xiv. 13).

The concluding verses of Heb. iv. contain a two-fold presentation of Christ: (1) as He appears to the seven churches (Rev. ii. and iii.); and (2) as the merciful High Priest, Who can sympathize with His people’s weaknesses.

“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him to Whom we must give an account” (Heb. iv. 12, 13 not AV JP).

In Rev. ii. 12-16 Christ says:

“These things saith He which hath the sharp sword with two edges Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of My mouth.”

The words spoken to each of the seven churches are searching indeed. Their works are known; the One Who speaks is a Judge of the thoughts and intents of the heart. His

purpose too is to lead them on to perfection or as the Revelation words it, to “overcome”. So in Heb. iv., the searching statement of verses 12 and 13 is addressed to those who are being urged to endure to the end.

Some commentators say that the reference in Heb. iv. 12 is exclusively to the *written* Word, while others maintain that it can only refer to the *living* Word. It is evident that somewhere before verse 13 the personal element is introduced. The simplest view seems to be that which is expressed in the figure of Rev. i. 16, “And out of His mouth went a sharp two-edged sword” and Rev. xix. 13 “His name is called The Word of God”. The apostle, in Heb. iv. 12,13, speaks of Christ together with the Word, using it for His people’s good. There is possibly a reference also to that specific passage of the Word which underlines the apostle’s argument, viz. Psa. xcv., which he referred to as the words of the Holy Ghost. That Psalm is still “living and energetic”. The Lord can still use it to reveal the vital difference between “soul and spirit”. This is a distinction that is not kept clear in the minds of many of the Lord’s people.

Much that enters into Church life, witness and worship, if viewed in the pure light of the Word, would prove to be of the soul rather than the spirit. While body, soul and spirit compose the complete man, the highest service and the only acceptable worship is that of the spirit or the new nature. Philippians, the epistle of the *Prize*, shews that discernment is necessary:

“And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment (*discernment*); that ye may *try the things that differ* (margin); that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ” (i. 9, 10).

II Timothy, the epistle of the *Crown*, also urges discernment:

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, *rightly dividing* the Word of truth” (ii. 15).

Hebrews, the epistle of the *Perfecting*, also reveals the need for discernment. Soul and spirit must be kept distinct.

The last words of verse 13 read in the A.V. “with Whom we have to do”. In Heb. xiii. 17 the word rendered “do” (*logos*) in iv. 13 is translated “account”, and this is its meaning in Heb. iv. 13 “to Whom we must give an account”. The atmosphere is that of the Judgment Seat of Christ, and verses 12 and 13 leave the mind impressed with the “terror of the Lord”. This is but one side of truth however. There is another, which equally impresses us with infinite sympathy, tender care, wondrous grace, and bids us to come boldly. That other phase is expressed in Heb. iv. 14-16:

“Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, Who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession” (not AV JP).

With this “profession” chapter iii. opened:

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

We have turned aside to consider the unfaithful of Israel and their forfeiture. We turn again and see in Him the great Captain and Perfecter of faith, Who, for the joy set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. An added reason for continuance is given in iv. 15, 16:

“For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched (sympathize) with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, APART FROM SIN.”

God never tempts a man to sin. Temptation is an essential feature in the record of the *race* and the *crown*, but it is a temptation which is of the nature of trial and test. Temptation which springs from our own sinful selves is another matter. James clearly distinguishes between the two sorts of temptations in the first chapter of his epistle:

“My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life” (verses 2 and 12).

That is the temptation of Hebrews and of Revelation. The other kind of temptation to which Heb. iv. takes exception is next reviewed by James:

“Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed” (i. 13, 14).

Just as Heb. iv. 14 looked back to iii. 1, 2, we find iv. 15 looking back to ii. 18:

“For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted.”

An example of the temptation that is intended here is found in Heb. xi. 17:

“By faith Abraham, when he was tempted, offered up Isaac.”

Whatever the temptation may be through which we may be called to pass, it is a comfort to know that He Who sits at the right hand above was made partaker of flesh and blood, was tempted like as we are, apart from sin, and is “able to sympathize with our weaknesses”.

“Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need” (iv. 16).

This question of temptation, and in particular the meaning of the words “tempted like as we are yet without sin” were given a careful examination in chapter iii., and the reader is earnestly exhorted to acquaint himself with this exposition if for any reason its study has been overlooked, as it is vital both to the understanding of the epistle, and for the safe guidance of the pilgrim through the wilderness of this world.

“The House of Jacob shall Possess their Possessions”

No.3. “Dullness” in hearing. “Sloth” in following. pp. 19, 20

Our possessions in Christ, as we have learned and believed are riches beyond the power of the mind to compute, and consequently any light that the Scriptures may throw upon sources of danger or anything that threatens the full possession of these priceless possessions should be a matter of immediate concern to every believer.

The early church by putting sloth among the seven deadly sins, exercised clearer discrimination than we have credited, for it is against sloth that the Apostle warned his readers, whom he exhorted to go on unto perfection. Sloth is a derivative of the word that gives us the English word ‘slow’, and those who were ‘slow of heart’ to believe, were rebuked by the Lord (Luke xxiv. 25). The epistle to the Hebrews has as its historical background:

- (1) In chapters iii. and iv. the failure of Israel to enter into their ‘rest’.
- (2) The failure of the Levitical system of priest and offering to touch the conscience and put away sin (Heb. v.-x.).
- (3) The examples of faith, set structurally over against the examples of unbelief of Heb. ii.-iv., and which commence with Abel and traverse O.T. history (Heb. xi.).

Each of these typical and historical backgrounds have key words that indicate some special danger, and which point to the remedy provided. The change of priesthood from that of Aaron to that of Melchisedec, the stress on the fact that faith sees the ‘invisible’, the inability of any typical offering to touch the conscience, will occur to the reader.

The section of Hebrews which demands our present attention is Heb. v. & vi. and the structure forces into prominence the two occurrences of the Greek word *nothros* which are found in the N.T. The one occurrence translating the word ‘dull’ the other rendering it ‘slothful’.

Hebrews v. and vi.

- A | v. 1-6. Melchisedec. Priest.
- B | v. 6-10. Perfected.
- C | v. 11 - vi. 1. The SLOTHFUL (dull) *versus* the perfect.
- B | vi. 1-10. Perfection.
- C | vi. 11-19. The SLOTHFUL *versus* the overcomer.
- A | vi. 20. Melchisedec. Priest.

One of the values of the structure of a passage of Scripture is that one can as it were see the parts that have been underlined by God. The structure compels us to notice the two occurrences of *nothros* which might otherwise slip our attention.

Lexicographers differ as to the derivation of this word. All of course are agreed that the letter 'n' is an abbreviation of *ne* which stands for the negative. Parkhurst derives the word from a Greek word meaning 'to run'. Thayer derives it from either a word meaning 'to push' or 'to care about', while another derives it from a word meaning 'to leap'. Whatever the actual ancestry of this word may be, it is clear that unreadiness and consequent unwillingness to exert oneself, the lack of 'push' and the lack of 'care' are implied.

The Apostle, quite apart from the question of Inspiration, was familiar with the language and figures of the O.T. Scriptures, and doubtless some of the passages to which we now refer would be present to his mind.

“We have seen the land, and, behold, it is very good: and are ye still? be not SLOTHFUL to go, and to enter to POSSESS the land” (Judges xviii. 9).

A reference to I Kings xxii. 3 will show that 'still' is a synonym for 'sloth' in some contexts:

“Know ye that Ramoth in Gilead is ours, *and we be still, and take it not out* of the hand of the King of Syria.”

When the question of “possessing” one’s “possessions” is the matter before us, we should emulate the spirit of Isa. lxii. 1:

“For Zion’s sake I will not *hold my peace* (same word as 'still'), and for Jerusalem’s sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth.”

Salvation and righteousness must 'go forth' before the prophet can rest satisfied. Not only would the prophet not hold his peace but he exhorts the watchman to 'keep not silence' and to give the Lord Himself 'no rest' until Jerusalem is made a praise in the earth.

After Israel had entered the land of promise, Joshua had to say to them:

“How long are ye SLACK to go to POSSESS the land, which the Lord God of your fathers hath given you?” (Josh. xviii. 3).

“I will not fail thee” the Lord had said (Josh. i. 5) using the very same word which is translated “slack”, for as Peter said “The Lord is not slack concerning His promise” (II Pet. iii. 9). The two hindrances that are emphasized in Heb. v. and vi. are, as we have seen, “dullness of hearing” and “slothfulness in following”.

**No.4. Three hindrances. Terah, Lot and the Canaanites.
pp. 59, 60; 77 - 80 =**

Possession in the O.T. is closely related to “the land” of promise, and there are more occurrences of the word *yarash* ‘to possess’ in Deuteronomy than in any other book of the Bible. Keeping merely to the English of the A.V. and taking no account of such renderings as ‘inherit’, ‘succeed’, ‘drive out’ or ‘dispossess’, we find 46 references to possessing the land in that great book of the law.

The first occurrence of *yarash* in the O.T. are found in Gen. xv., and are related (1) To the true heir, and (2) To the inheriting of the land.

“I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward” (xv. 1). In reply to this assurance of God, after the victory over the confederate kings and the blessing by Melchisedec, Abraham appears to have reviewed the fact that he was now an old man, and it looked very likely that his heir would have to be the steward of his house, seeing, as he said “I go childless” (xv. 2).

While Abraham’s attitude is by no means a fulfillment of law 191 of the code of Khammurabi, it is sufficiently near in spirit to reveal Abraham’s intention and obligation. However, God had other plans. To Abraham’s plaint “Behold, Thou hast given to me no seed, and, lo, one born in my house *is* mine *heir* (*yarash*)”, the Lord replies, “This shall not *be* thine *heir* (*yarash*); but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels *shall be* thine *heir* (*yarash*)” (xv. 4).

Then follows the Divine promise and the great act of faith (Gen. xv. 5, 6) and God said:

“I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land *to inherit* it (*yarash*)” to which Abraham replies,

“Lord God, whereby shall I know that *I shall inherit* it? (*yarash*)” (Gen. xv. 7, 8).

In Gen. xv. we are turned back to the initial call of Abraham, and the certainty of the promise, that “the house of Jacob SHALL possess his possessions” (Gen. xv. 1-7), but from verse 8 to the end we are directed forward to the strange pathway which the chosen seed must tread before the possession is entered. This sheds light on the greater purpose of the ages, and is seen to involve a principle that obtains in every calling. Before we consider this great problematic passage, let us follow the Divine direction and turn back to the earlier chapters of Genesis where the initial call of Abraham, together with the hindrances that prevent him from taking possession of this inheritance, are recorded.

Gen. xv. turns us back to Ur of the Chaldees, where the call first came. The first movement of Abraham’s family out of Ur of the Chaldees is by the record of Gen. xi. 31.

“And Terah took Abram his son and Lot the son of Haran his son’s son, and Sarai his daughter in law, his son Abram’s wife; and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, TO GO into the land of Canaan; and they came to Haran, and DWELT THERE.”

We have inspired warrant for the fact that God appeared unto Abraham “*when he was in Mesopotamia*” and “before he dwelt in Charran” and the call of the Lord was specific:

“Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I will show thee” (Acts vii. 2, 3).

Haran, although some 600 miles away from Ur, was nevertheless situated in the same country and on the wrong side of the Euphrates. The 600 miles that separated the two cities did not alter the fact that both Ur and Haran were dedicated to the same Babylonian moon-god. Terah had made a great move, but had not made any radical change. Paul as good as told the Galatians that to turn from Christ to weak and beggarly elements after having been redeemed from worshipping idols, was in spirit, much like returning to their early idolatry. The flesh can take part in campaigns, and go to great lengths of self denial and discomfort in the form of religion, only to exchange an Ur for an Haran and miss the great reality.

Gesenius says that the name Terah is from a Chaldee root meaning ‘to delay’. It will be seen how aptly this name fits his typical character. “Who did hinder you?” said Paul to the Galatians (v. 7), and the answer “Religion after the flesh” is but the name Terah expanded in the light of the Gospel revelation. Terah’s action symbolizes the first of a series of hindrances that postponed the ‘possessing’ of this “possession”, and is a lesson for us all. While Stephen declared that the call came to Abraham before he dwelt in Haran, Gen. xi. says that it was Terah who responded. When one senses the authority of the parent in O.T. times this apparent contradiction is seen at its true value. Terah is a picture of religious flesh. It makes an attempt to follow the Divine call, but it breaks down in essentials.

God called Abraham to leave his country and his kindred, but Terah includes both himself and Lot. Terah started out with the intention of going to the land of Canaan, but he never crossed the river Euphrates. Even though he trekked 600 miles, and had left Ur of the Chaldees behind, he had merely exchanged one pagan city for another. Abraham’s inheritance was on the other side of the river. He becomes “Abraham the Hebrew” (Gen. xiv. 13) because he ‘crossed over’ (Hebrew *abar* as in Gen. xxxii. 10; Josh. i. 2).

Here is the first typical action that indicates one of the reasons why many fail to ‘possess’ their “possessions”.

Terah, in spite of all his response and removal, never left the land of Mesopotamia, he merely changed one form of paganism for another. Religion is no friend to faith. It is the great hinderer. The second lesson that Gen. xi. teaches is that Abraham’s inheritance was entered only after his father died, even as his true heir was given to him after he was ‘as good as dead’. God’s promised inheritance looks to resurrection for its full realization, and in prospect can only be enjoyed on resurrection ground.

After Terah's death, the Lord in His grace calls Abraham again; note the word 'had' in the AV. "Now the Lord *had* said unto Abraham" (Gen. xii. 1), and is referred to by Stephen in Acts vii. 2.

Upon the death of his father God said to Abraham:

"Get thee out of thy country (for Haran was in the same 'country' as Ur, even though a great trek divided the two cities), and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house (this reference to his father's house is not mentioned by Stephen), unto a land that I will show thee" (Gen. xii. 1).

On the surface there appears to be a discrepancy when we compare these two calls together. Terah evidently "knew" that "Canaan" was the objective, yet according to Heb. xi. 8 Abraham went out 'not knowing' whither he went. The word used by the Apostle in Heb. xi. 9 for "knowing" is *epistamai*:

"To obtain, and thus have a knowledge of anything by proximity to it, or as a result of prolonged attention: in contrast with the process of getting to know it, and with a mere casual *dilettante* acquaintance with it" (Appendix 132.1 V. *Companion Bible*).

To Agrippa, who was 'an expert' in Jewish customs and questions (Acts xxvi. 3), Paul could say "The king knoweth of these things" (Acts xxvi. 26) using *epistamai*, for Agrippa alone of his judges was versed and expert in such matters. Now both Terah and Abraham knew of the land of Canaan, and knew that in that land the inheritance was to be found, but he had no expert knowledge, nothing to equip or warn him of the requirements of such a journey, he went out not well equipped humanly speaking for such a response. The same could be said in a greater degree, when Abraham responded to another call to go to a mountain which God would show him, and there offer up his all, there too, he went humanly speaking ill equipped and unversed in the requirements that would be made of him. In each case Abraham 'believed' and went forward where the ordinary man of 'sense' would have drawn back.

This feature therefore is not without its bearing upon the great lesson we are out to learn. When thinking of our inheritance and the pathway that leads to its enjoyment we need to remind ourselves that:

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His spirit" (I Cor. ii. 9, 10).

Abraham was no worldly wise 'expert', he was an unworldly and simple believer.

God promised to 'show' Abraham the land that was to be the inheritance both of himself and of his seed, yet we read the whole of chapter xii., and on nearly to the end of chapter xiii. before that promise was fulfilled. If we ask why? the answer is not that God was 'slack concerning His promise', but that Abraham had failed to fulfil the conditions that were attached.

Gen. xii. 4, 5 significantly reads 'and Lot went with him'. "And Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran." Abraham can hardly be said with this passage before us that he had left his 'kindred'.

There is an intended parallel between Gen. xi. 31 and xii. 5. "They went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and they came to Haran and dwelt there." Note the word THERE. The second reference reads: "They went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came." So far we may say, this is good. Canaan has now been entered, but there is a significant comment in verse 6 "And the Canaanite was then in the land". Note the word THEN. It appears that Terah's delay gave Satan an opportunity of forestalling the purpose of God and consequently, Israel could not really possess their possessions until the Canaanites were expelled and destroyed.

This also is a solemn lesson for all believers, and links the failure to possess with the conflict of the two seeds, a theme too vast to develop here.

After Abraham's return from Egypt, where nothing but a Divine interposition saved Sarah and the true seed from contamination, we read "and Lot with him". Still the condition remained unfulfilled, and it was not until strife arising because of the greatness of their substance that Abraham, driven apparently by exasperation, gave Lot the choice of the land if only he could be persuaded to separate from Abraham.

"Is not the whole land before thee? separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left" (Gen. xiii. 9).

Then come the significant words:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, AFTER that Lot was separated from him. Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art all the land which thou seest arise, walk through the land in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee" (Gen. xiii. 14-17).

God kept His word. He had said "I will show thee" (Gen. xii. 1) and He kept His promise immediately after Abraham kept the terms laid down.

The several hindrances that are revealed in these passages have a bearing upon the believer today, when translated into spiritual realities.

Terah, assayed to do in the flesh, what could only be done in the spirit. He intended to go into the land of Canaan but dwelt in Haran. He made a move, and probably impressed his contemporaries with his sincerity, but it was after all just a 'religious movement'. He never "passed over". The Euphrates flowed between him and the land of promise after he reached Haran as surely as it had when he lived in Ur.

Abraham was held by 'the old man'. He could not respond until Terah died.

The next hindrance was twofold. Satan had profited by the delay and had peopled the land of promise in advance with his own usurping seed. Lot, by reason of his kinship with Abraham, kept back the realization of the promised possession until by sheer force of circumstances he was compelled to 'separate'. This too has a full lesson which is expounded in more than one passage of the N.T.

Only when Terah and Lot are either dead or separated, can Abraham enjoy the firstfruits of his inheritance. He then saw it and walked through it, although still possessing not a foot of it except by faith. This however is as far as we can attain in this life, and the lesson which Genesis teaches is of perennial value. There are other aspects of this same truth which must be considered in subsequent articles, sufficient is before us surely, to call for the exercise of heart and mind.

No.5. The sending of the spies. pp. 132 - 136

The opening words of Numb. xiii. seem to teach that the sending of the spies by Moses was in harmony with the will of the Lord.

“And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Send thou men, that they may search the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel.”

So also, the words of Christ to Thomas could be interpreted when He said “Thomas, reach hither thy finger”; nevertheless we know that it would have been more blessed had Thomas believed without such evidence.

In chapter x. of the book of Numbers we read these words:

“And they departed from the mount of the Lord three days journey: and the ark of the covenant of the Lord went before them in the three days journey, TO SEARCH OUT a resting place for them” (Numb. x. 33).

Here we find the identical word used that is afterwards used of the spies. “That they may *search* the land”, “To *spy out* the land”. Altogether the Hebrew word *tur* occurs thirteen times in Numb. x. to xiv., an ominous number, associated in the Scriptures with rebellion.

Notice what the spies were to include in their report, whether the land was ‘good or bad’, ‘fat or lean’. Surely if God Himself had chosen this land for their possession, and had described it as a land flowing with milk and honey, it hardly seems to be the exercise of faith or trust to send spies to see whether it be ‘fat or lean’!

The ‘three days journey’ already mentioned seems to suggest that the Risen Christ has gone ahead, and is sufficient pledge concerning the nature of the inheritance that awaits

His redeemed people. Moreover, when Moses rehearsed this matter before all Israel after the days of wandering had come to an end, the sending of the spies is put in a somewhat different light.

“And I said unto you, ye are come unto the mountain of the Amorites, which the Lord our God doth give unto us. Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee: GO UP AND POSSESS IT, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath said unto thee; fear not, neither be discouraged” (Deut. i. 20, 21).

Notice that the land had been GIVEN to Israel. Moses said to his father-in-law, “We are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, I will GIVE it you” (Numb. x. 29).

This was the basis of the argument of Caleb and Joshua,

“The land which we passed through to search it, is an exceeding good land. If the Lord delight in us, then He will bring us into this land, and GIVE it us; a land which floweth with milk and honey” (xiv. 7, 8).

The word ‘set’ used by Moses in Deut. i. 20, 21 is actually a repetition of the word ‘give’ as the margin indicates. God’s Gift, God’s Word, God’s Covenant promise, all were put to the question by the sending of the spies.

“Ye came near unto Me every one of you” (Deut. i. 22).

The same words are used in Deut. v. 23 where once again the people were moved by fear. This kind of ‘coming near’ has something unhealthy about it. It seems on a par with the attitude of those who would catch the Lord in His speech, and approach Him with honeyed words “Master, we know that Thou art true” etc.

“We will send.” These words must be remembered when we read Numb. xiii. 2 “Send thou men”. Ezekiel makes it *clear* that when the Exodus took place, the Lord had Himself ESPIED the land for them, a land flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands (Ezek. xx. 5, 6). The spies were to bring word again ‘by what way we must go up’ but God had already told them. Even when the report had been made, Israel ‘rebelled against the commandment of the Lord’ (Deut. i. 26) and they charged God with ‘hating’ them, and in spite of all the faithful testimony of Caleb and Joshua and the added reminder of Moses, they ‘did not believe the Lord their God’ (Deut. i. 32).

Quite a number of those who believe the teaching of the epistles of the Mystery have expressed themselves as unsatisfied by the scantiness of the revelation there contained as to (1) just what constitutes the glory of our inheritance, and (2) just exactly by what way the Church shall enter into its hope. There is a looking back to the hope of an earlier dispensation, a sort of envy at the lavish description of the millennial kingdom, or of the wonders of the Heavenly City, and one senses something petulant in the request, “Where is our hope described in the epistles of the Mystery? Why are there no details given to us as to others?” There is also a querulous complaint* that whereas I Thess. iv. or I Cor. xv. are most explicit, one cannot be sure from the prison epistles whether the Church of the One Body will be *caught up* by rapture, will *die off* and pass through death

and resurrection, whether all will go *together*, whether there will be *angelic* accompaniments, etc., etc. All this, which superficially sounds like earnest inquiry, is but the old unbelief of Israel re-expressed. They wanted to know *more than God had revealed* about 'the land' which was their inheritance, and they wanted to know *more than God had revealed* as to 'what way we must go up'. Both these questions were already answered to faith. God had 'espied' the land and had called it 'good'. God went before them with fire and with cloud 'to shew them by what way they should go'. Faith needs nothing more.

[* - We were once asked by an American correspondent writing along these lines to 'come down flat-footed' as to the accompaniments and happenings associated with our hope.]

If our inheritance is at the right hand of God, 'far above all', it is transcendently above all human thought and experience, and what words of human language could describe the riches of the glory of that inheritance of the saints? If in the resurrection and translation we need adjusting to the new sphere of blessing 'in the heavenly places', how should we be the better if God described the process? It is enough for us that, as we receive a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of 'Him', the ascended Lord, and the Mystery, we shall receive as full an answer to our quest for knowledge as God sees fit to give. If we are assured that 'when Christ Who is our life shall be manifested, we also shall be manifested with Him in glory' (Col. iii. 3), what does it matter if 'the way we must go up' is left unexplained? We shall arrive—praise God. We do not know how; all that is His responsibility, not ours.

Our refusal to be turned back to I Thess. iv. as the hope of the Church is to be understood in the light of Numb. xiii. and xiv. We seek the spirit that enabled Caleb and Joshua to believe God, and leave the consequences. As we pointed out when dealing with Col. i. 23 (see Volume XXI), the great evidence of progress in the truth, or of the beginning of decline, is closely associated with holding steadfast to 'the hope'. Caleb and Joshua were threatened with stoning for the stand they took. We shall probably get its equivalent again and again; but as in their case, so in ours, His truth shall be our shield and buckler.

One of the reasons why the Lord was not too explicit about the land of Canaan and the way up, was because it was inhabited by a monstrous seed of the wicked one, the giants, the sons of Anak, and viewing such antagonists with the eyes of the flesh, the spies said: "We were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight" (Numb. xiii. 33). The cities were walled and very great, and grace was not given in the wilderness to deal with these remote difficulties. When at last Israel did stand before the walls of Jericho, *they fell down flat* at the shout of faith.

The pathway to our inheritance is blocked by principalities and powers, spiritual wickedness and world-holders of darkness. If we should see them with the eyes of the flesh, we would crumple up as did Daniel (Dan. x. 9, 10). God mercifully spares us this vision. We believe His Word; that is enough. If we knew the formidable strongholds of Satan that must be overcome in 'the evil day', we would recoil in fear and unbelief. We shall not face them until we are all assembled beneath the banner of our true Captain,

the greater Joshua, with Jordan behind us, and the land of promise immediately before us. Why not take a leaf out of this book of experience? Why not believe what God has revealed, and lovingly accept as best the fact that He withholds certain things?

Before closing this article, let us record the encouraging words of faith given by Caleb:

“And Caleb stilled the people before Moses, and said, Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it” (Numb. xiii. 30).

The word translated ‘stilled’ does not indicate that the people were calmed or comforted, the seven other occurrences of *hasah* suggest some element of authority, ‘Let all the earth keep silence before him’ (Hab. ii. 20). Men recognize the majesty of faith, even though they refuse to follow it. Caleb did not merely say ‘Let us go up’ or ‘Let us go up and possess it’, but “Let us go up AT ONCE and possess it”. While there is no adverb in the original to correspond with the words ‘at once’, there is an insistence that is very marked, for the Hebrew reads ‘going up, let us go up’, suggesting a prompt unhesitating obedience without delay and without dallying.

“We are well able to overcome it.” These words in another context may indicate unholy and unwarranted self-confidence, but God is faithful to His promise, Who has gone before and Who calls upon us to follow. His commands are then His enablings.

Again, after the dreadful desire to make a captain and return into Egypt, both Joshua and Caleb repeated their testimony and their exhortation saying “If the Lord delight in us, then He will bring us into this land and give it us: a land which floweth with milk and honey. Only rebel not ye against the Lord, neither fear ye the people of the land; for they are bread for us: their defence is departed from them, and the Lord is with us: fear them not” (Numb. xiv. 8, 9).

Later the Psalmist said:

“He brought me forth also into a large place: He delivered me, because He *delighted* in me” (Psa. xviii. 19).

Caleb and Joshua stood firm upon the ground of grace.

There are a number of key words that are used by Moses, Caleb, Joshua, Israel and the Prophets, the Psalmist and the Apostles afterwards that provide a solemn lesson as we think of helps and hindrances that we meet when we would ‘possess our possessions’. These we must consider together in another study. There is also the great revelation concerning the Amorites, the Canaanites and their spiritual equivalents to be pondered, and the contrast between the original plan to possess the land, and that which was subsequently followed. To these themes we must return and pray that increasing light may be given as we meditate upon these things that have been written for our learning.

No.6. “The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full”

(Gen. xv. 16).
pp. 156 - 159

The reader will remember that we are to consider in this article the meaning or spiritual implications of the words spoken to Abraham concerning the period of affliction that his seed should endure 'For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full' (Gen. xv. 16).

The word translated 'iniquity' is the Hebrew *avon* and without actual reference, we might easily assume that such a word would be employed in Gen. iii. and vi. or xi., or in many places in Genesis where the sons of men are recorded following their evil ways. The fact however is, that *avon* occurs but four times in Genesis. Once it is used in self condemnation by the brethren of Joseph for their unnatural hatred (Gen. xlv. 16), the remaining three have peculiar associations with the evil *seed*. Cain uses it, 'my iniquity' (margin Gen. iv. 13) and he hated his brother; the angel uses it when he spoke of the wickedness of Sodom (Gen. xix. 15). Now just as Israel were debarred their inheritance until the iniquity of the Amorite was completed, so Sodom could not be visited with judgment until Lot had escaped and entered the city of Zoar (Gen. xix. 22).

The four references to 'iniquity' *avon* are therefore closely related, as will be more clearly seen by the following arrangement of the references:

- A | Gen. iv. 13. *Cain*. The murderer and hater of Abel.
Cain was "of that wicked one".
The first of the seed of the serpent and manifested the 'enmity' between them.
- B | Gen. xv. 16. *Amorite*. One of the Canaanite tribes.
The usurping nations, who were spoken of 'after that' in Gen. vi. 4.
- B | Gen. xix. 15. *Sodom*.
Linked by Jude 7 with Gen. vi. 4 and destroyed by fire from heaven.
- A | Gen. xlv. 16. *Israelites*. The word used as a result of the conscience,
but which was followed by repentance and restoration.

The Hebrew word translated 'iniquity' *avon* is derived from *avah* 'to bend, curve, twist, distort' and 'to be perverse', very much as the English word 'wrong' is derived from the idea of being 'wrung' or 'twisted'. So in Lam. iii. 9 it is used of 'crooked' paths, and in Isa. xxiv. 1 it is translated 'turn upside down'.

Seeing that the word is used but four times in the book of Genesis, as compared with 38 occurrences in the remaining books of the law, some specific perversion seems to be implied. We can get confirmation for this particular emphasis by observing the way in which another Hebrew word is used in Genesis namely the verb *chata* "to sin". The first occurrence, Gen. iv. 7 is generally understood to refer to a sin-offering, and if this reference be excluded, then we must read on in Genesis until we come to the twentieth chapter before we come to the word *chata* 'to sin'. The next occurrence of the word, Gen. xxxi. 39 "I bare the loss" has no bearing upon our search, and so we come to Gen. xxxix. 9 before we read the next reference to 'sin'. The two passages that stand out therefore in Genesis as recording specific 'sin', are those that speak of Abimelech's

attempt to interfere with the coming of the true seed through Sarah, and the solicitations of Potiphar's wife.

The iniquity of the Amorite, the bending or twisting of something from its true course is also connected with the attack upon, and the corruption of the true seed. The Amorites being Canaanites were a people upon whom a curse had been pronounced.

To the serpent God said "Thou art cursed above all cattle" (Gen. iii. 14).

To Cain the Lord said "Thou art cursed more than the earth" (Gen. iv. 11).

To Canaan Noah said "Cursed be Canaan" (Gen. ix. 25).

Contrary to common belief no curse was pronounced upon either Adam or Eve; the ground was cursed for their sakes. The first man to be cursed was Cain, and the N.T. declares that 'he was of that wicked one', and the second was Canaan.

From these references it becomes apparent that there is a cursed line running parallel with that of the true seed, and the subject is of such importance that we must extend our survey, and in order to impress this terrible pedigree of the false seed upon the mind, let us set out the testimony of the Scriptures in tabular form:

- (1) Enmity declared between the two seeds (Gen. iii. 15).
- (2) Enmity is the meaning of the name "Job", and the book of Job sets forth the conflict of the ages and the attack of Satan upon one who was "perfect" i.e. one of the true seed (Job i. and ii.).
- (3) Cain was "of that wicked one" (I John iii. 12) and his line is not included in subsequent genealogies (Gen. v. 1; I Chron. i. 1).
- (4) Noah was "perfect in his generations" (Gen. vi. 9) and is placed in contrast with "all flesh" that had corrupted its way on the earth.
- (5) The sons of God (Gen. vi.; Job i. 6) are fallen angels. These are said to have kept not their first estate, but to have left their own habitation and are likened to Sodom, having gone after strange flesh (Jude 6, 7).
- (6) The result of the irruption of the fallen angels was a race of abnormal men, called "giants" or *nephilim* "fallen ones" (Gen. vi. 4).
- (7) There was a subsequent corruption of the race "after that", that is after the Flood (Gen. vi. 4), and as the purpose of God was now focused upon the line of Shem, so the attack of the evil one was concentrated upon the land promised to Abraham, "The Canaanite was *then* in the land" (Gen. xii. 6).
- (8) The descendants of Canaan are named in Gen. x. 6-19, with whom are allied Nimrod the rebel and founder of Babylon (Gen. x. 8-10). These descendants are Sidon, Heth, The Jebusite, the Amorite, the Girgasite, the Hivite, the Arkite, the Sinite, the Arvadite, the Zemarite and the Hamathite. Some of the descendants of Canaan are not mentioned anywhere else in the Scriptures, except once more in the genealogical table of I Chron. i., and it may be that all were not contaminated. All were not 'giants' as were the Amorites.
- (9) It will be observed that there is no son of Canaan named Jebus, or Amor, or Girga. There is a strange departure from the normal in the genealogy of Gen. x. All we know is that Canaan begat Sidon his firstborn, and Heth, but whether the father of the Jebusites, was a son named Jebus, or whether the father of the Amorites was a son

named Amor, Scripture is silent, but this strange departure in the writing of a genealogy lifts out into prominence these Canaanite tribes.

- (10) Og, king of Bashan, an Amorite (Deut. xxxi. 4) is called “Of the remnant of the giants” (Deut. iii. 11). Giants had dwelt in this vicinity “in old time” (Deut. ii. 20), and Bashan was called “the land of the giants” (Deut. iii. 13). In connection with which the reader should consult *The Giant Cities of Bashan* by Porter.
- (11) A special tribe of the Canaanites was descended from Arba. He is said to have been a great man among the Anakim, and gave his name to the city of Kirjath-arba, afterwards called Hebron (Josh. xiv. 15).
- (12) The Anakim were described as “tall” and the name means “long necked”. These struck terror in the heart of the ten spies who brought back an evil report. In their sight, Israel felt as “grasshoppers” (Numb. xiii. 28) and the saying was repeated “who can stand before the children of Anak?” (Deut. ix. 2).
- (13) Some of the “giants” remained unto the days of David, notably Goliath (I Sam. xvii. 4) and Ishbi-benob, Saph, a brother of Goliath and an unnamed man of great stature who had “on every hand six fingers, and on every foot six toes” (II Sam. xxi. 16-22).
- (14) The parable of “the wheat and the tares” declares that the “good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one, and the enemy that sowed them is the devil” (Matt. xiii. 38, 39). No other end but to be gathered out and burned is said of the tares. They are evidently a counterfeit of the true seed, for not until the harvest is it possible to discriminate without endangering the true seed.
- (15) The Saviour discriminates between “My Father” and “your father” saying “If God were your Father, ye would love Me”, “ye are of your father the devil . . . He was a murderer from the beginning” so linking up with the “iniquity” of Cain (John viii. 38-44).
- (16) Some were called by the Lord “serpents” and “generations of vipers” (Matt. xxiii. 33), and He asked “How can ye escape the damnation of hell (gehenna)?” This denunciation is preceded by words that are reminiscent of Gen. xv. “The iniquity of the Amorite was not yet full” for He said “Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers” (Matt. xxiii. 32).
- (17) The Apostle Paul was withstood by a sorcerer named Bar-Jesus, significant name! who was also called Elymas, which by interpretation means a “sorcerer”. The Apostle called him “a child of the devil” (Acts xiii. 10), and his evil attitude is described as “perverting” the right ways of the Lord.
- (18) Just as the Amorites barred the way and prevented Israel from entering into their inheritance, so the Apostle says “we wrestle not against flesh and blood (even as Israel were told ‘meddle not’ with Esau or with Ammon in Deut. ii. 5, 19), but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high (or heavenly) places” (Eph. vi. 12). These principalities were “spoiled” and “made a show of openly” at the cross (Col. ii. 15) and were led captive at the Ascension (Eph. iv. 8) even as in type Joshua took the thirty-one kings (Josh. xii. 9-24).
- (19) John in his first epistle differentiates between “the children of God” and “the children of the devil”, and instances “Cain who was of that wicked one” (I John iii. 10-12).
- (20) In the book of the Revelation, we learn that at the time of the end, there will be those who say they are Jews, and are not, but who are “the synagogue of Satan” (Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9) and they who hold “the doctrine of Balaam” (Rev. ii. 14); a false prophetess named Jezebel (Rev. ii. 20), together with some who have “known the depths of Satan” (Rev. ii. 24), while the Laodiceans were about to be “spued out” of the Lord’s mouth (Rev. iii. 16), a figure that reminds us of the Canaanites who were “spued out” of the land (Lev. xviii. 28). They are summed up as “earth dwellers” whose names are not written in the book of life (Rev. xiii. 8). They are the false seed. When Babylon falls,

the true seed enter into their inheritance, even as at the filling up of the iniquity of the Amorite, Israel entered into theirs, and in the seven last plagues is “filled up the wrath of God” (Rev. xv. 1).

Here in these twenty items we have given little more than a catalogue; if each passage cited is considered in the light of the context, it seems impossible to avoid the doctrine of the two seeds, a doctrine which not only illuminates the purpose of the ages, but is the theme of that most ancient book, the book of Job, which sheds light on Gen. iii., vi., the extermination of the Canaanites, and a many doctrinal and dispensational subject. It is this that makes the passages in Gen. xv. of such importance, and which by application illuminates the conflict that the Church of the One Body must expect while “principalities and powers” are “the rulers of the darkness of this world”.

**No.7. “Ye have compassed this mountain long enough.”
pp. 178 - 180**

It is a fact that should be reiterated until its significance is realized, that the FIRST BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT were the epistles of Paul. The Church has elected to travel by way of the Gospels and the Acts, even as Israel wandered their forty years, but that fact remains that the initial revelation of Divine grace was not accepted except by the minority.

The story of Israel’s failure under Moses and eventual triumph under Joshua is recorded in the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua. Deuteronomy is so called because the law was given a second time, and is taken from Deut. xvii. 18, where “copy of the law” is spoken in Rabbinic writings as the *Mishneh* or “doubling” and which the LXX translates *deuteronomion* “repetition of the law”. It is the time of restatement, after the period of wandering is over. The first four chapters of Deuteronomy were spoken by Moses “on this side Jordan in the wilderness, in the plain over against the Red Sea”. The “plain” is the *Arabah*, the name of the valley that extends southward from the Jordan. There is a world of feeling in the retrospect which is spoken in parenthesis:

“(There are eleven days journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea)”,

even as the poet has expressed it:

“The saddest words of tongue or pen
It might have been”

Moses, however, apart from the expression of regret, passes to the immediate present:

“And it came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month”,

and only reviews the past, in order to prepare the children of Israel for the tests of faith and endurance that now awaited them.

“The LORD our God spake unto us in Horeb, saying ‘Ye have dwelt long enough in this mount’.” (Deut. i. 6).

This command came on the twentieth day of the second month of the second year after Israel’s exodus from Egypt, as Numb. x. 11 records and with standards held aloft and with the camp in marching order, the move was made that might have ended in a speedy entry into the land of promise. Weakness, failure, rebellion, murmuring however are soon revealed to their undoing. These signs of weakness are as follows:

- (1) Moses. “I am not able to bear you alone” (Deut. i. 9).
- (2) Israel. “Ye came near unto me, every one of you, and said ‘We will send men before us’.” (Deut. i. 22).
- (3) Israel. “Ye murmured in your tents.”
“Ye did not believe the Lord your God” (Deut. i. 27, 32).
- (4) Moses. “Thou shalt no go in thither” (Deut. i. 37).
- (5) Israel. “Went presumptuously up into the hill” (Deut. i. 43).

It will be seen that there is a blend of human frailty and human perversity in this record. Moses refers to his own inability to cope with the duties that belonged to his office, and this must be read together with the record given in Exod. xviii. There we discover that it was at the suggestion of Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, that arrangements were made to spread some of the arduous work of administration.

“And when Moses’ father in law saw all that he did to the people, he said, Thou wilt surely wear away” (Exod. xviii. 14-18).

Whether the advice of Jethro was prompted by Divine or worldly wisdom we cannot tell; the main fact stands out clearly, that, strong and wise and endowed as Moses must have been, he was after all human and consequently frail. Moses moreover represented “the law” and not till Moses was dead could Joshua, the type of Christ, rise up and go over Jordan. Great and glorious as was Moses, type and foreshadowing as he was of the Prophet that should be raised up “like unto” himself, the fact that he places this acknowledgment “I am not able to bear you myself alone” and records that he spoke these words “at that time” is suggestive.

The sending of the spies, and the murmuring of the people were symptoms of a deadly unbelief which brought about their fall:

“Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it” (Heb. iii. 12; iv. 1, 2).

The R.V. reads in verse 2 “because they were not united by faith with them that heard”. “Them that heard” the word and believed, were men like Caleb and Joshua, those who sided with the ten spies and their evil report were those who were not united by faith

to the faithful two. The only other occurrence of *sunkerannumi* is in I Cor. xii. 24 “God *hath tempered* the body *together*”. All Israel were “baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat” (I Cor. x. 1-4); they were all, at least typically “saved” people, but the record continues “But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness” (I Cor. x. 5). Among the items picked out by the Apostle for our warning is the fact that “murmuring” ended in their destruction, even as in Philippians, the same Apostle, writing to believers of the high calling, warned against “murmuring” and those whose end is “waste” (destruction A.V.), and whose god was their belly (Phil. ii. 14; iii. 19).

The weakness and the perverseness of the human heart it will be seen early manifested itself in both leader and people, pointing on, in the first instance to Joshua who led the people in, and ultimately to the Lord, for it is written “If Jesus (i.e. Joshua) had given them rest” David would not have still spoken of that rest as future (Heb. iv. 8).

The remainder of the first chapter of Deuteronomy is occupied with the rebellion and the forty years’ wandering. Chapter ii. sums up that dreadful experience in the words of verse 1:

“Then we turned, and took our journey into the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea, as the Lord spake unto me: and we compassed Mount Seir many days” (Deut. ii. 1).

At the end of this period the Lord again spoke:

“Ye have compassed this mountain long enough: turn you northward” (Deut. ii. 3).

There is a world of frustration in that word “compass”. The same Hebrew word gives us “whirl about” (Eccles. i. 6); “wind about” (Ezek. xli. 7); “driven back” (Psa. cxiv. 3, 5).

We are not of them that “draw back unto perdition (or waste)” said the Apostle with an eye on this tragedy of wasted effort and breach of promise. Abraham knew something of this blank, unprofitable period (Gen. xii. 7 and xiii. 18), the intervening descent into Egypt and the dwelling with Lot being so much waste of precious time, mercifully blotted out, but waste nevertheless.

New directions however are given to Israel. No longer are they told to go up by way of the mountain of the Amorites, their route is altered and led by way of the lands of Esau, Moab and Ammon. We too must take it to heart, that while the basic truth of Ephesians and Philippians remains to us, practical and experimental modifications are observable in II Timothy, the last epistle of Paul. We cannot now “go up by way of the mountain”. Fellowship which is rich and full in Ephesians and Philippians is absent from II Timothy, where the insistence there is on “thyself”. We look with longing at the record of the Philippian assembly, but know that no such fellowship will again be manifested on earth. Rather the sphere and atmosphere of our service is indicated in the fourth chapter of II Timothy, where loneliness rather than the encouragement of “striving together” may be our lot.

Meditations on Psalm LI

No.8. The inner character of sin indicated (verses 4 - 6). p. 80

When David said “Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned”, no one doubts but that he *included* the treachery of his act against his fellow man Uriah the Hittite; the recognition that he had sinned against God in sinning against his fellow man, instead of belittling his crime, only made it the greater. Had David left the matter there, no problem would have arisen. He made, however, a fuller and more complicated statement than that, one that touches very high doctrine, and has caused many controversies, and which provided the Apostle Paul with an argument in the development of the teaching of the epistle to the Romans.

“Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight: that Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou judgest” (Psa. li. 4).

Following this theological comment, David makes another reference to his sin; and as before, he goes outside of his own immediate action.

“Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me” (Psa. li. 5).

On the Threshold

pp. 237, 238

Under this heading as opportunity occurs, we are printing a series of short meditations, originally designed to accompany a daily reading. We have, as a matter of interest, retained the original date heading, and the reader will understand why we have entitled this series "On the Threshold", for in 1909, we commenced the series entitled "Dispensational Expositions" in *Things to Come* and at the same time No.1, Volume I of *The Berean Expositor* was published. There is nothing very striking about this simple little series, it sought then to minister to the heart's need and that need is as great today if not greater.

January 5th, 1908

*"What things soever ye desire, when ye pray,
believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them" (Mark xi. 24).*

There is such a thing as making one's self believe, and this can produce but "make believe" prayer. There is such a thing as a desire, which as James iv. 2 says receive not. "Ye desire, and have not, ye ask and receive not." True prayer is the outcome of true faith inwrought by the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii. 26 "We know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us". "Strength for much has the prayer of a righteous man when it is inworked (by God)." "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me." "No good thing will He withhold, from those who walk uprightly." "He will fulfil the desires of them that fear Him." True prayer is accompanied by a consistent life, and it is vain to imagine that our desires will be granted if we are not seeking to please the Lord.

Compare and ponder well the parallel verse in I John iii. 21, 22 "Beloved, if our hearts know nothing against us, then have we boldness toward God. And whatsoever we ask we receive of *Him because we keep His commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in His sight*".

*"Fear not, for I have redeemed thee,
I have called thee by thy name" (Isa. xliii. 1).*

What gracious assurance is here given to the child of God! Let us notice its basis "I have redeemed thee". Let us pause over this statement. First, our assurance is secure because it depends not upon ourselves but the Lord, "*I have*". We are not to look for our security, at *our* goodness, *our* frames of mind, but look away to Him Who quickeneth the dead, Who chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world. Praise God! He has not left us to the doubtful issues of human strength, but says "*Fear not for I have*". Secondly, assurance rests upon the finished Work of Christ. Until sin has been dealt with, until the awful debt has been paid and justice satisfied, we have every reason to fear, but when once in infinite mercy the Lord reveals to us the Saviour, the spotless Sin offering, bearing our sins and providing us with righteousness, from that moment we hear the

words "*Fear not for I have redeemed thee*". Thirdly, "I have called thee by thy name". The child of God has here another ground of assurance. He is known individually; he is redeemed as a known sinner; he is called by name. He has no fear of being lost in the mass, for the Lord knows all His sheep. The final note of cheer is "thou art Mine". Redemption has paid the price, Grace has quickened us to life and led us to Christ and now that we belong to Him, surely we have every reason to rejoice and to "*Fear not*".

(At the end of this year 1908, we had an interview with Dr. Bullinger which brought us into association with *The Companion Bible* and *Things to Come*, and led to the witness now known as The Berean Forward Movement. We trust, however, far we have traveled since January 1908, we have traveled "with Him").

One Lord

“Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one LORD” (Deut. vi. 4).

**No.6. The term “Economy” as applied to
the doctrine of the Trinity.
pp. 14 - 19**

The Creeds, and the Athanasian Creed in particular, are the products of controversy, of attempts so to define and safeguard the truth, as to refute error, and preserve the truth intact for all time. In such an atmosphere, there is always the danger of overstatement, of pushing a truth to extremes in the attempt to emphasize its worth, or to safeguard it from corruption. To appreciate the reason for the language employed in the Athanasian Creed, one would need to be acquainted with the heresies of Arians, Macedonians, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Socinians, Sabellians and many others. When we perceive that this was the atmosphere in which the creeds were formed, we can well expect that on many occasions men with the best intentions will be found ‘putting out the hand, to stay the ark of God’. In this controversy concerning the Trinity, we shall find that ‘The Father’ is given *the supreme place* in the Godhead, that the ‘Son’ is at one time spoken of as co-eternal with the Father, as other times “*derived*” from the Father, and this again because of its necessary implications corrected and preserved from its logical consequences by the invention of the phrase ‘The eternal generations of the Son’. No wonder Dr. South said, when dealing with this vexed question:

“The Trinity is a fundamental article of the Christian religion, and he that denieth it may lose his soul, so he who strives to understand it may lose his wits!”

If this is the considered opinion of a theologian, it is evident that something is seriously amiss. We will introduce the inquiry that must next occupy our most earnest and prayerful attention by quoting from ‘The orations of Athanasius against the Arians’. And first, a word of explanation may be called for that the term ‘Arian’ may be understood. Arius, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria in the fourth century, believed that the Son was the first of all *created* beings, not one with the Father, nor equal to Him, and it was to the confutation of the errors of Arius that the Athanasian creed owes its inception. Dr. Newman says ‘I am sure at least that S. Athanasius frequently adduces passages in proof of points of controversy, which no one would see to be proofs, unless apostolic tradition were taken into account, first as suggesting, then as authoritatively ruling this meaning’. This admission by Newman should be borne in mind as we place before the reader some of the arguments used by Athanasius. Further, in order that the reader may not miss the purpose of these quotations, we suggest that the arguments adduced by Athanasius *would have been true* had John i. 1 been written as follows:

“In the beginning was the SON, and the Son was with the FATHER and the SON was the FATHER.”

This is monstrous, but is the only conclusion that the creed reaches, however it be ringed around with verbal safeguards. Throughout the battle of the creeds, it is assumed by contestants of both sides that 'The Father' is the title of God in His essence and from all Eternity, that before creation, before time, God was 'The Father'. In later times, this has been most dogmatically stressed by such writers as Dr. Cudworth, who died in 1688. He said:

"The three persons of the Trinity are three distinct spiritual substances, but the Father alone is truly and properly God, that He alone in the proper sense is supreme, and that absolute honour is due to Him only, and that He absolutely speaking, is the only God of the universe, the Son and the Spirit being God, but only by the Father's concurrence with them and their subordination or subjection to Him" (R. Nelson).

Here is the logical consequence of projecting the title 'Father' back to the beginning, making it a title of *Essence*, instead of one of the *assumptions* of Ineffable Deity, yet we believe that 999 out of every 1,000 that have recited the Creed, have, and do conjure up in their minds some such Trinity as Dr. Cudworth has so frankly yet so dreadfully admitted. Here are some of the arguments of Athanasius, all marred by the same fatal mistake:

"Tell us then, you blasphemers, what was it which had a being before the Son had any?"

"He has always been what He is now, the Father of the Son."

"And to the same purpose and effect is that other proposition of yours, 'the Son was not before He was begotten'."

"The Scriptures declare our Saviour to have existed from all eternity in union with the Father."

"The generation of the Son is not like that of a man, which requires an existence after that of the Father, but the Son of God must, as such, have been begotten from all eternity."

"If the Word did not exist from all eternity with the Father, then there was not a trinity from all eternity."

"We detest and abominate the wild blasphemies of the Arians, and we know and confess that the Son existed from everlasting."

"There is nothing in which the Son is more expressly and evidently the character and image of the Father, than in that absolute and unvariable state of being which He derives from the Father."

Is the writer, or the reader, a blasphemer, when he answers Athanasius' question "What was it which had a beginning before the *Son* had any?" by quoting the Scripture "In the beginning was the *Word*" for "The *Word* was made flesh". He was "The *Word*" before He became "The *Son*". Can we not perceive that where the Scriptures speak of the *Word*, the *Form* and the *Image*, Athanasius persists in speaking of the *Son*? He maintains that the Scriptures declare the Son to have existed from all eternity in union with the Father, but quotes no Scripture in proof. Where he does quote proof texts they speak not of the 'Saviour' nor 'The Son' nor of 'The Father', and inasmuch as the Scripture emphasizes that God is one, his regret that 'then there was not a Trinity from all eternity' may have been actually expressing a sublime and solemn truth!

Bishop Pearson, a recognized authority on the Creed says:

“That God is the proper and eternal Father of His eternal Son—that in the very name Father there is something of eminence which is not in the Son: and some kind of priority we must ascribe to Him we call the First, in respect of Him we call the Second Person.” This priority he says

“Consisteth of this, that the Father hath the essence in Himself, the Son by communication from the Father, from whence He acknowledgeth that He is *from Him*, that He *liveth by Him*, that the Father *gave Him* to have life in Himself.”

“He must be understood to have Godhead communicated to Him by the Father, Who is not only eternally, but originally God.”

Had Bishop Pearson confined these comments to the relation that existed between the Father and the Son *during that Son’s life in the flesh*, after He had made Himself of no reputation and had been found in the form of a servant and found in fashion as a man, all would be well, but because the Bishop and the orthodox persist in teaching that the Trinity is eternal, that the essence of the Godhead from all eternity is a Trinity, logical and Scriptural writers descend to such awful statements that “He must be understood to have the GODHEAD communicated to Him by the Father, Who is not only eternally but **ORIGINALLY GOD**”! How men who endorse the Athanasian Creed can tolerate such terms is beyond understanding. The fatal concept, that the Father is:

“The fountain of the Godhead, owned
And foremost of the Three”,

is categorically denied by the Creed they seek to uphold, which says “In this Trinity none is afore or after other, none is greater, or less than another”.

See how men of God, when once they make one fatal mistake, are compelled to make others. Bishop Pearson speaks of ‘priority’ and ‘first’ of the Father, but any who know the epistle to the Colossians could quote passages which give these titles to the Son. If we can but see that the Trinity is a mode of the Godhead assumed in time for the purpose of Creation and for Redemption, but that before the world was, before Creation came into being God was essentially ONE, we shall have taken a step nearer to the truth of the great and holy subject. Moses Stuart has this to say on the subject, which is very much to the point:

“There can be no doubt in the mind of any man who carefully examines, that the Nicene fathers and the Greek commentators, one and all, held that Christ, as to His *divine nature* was DERIVED from the Father Yet we may well ask the question—WE CANNOT HELP ASKING IT, Is then the Son, Who is *God over all blessed for ever*—is he, in His DIVINE nature, *derived and dependent*? Has He, as *very God an aitia* (a cause) and an *arche* (a beginning)? And is it possible for us to make the idea of *true and proper divinity* harmonize with that of *derivation* and consequent *dependence*? No; it is not Their views of the divine nature were built on the metaphysical philosophy of their day; but we are not bound to admit this philosophy as correct; nor is it indeed possible, now, for our minds to admit it.”

One writer on the subject has said:

“The consummation of creation is to consist of the return of the *logos* from the humanity of Christ to the Father, so that the original Trinity of the Divine nature is after

all held to have been temporarily compromised, and only in the end will it be restored that God may be all in all.”

Here the titles “*Father*” and “*Son*” are kept in their place as relative terms. Tertullian is said to have introduced the term *oikonomia* into the answer to the problem, meaning by its use to teach this, that the Trinity is not to be affirmed of God in the Absolute sense, but was *assumed* by God for the economies and dispensations of Creation and Redemption. Appendix 4 of *The Companion Bible* has this note “Elohim is God the Son, the living ‘WORD’ in a Divine form *to create*” (John i. 1; Col. i. 15-17; Rev. iii. 14); and later, with *human* form to redeem (John i. 14). Dr. John Kaye, Bishop of Lincoln, said of the attitude of Clement of Alexandria:

“The whole tenor of the passage proves that Clement ascribed all the attributes of the Godhead to Christ: but when He is spoken of as the Son, with reference to the Father, or as sent forth by the Father to conduct the economy, the relation itself implies a certain subordination or inferiority.”

“Clement then dilates on the impossibility of describing God, or giving him a proper name, ‘for whatever has a name must have been generated or begotten’ Before creation was, He was God, He was good; and on this account He chose to be Creator and Father Inasmuch as the cause or beginning of anything is always most difficult to be discovered, God, Who is the Beginning and Cause of existence to all things, can never be described by words. You cannot apply to Him the terms, genus, difference, species, atom, number, accident, subject of accident, whole, part, figure; nor can any name be properly or essentially given Him. When we call Him One, or the Good, or Mind, or the Existent, or Father, or God, or Creator, or Lord, we do not profess to give His name; but through inability to discover more appropriate terms, apply these honourable appellations in order that the thought may have whereon to rest. These appellations do not simply express the Deity, but are collectively indicative of the power of the Almighty. Names are given with reference either to some quality of the thing named, or to the relation to some other thing; but neither of these circumstances is applied to God.”

Clement of Alexandria seems to have seen the truth far more clearly than Athanasius whose creed so dominates the mind of many. “Economy, relations, subordination, inferiority”. Here in a truer sense he distinguishes “substance” from “person”.

Dr. Burton of Oxford wrote: “It will be observed that the sense which the church has attached to the *Son of God* is strictly *literal*; by which I mean that she takes the term *Son* in the same *sense* which it bears in ordinary language Whereas every other hypothesis, not excepting the Arian uses the *Son* in a figurative or metaphorical sense What would be said of a philosophical writer who used the relative terms *Father* and *Son*, who spoke of the *two Beings* acting toward each other, loving each other, as human fathers and human sons, and yet expect his readers not to understand these *two Beings* to be *distinct* and separate Persons?”

Bishop Burton wrote: “The Father is not the true God without the Son or the Holy Spirit, and therefore to call the Father the true God (John xvii. 3) does not exclude the

Son.” The reader is reminded that No.5 of this series is devoted to the consideration of the term “The only true God”.

In the O.T. we read ‘like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him’ but the title here is “The Lord” Who is likened to ‘a father’. Rotherham’s version is nearer to the original and reads:

“Like the compassion of a father for his children.”

If any will quote Psa. lxxxix. 26 “Thou art my father, my God” he should remember that the language is prophetic and actually applies to the future exaltation of Christ “I will make Him My Firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth” (Psa. lxxxix. 27). Nowhere in the O.T. is God revealed as “Father”; *there* the great Name of God is “Jehovah”.

It can be said without risk of denial, that God is not revealed as “Father” until the Word was made flesh and was seen as “The only begotten of the Father” (John i. 14). The two titles Father and Son are relative terms, neither can be true apart from the other. To speak of ‘the eternal generations of the Son’ is to misuse language, and rob us of the One Mediator “Himself Man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. ii. 5 R.V. margin). Those who invented the term meant well; they were defending the Deity of Christ, but by their anxiety, they make Him *for ever* dependent, *for ever* derived, *for ever* owing His existence to another, which immediately destroys His essential Deity, and if we use their language, we shall be compelled to adopt the language of Cudworth already quoted and by giving supreme honour to the Father, and by refraining from giving *equal honour to the Son*, we shall eventually find ourselves condemned by the words of John v. 23:

“That all men should honour the Son, EVEN AS they honour the Father, He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent Him.”

If we misuse the word ‘person’ if we insist that the Trinity is ‘essence’ and do not perceive that it is ‘economical’ or ‘dispensational’, we shall reap the consequences that come from attempting the impossible.

“Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?” (Job xi. 7).

To us, the mystery of God is resolved in the face of Jesus Christ, and the mystery of godliness is that God was manifest in the flesh, and Ezekiel in the overwhelming and complicated imagery of his opening vision sees at length the resolution of the mystery, saying:

“Upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of A MAN above upon it” (Ezek. i. 26).

Not only does dispensational truth discover the callings of the redeemed their several spheres of inheritance, the differings ages and their goals, it illuminates the very assumptions of the Invisible God, Who for the purposes of Creation is revealed as *Elohim*, for the carrying out of the purpose of the ages, is revealed as *Jehovah*; for the

purpose of Redemption is revealed as the *Son*. Sabellius, Arius and other ‘heretics’ were desperately wrong in their ultimate conclusions, but how far those other ‘heretics’ who are now accepted as champions of orthodoxy were responsible, in their wordy battles for pushing others to such extremes, only the Judgment Seat will reveal. Zeal is good, zeal without knowledge is deadly, zeal that becomes a persecuting flame is self destructive.

No.7. To Whom is Creation ascribed in the N.T.? pp. 31 - 35

“I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth”

-- (The Apostles’ Creed, Common Prayer).

“There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost”

-- (Article I of the XXXIX articles. Common Prayer).

Those who framed the Book of Common Prayer appear to have entertained consciously or unconsciously the conception of the Godhead which we have already examined in No.6 of this series. Let us proceed with our study and note what the Scriptures say concerning the Creator. The word ‘Creator’ occurs but three times in the O.T. (Eccles. xii. 1; Isa. xl. 28; xliii. 15) and but twice in the N.T. (Rom. i. 25; I Pet. iv. 19). Isaiah names the Creator as “The everlasting God, the LORD”, which Dr. Young translates, literally “The God of the Age, Jehovah”. If our contention set out in No.3 of this series be accepted, namely that Jesus Christ, God manifest in the flesh, is the Jehovah of the O.T. Isa. xl. 28 points not to God the Father, but to the Son as the Creator. Isa. xliii. 15 is part of a statement. The speaker is “the LORD your Redeemer”. Now the word ‘Redeemer’ is the “Kinsman Redeemer” (Heb. *gaal*), so fully set out in the book of Ruth. The self-same word that is used in Isa. xliii. 14 is translated ‘near kinsman’ in Ruth iii. 9, and is the one Job believed should stand upon the earth in the latter day. Isaiah, who not only wrote by inspiration of God, but was jealous of the glory of the God he served, had no compunction in linking together the name Jehovah, next of kin, Creator and King, every one of which titles belong to the Son of God, and one of them, *next of kin*, belonging to Him alone. It can never be said that ‘God the Father’ is our near kinsman, but it is the glory of the gospel that *this* is the peculiar glory of the Saviour. Rom. i. 25 speaks of the coming in of idolatry, saying that those who so grievously sinned:

“Changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever. Amen.”

Did this passage stand alone, we could not use it to indicate whether the Father or the Son was in the writer’s mind, but if we read on we come to Rom. ix., where the Apostle, speaking of the privileges of being an Israelite, says:

“Of Whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. ix. 5).

The Creator is “blessed for ever. Amen”. The Son of God is “over all, God blessed for ever. Amen”.

Again the reader is turned, not to the Father, but to the Son. The reference in I Pet. iv. 19 links “the faithful Creator” with “God” and so leaves the question of the Father and the Son untouched. Turning to the N.T. for specific teaching concerning the Person of the Creator, we note that the A.V. of Eph. iii. 9 speaks of the mystery ‘which had been hid in God Who created all things *by Jesus Christ*’, but the R.V. omits the words ‘by Jesus Christ’ and this is the unanimous opinion of all textual critics. Whatever we have discovered therefore through the testimony of the O.T. will apply here, namely, the God Who created all things is Jehovah, the Kinsman Redeemer of His people. It is axiomatic, that He Who built ALL THINGS is God (Heb. iii. 4), and we will keep this fact before us as we continue our search. The ascription of praise to Him Who created all things is given by the living ones (wrongly called ‘beasts’) in Rev. iv. to the One Who sat upon the rainbow circled Throne. To Him the four living ones that had six wings about him, cried “Holy, Holy, Holy, LORD GOD Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come” (Rev. iv. 8). Isaiah saw a vision in the Temple and in it the seraphim, each having *six wings*, cried “Holy, Holy, Holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of His glory” (Isa. vi. 2, 3) and John says that in this vision, Isaiah said these things “when he saw His glory and spake of Him” (John xii. 41). The other titles in Rev. iv. “Lord God Almighty” and He “which was, and is, and is to come” we must leave for a future consideration, but the reader can find these passages for himself.

Again in Rev. xiv., the terms of ‘the everlasting gospel’ include the worship of Him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. Here, no other title is given to the Creator than “God” (Rev. xiv. 7). In Acts xvii. the God that made the world and all things therein, in Whom all live and move and have their being, is the Lord that men should seek “if haply they might feel after Him and find Him” (Acts xvii. 24-28). We must defer an examination of these words until we have compelled our survey of the references to the Creator in the N.T. Up till now the references use the titles “Lord, God and Almighty”, without any specific indication as to whether the Father or the Son is directly intended.

We now come to passages where the reference to Christ is specific.

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. ALL THINGS were made by Him; and without Him was NOT ANY THING made that was made He was in the world, and the WORLD was made by Him, and the world knew Him not” (John i. 1-10).

Here we have explicit, unambiguous, exclusive testimony. The creation of ‘all things’, the Maker of ‘the world’ is He Who in the fullness of time was made flesh, and tabernacled among us, Whose glory was:

“The glory as of the only begotten of the Father” (John i. 14).

“UNOT THE SON He saith, Thy throne O GOD and Thou, LORD, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands Thou art the same Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and for ever” (Heb. i. 8, 10, 12; xiii. 8).

We know now Who it was that answered Job out of the whirlwind and asked him “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?” (Job xxxviii. 4); it was Him Who is called “The Word”. Now we know that the Psalmist addressed Him Who is ‘The Word’ when he said:

“Of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth: and the heavens are the works of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure” (Psa. cii. 25, 26).

He is addressed by the Psalmist as LORD (Jehovah) verse 1, and “My God” in verse 24, anticipating by centuries the confession of Thomas “My Lord, and My God”.

“His dear Son”, the One in Whom we have redemption, Who is the Image of the invisible God, the Firstborn of every creature, is the One to whom universal creation is ascribed by Paul in Col. i.:

“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” (Col. i. 16).

At the close of Rev. iv., the six winged worshippers say:

“Thou hast created ALL THINGS, and for Thy pleasure they are, and were created” (Rev. iv. 11).

We know from these Scriptures that this ascription of glory, honour and power, is directed to Him Who is the Image of the Invisible God, the Word, the One Who is addressed in Heb. i. as “God” and “Lord”, Who laid the foundations of the earth, and Whose hands made the heavens. Nothing can be more explicit than the testimony of John i., Heb. i. and Col. i. To believe what these passages teach, makes it impossible for any one at the same time to confess:

“I believe in God the Father Almighty, *Maker of heaven and earth*”,

for creation is *never* ascribed to the Father, but *always* to Him Who in fullness of time became flesh and dwelt among us, the Only begotten Son of God.

We return to Rev. iv., and to Acts xvii. to pick up the threads that were for the time left ungathered. The Creator in Rev. iv. 8 is called “Lord God Almighty”. In Rev. xix. 6 we read “Alleluia: for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth” and in Rev. xi. 17 “We give Thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, Which art, and wast and art to come; because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast reigned”. In each passage, identical language is found in the original:

Kurios ho Theos ho pantokrator.

Who is the Lord, God Omnipotent? It is He Who is “King of kings and Lord of lords” (Rev. xix. 16). What is His name, is it known? Yes, and no.

“He had a name written, that no man knew, but He Himself” yet “His name is called The WORD OF GOD” (Rev. xix. 12, 13).

He Who takes to Himself His great power and reigns is Christ which Rev. xi. follows by saying “Thy wrath is come” (Rev. xi. 18). At that time of judgment, this is declared to be “the wrath of the LAMB” (Rev. vi. 16).

Returning once again to Rev. iv., we noted that the title ‘which was, and is, and is to come’ is given (Rev. iv. 8). In chapter i. this title is assumed by Christ (Rev. i. 8) and is used again in chapter xi. Here however a somewhat remarkable feature demands attention. All the critical texts, and the Revised Version read “Which art and which wast” omitting the words ‘and which art to come’ for the glorious reason, *He is here seen as having come*. The name Jehovah was assumed by the Invisible God as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, saying, “This is My name *unto the age*, and this is My memorial *unto all generations*” (Exod. iii. 15). This is not correctly translated by the title “Eternal” for ‘the age’ and ‘generations’ are within the limits of time. The glory of the name Jehovah is that it will *be fulfilled*, and pass away, even as it is the glory of the office Priest, and at long last, even “The Son also Himself” shall be subject unto Him that did put all things under Him “That GOD”, not *Elohim*, nor *Jehovah*, nor *El Shaddai*, nor the *Father*, nor the *Son*, nor the *Holy Spirit*, but GOD in a sense hitherto unrevealed and uncomprehended by man, shall then be all in all! The Son takes back the glory that was His before the world was, the Son ascends the throne of Deity, the Mediatorial kingdom being finished and the purpose of the ages achieved, all the self-limitations and voluntary humiliation which Creation and Redemption imposed being no longer necessary, the day of Redemption being reached, reconciliation being complete, God will then reveal why creation was called into being; why it was necessary for The Image, The Form, The Word to be assumed; why the relation of Father and Son came in with the Gospel; how it is that no name or collection of names can ever set forth the Infinite; how the ‘Persons’ of the Godhead were assumptions of Deity until seeing through a ‘glass darkly’ gives place to sight.

In Acts xvii. 27 the Apostle Paul, speaking of the Creator, said “That haply they might feel after Him and find Him”. “Feel after Him.” This expression uses the Greek word *pselaphao* “HANDLE Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have” (Luke xxiv. 39). “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes; which we have looked upon, and our hands have HANDLED, of the Word of Life, for the life was manifested” (I John i. 1, 2). Christ in resurrection, the One Who “In the beginning” created all things, Who “from the beginning” in resurrection was “manifested unto us”, was preached by Paul to the philosophers at Athens. They, in the dim light of their philosophy, ‘groped’ (as the word is translated in the O.T. Isa. lix. 10), but the disciples of the Saviour had actually ‘touched’ or ‘felt’ Him (as the first occurrence of the word is translated in Gen. xxvii. 12).

While the Articles of Religion rightly speak of the ‘One living and true God, without body, parts or passions’, we must not allow this man-made article to rob us of the testimony of the Scriptures, that He Who created heavens and earth, could be ‘handled’ by those who beheld Him in the flesh. Why should God say “before Me there was no God FORMED, neither shall there be after Me” (Isa. xliii. 10)? This cannot refer exclusively to the making of idols, for millions of ‘gods’ have been ‘formed’ since Isaiah uttered these words. Israel were chosen to be “Jehovah’s witnesses”, were called upon to know and to believe and to understand “that I am He”. “I, even I, am the LORD; and beside Me there is no Saviour” (Isa. xliii. 10, 11). These words refer to the Son of God, Who in fullness of time was literally and actually ‘formed’. The word translated ‘to form’, the Hebrews word *yatsar* is used by Jeremiah of the forming of a child in the womb (Jer. i. 5), even as in Isa. xlv. 24. In the same chapter that contains the word “no God formed”, Israel is said to be “formed” (Isa. xliii. 1, 7, 21). These are the Words with which the Holy Ghost teacheth (I Cor. ii. 13). Idolatry is the usurpation of the prerogative of Christ, Who is the Image of the Invisible God (Isa. xlv. 10). Calvin looks upon the words “Before Me there was no God formed” as a kind of irony, but in the self-same chapters that reveal that “The Word” and “The Image of the Invisible God”, is the Creator of heaven and earth. We read that “in the BODY OF HIS FLESH” He wrought out our redemption (Col. i. 22), and in the next chapter we are assured that “In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead BODILY” (ii. 9).

It will, we trust, be evident that Creation is nowhere ascribed to “The Father”, but is everywhere to Him, Who being God, became Man; Who is declared to be the Only begotten Son; Who was God manifest in the flesh, Jehovah, He that was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty, the same yesterday, and today, and forever. When the moment comes, which is depicted in Rev. xi., “The mystery of God” shall be finished. What that involves we must consider in a future article.

No.8. The Son of God, The Son of Man. pp. 54 - 58

We discover from the closing verses of John xx., that the whole of this Gospel, and the purpose which regulated the selection of its material, was directed to one end:

“That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and believing ye might have life through His name” (John xx. 31).

Matthew opens his Gospel with the book of the generations of Jesus Christ “The Son of David” (Matt. i. 1), and in Matt. xxii. the Saviour puts the question to the Pharisees:

“What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He? They say unto Him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call Him Lord If David then call Him Lord, how is He his son?” (Matt. xxii. 42-45).

Here, it is evident that there is more in this title “The Son of God” than may at first appear. Earlier in the Gospel of Matthew a deeper depth is sounded, for the Saviour made it very evident that there was a profounder mystery attached to the Person of *the Son*, than was attached to the Person of *the Father*!

“And no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, *and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him*” (Matt. xi. 27).

Again, not only is equal honour to be given to the Father and to the Son, but the solemn words are added:

“He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent Him” (John v. 23),

showing that it is impossible to by-pass in any way, either by worship, doctrine or preaching, the peculiar office of the Son of God. This title “Son” is found in a variety of associations.

- (1) “The Son” as in Matt. xxviii. 19.
- (2) “The Son of God” as in Matt. iv. 3.
- (3) “The Son of David” as in Matt. ix. 27.
- (4) “The Son of Man” as in Matt. viii. 20.
- (5) “The Son of the Highest” as in Luke i. 32.
- (6) “My Beloved Son” as in Matt. iii. 1.
- (7) “His Only begotten Son” as in John iii. 16.

Here are the seven distributions of the title “Son”, the number seven being suggestive.

We must now acquaint ourselves with the way in which the title “The Son of God” occurs, notice the occasions where it is balanced by the title “Son of Man” and also examine carefully the references to the “Begotten” Son. All this is not to be conducted out of mere curiosity; truth, vital truth is at stake, and the Person of the Son is central in the inquiry. The earliest reference to the Son of God is in Luke i. 35. In answer to Mary’s problem, the angel Gabriel said:

“The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.”

After this we learn that Mary stayed with Elizabeth for about three months, until the time for the birth of John the Baptist to take place, when she returned to her own house (Luke i. 56). John the Baptist was called “The prophet of the Highest” (Luke i. 76), in contrast with Mary’s Son Who should be called “The Son of the Highest”. When the days were accomplished (or filled up) that she should be delivered, Mary brought forth her first born Son (Luke ii. 6, 7). While therefore there is a marked difference between John the Baptist and the Saviour, there is no difference in the time and process of their birth. John had a human father, Jesus had no human father, but both had a human mother, and the Child of Mary is called “The Son of God”. In all, there are twenty-seven occurrences of the title in the four Gospels, one in the Acts, fifteen in the epistles and

one in the book of the Revelation. The way in which “The Son of God” is employed in these references is as follows: acknowledged by Satan and those possessed of Devils; taunted with the title at the crucifixion; acknowledged by the disciples and by the centurion; adjured by the High Priest to answer whether he were the Son of God. In John’s Gospel He was acknowledged by the Father at His baptism, by Nathanael, by the man born blind, by Martha, and charged with blasphemy for claiming to be the Son of God. He affirmed that the dead will hear His voice and live, and that He would be glorified in the case of Lazarus and He is the object of faith unto everlasting life. Romans has but one reference to the Son of God and six to The Son:

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

Ephesians has but one reference, where the ‘knowledge’ or the ‘acknowledgment’ of the Son of God lies at the heart of the Unity of the Faith (Eph. iv. 13). The first epistle of John has a number of references to the Son of God, which reach their climax in I John v. 20:

“We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This (‘The same’ as in John i. 2) is the true God, and eternal life” (see also I John i. 1, 2).

To Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, the promise was made:

“Thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John” (Luke i. 13).

To Mary, the mother of the Saviour, the promise was made:

“And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shall bring forth a Son, and shalt call His name Jesus” (Luke i. 31).

Concerning John, the angel said:

“He shall be great in the sight of the Lord”,

and Zacharias prophesied and said:

“And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest” (Luke i. 15, 76).

Concerning the Saviour, the angel said:

“He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David” (Luke i. 32).

Apart from the miraculous conception of the virgin mother, and the high glory of the Son to whom she gave birth, there is no warrant for taking the ‘begetting’ of the Son of God back into eternity. His sonship belongs to time, and is related to His coming in the flesh. The title “The Only Begotten” is the translation of the Greek word *monogenes*,

which occurs nine times in the N.T. Four of these occurrences refer to the children of ordinary human parents:

“Behold, there was a dead man carried out, the only (*monogenes*) son of his mother” (Luke vii. 12).

“Jairus had one only (*monogenes*) daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying” (Luke viii. 42).

“Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is mine only child (*monogenes*)” (Luke ix. 38).

“By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son (*monogenes*)” (Heb. xi. 17).

In each of these instances, a parent’s heart is wrung by the death, sickness, affliction or the commanded sacrifice of an ‘only begotten’ as though it would prepare us to discover in the title, a term of intense endearment, a term that points forward to a sacrificial death, but which in *each case* ended triumphantly in an anticipation of the resurrection. The five remaining passages all refer to Christ. The R.V. margin at John i. 18 tells us that many ancient authorities read *God only begotten* instead of ‘only begotten Son’, and there is a great deal of authority for this extraordinary reading. For the moment therefore we will omit John i. 18 from our list of occurrences, and observe that of the remaining four, three are found in the Gospel according to John, and one in his first epistle. No other writer in the N.T. speaks of Christ as the only begotten Son. If therefore we can see what these passages say of the Only begotten Son of God, we shall know all that God has revealed on the subject.

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

“For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John iii. 16).

“He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God” (John iii. 18).

“In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him” (I John iv. 9).

It will be seen that of these passages, only one, namely the first, makes any statement as to the nature of the only begotten Son of God; the others tell of the love that gave Him and the life that is given to those that believe in Him.

The Word, Who was God, and yet could be with God, in fullness of time “was made flesh”, and this is so vital a doctrine that John says:

“Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God” (I John iv. 2, 3).

The emphasis which the Scriptures place upon the fact that the Word became flesh, that He was of the seed of David according to the flesh, that as concerning the flesh, Christ came of Israel, that it was in the body of His flesh through death that He accomplished reconciliation is of itself a testimony concerning the meaning and intention

of the title “The only Begotten Son” yet this is by no means all. Over against the title “The Son of God” we must place the ever recurring title “The Son of Man”, and the simple reference to the Saviour as a “Man”, and until we do, we shall not have before us the Scriptural picture of the Son of God. The title “The Son of Man” occurs in the N.T. 88 times. The first occurrence is in Matt. viii. 20 where the Saviour uses the title of Himself and of His great humility, not having where to lay His head. The last occurrence in Matthew is where the Saviour claims the prophecy of Daniel to be of Himself and of His Second Coming:

“Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven” (Matt. xxvi. 64).

The last reference in the N.T. is in Rev. xiv. 14, where He Who once had no place to lay His head, is now seen ‘having on His head a golden crown’. The vision of the Son of Man, given in Rev. i. 13-18, was of One Who was dead, but Who is alive for evermore, and has the keys of hell and of death. Every reference to Christ as the Son of Man in the N.T. goes back to the great prophetic use of the title in Psa. viii. There by comparison with I Cor. xv. 23-28, Heb. ii. 5-9 and Eph. i. 22, 23, we see the Lord as the second Man and the last Adam, with ‘all things under His feet’, the Head of the universe. The two titles “The Son of God” and “The Son of Man” are complementary. Neither can be held apart from the other. Both belong to the One Person “The Only Begotten of the Father”. Though He called Himself the Son of Man (Matt. viii. 20), the devils addressed Him as the Son of God in the same chapter (Matt. viii. 29). When He challenged His disciples, saying,

“Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?”

Peter declared, by the revelation of the Father:

“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. xvi. 13, 16).

When Nathanael confessed “Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God”, the Saviour told him that he would see greater things than this, and said “Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man” (John i. 49, 51). Throughout the record, He Who is the Son of Man is the Son of God. There are one or two passages in the N.T. which speak of the relationship of the Son with the Father ‘before the world was’ which obviously must refer to pre-incarnation times, and these are important enough to demand a study to themselves. For the moment we stay to acknowledge that the Son of God is the Son of Man, one blessed and glorious Person.

No.9. A review of some problematic passages.
pp. 72 - 76

“What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before” (John vi. 62).
“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).
“For Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world” (John xvii. 24).

From these wondrous words, we learn that both the Father and the Son, were together and shared a glory before the world was, and before the foundation of the world. In I Pet. i. and in Eph. i. we can read that Christ was foreordained, before the foundation of the world, to be the Lamb, and that the believer to whom Ephesians was addressed was chosen in Him, i.e. Christ, before the foundation of the world.

Let us look at John vi. 62. The title the Son of Man is definitely related to ‘the flesh’; not only is this generally true, but is specifically indicated in John vi. 53. At the Ascension, the Saviour ascended up far above all heavens, and sat down at the right hand of God. Does John vi. 62 teach that *the Son of Man*, as the Son of Man, i.e. as the One Who took part of flesh and blood like unto the children for whom He died, occupied that place in glory before the world was? No Scripture can be found to support such an idea, and no system of teaching, however crazy, has ever maintained the contradictory doctrine, that *before* the Incarnation, *before* the Son of God was born and became “The Man Christ Jesus” that He, as the Man of flesh and blood, was there in the glory before time began. It was the Son of Man Who was speaking, and He was speaking of Himself, but John tells us that in the beginning, when He was with God, He was the Logos, the Word, not the Son. When He made all things, He had life in Himself, and before the Word became flesh, He had this place of glory, and to this He was yet to ascend.

There is an inscription in a public building in Glasgow which informs the reader that King Edward VII laid the foundation stone in a certain year. If the reader took the trouble he would discover that in the year named, *Queen Victoria still lived and reigned*, and Edward VII was, at that date, when he laid that foundation stone the ‘Prince of Wales’, but seeing that the building was not completed until after Victoria had died, and the Prince of Wales had become King, no one who knew the facts would have any difficulty. He who was *at the time* Prince of Wales, had become *at the time* of the announcement, King, so He Who at the time was “The Word”, “The Image”, “The Form of God” was, *at the time* when He uttered the words of John vi. 53 “The Son of Man”. The title “Christ” means “The Anointed” or “The Messiah”.

“God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power” (Acts x. 38).
“The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the
gospel” (Luke iv. 18).
“Thy holy child Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed” (Acts iv. 27).

John’s gospel focuses the faith of the believer on the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and Mathew tells us that Jesus Christ is the Son of David and the Son of

Abraham, Who was born of Mary, named Jesus, and is called Christ (Matt. i. 1, 16). John who so stressed the need for faith in the fact that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” is the one who records the explanation that “The Messiah”, being interpreted is “The Christ” (John i. 41). Herod ask “where Christ should be born” (Matt. ii. 4); the Saviour Himself, while forcing the Pharisees to acknowledge that He was “The Lord”, readily granted that He was “The son of David” (Matt. xxii. 41-46). “Ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s” said the Apostle (I Cor. iii. 23). Christ died for our sins, Christ was raised from the dead, Christ is coming again. When, therefore, the Apostle reveals that some were chosen in Him, that is in Christ, before the foundation of the world, it means that He Who at that time was “The Word” and “The Image of the Invisible God”, was the blessed One who was yet to lay aside His glory and be made in the likeness of men, just as we have already seen that while He was the Son of Man when He uttered the words of John vi. 53, He had not become a partaker of flesh and blood at the time spoken of as before the world was, and the place where He was before.

Notice the change of terms in John i. 1-18. As the WORD He was with GOD; as the only begotten SON, He is in the bosom of the FATHER. In the Divine counsels, God was to be manifested in the flesh (I Tim. iii. 16), to come into this world a Man, and be the Only begotten Son of God. As a consequence of the Mediatorial work for which this mighty miracle of Divine condescension was planned, many who were sinners and undone, would find themselves by redemption sons of God. God therefore was potentially the Father before the foundation of the world, even as Christ was verily foreordained from before the foundation of the world.

Another passage of Scripture calls for attention. The Apostle writing to the Corinthians concerning the vexed question about eating things offered to idols says:

“As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many) But to us there is but one God, the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ” (I Cor. viii. 4, 5).

To Paul, the title “The one Lord” would mean none but Jehovah, and this has been made plain in the second article of this series. He is opposing the ‘gods many’ by the One God the Father, and the ‘lords many’ by the One Lord Jesus Christ. If we attempt, as some have done to teach that the Father alone is God, to the exclusion from that title of the one Lord, we shall in the very act destroy the very God we seek to serve. Of the Father, Paul says “Of (*ek*) Whom are all things, and we for (*eis*) Him”, and of the Lord “Through (*dia*) Whom are all things, and we through (*dia*) Him”. If these statements are kept apart, then God has originated the great purpose of the ages, but has never implemented it, and on the other hand the Lord has mediated this purpose but never planned it. Yet this division is contradicted by such passages as Rom. xi. 36, which does not speak of God as the Father, or of the Lord, as Jesus Christ but indiscriminately says:

“O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of GOD For who hath known the mind of the LORD For of (*ek*) HIM (Whom? God or the Lord?)

and through (*dia*) HIM, and to or for (*eis*) HIM, are all things, to WHOM (Who, God or Lord?) be glory unto the ages. Amen” (Rom. xi. 33-36).

This doxology, being written after I Cor. viii., sufficiently disposes of any attempt to see in the language of the Apostle an intended distinction in essence between the one God Who is the Father, and the one Lord Who is Jesus Christ, but rather the distribution of function which is in perfect harmony with the economical and dispensational limitation of the Trinity, and the mediatorial office of the Son.

In an earlier study we alluded to the reading of John i. 18 “The only begotten God”. The change from “Son” to “God” in the original form of writing is but the change of one letter. This reading is elaborately set forth by Tregelles, and he thinks it such that Arius, though ‘opposed to the dogma taught’, upholds the reading *monogenes theos* ‘Only begotten God’. With this reading of John i. 18 we must align that of Isa. xliii. 10:

“Before Me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after Me.”

Before the Incarnation was “The Word”, “The Image of the invisible God”, “The Form of God”; at the Incarnation when the Word was made flesh, He became “The only begotten God” or “God manifest in the flesh”. There is practical unanimity among textual critics that the words of I John v. 7, 8 “In heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost and these three are one, and there are three that bear witness on earth”, should be omitted though Bishop Middleton and Gaussen in his *Theopneustia* were in favour of the retention. We will let their reasons be heard even though we may not agree with their conclusions. Bishop Middleton’s main contention is that if we omit the words of verse 7, then the presence of the article at the close of verse 8 is inexplicable. The original reads *eis to hen*.

“If the seventh verse had not been spurious, nothing could have been plainer than *to hen* of verse 8, referred to *hen* (one) of verse 7: as the case now stands I do not perceive the force or meaning of the article.”

Bishop Middleton then devotes several pages in establishing his contention that the closing words of verse 8 are ungrammatical and without precedent IF verse 7 be removed. Gaussen draws attention to another grammatical difficulty. The word ‘three’ in the Greek is masculine, while the words spirit, water and blood to which it relates, are all neuter. If the seventh verse remains, this could be explained by what is called ‘attraction’ but it becomes inexplicable when we deprive it of the contested words.

Middleton concludes by saying:

“I am not ignorant, that in the rejection of the controverted passage, learned and good men are now, for the most part, agreed the objection, however, which has given rise to this discussion, I could not consistently with my plan suppress.”

The rejected passage reads:

“In heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth.”

The most convincing argument seems to be the strange silence on the part of those who took part in the early controversies of the church. It seems unaccountable that those who defended the doctrine of the Trinity should quote so many passages of Scripture, and yet omit this one. Truth needs no bolster.

**No.10. Not a “Creed” but “This is the sum” (Heb. viii. 11).
pp. 93 - 100**

While we dare not attempt to formulate a creed, we do exercise the private right of attempting to sum up what we have discovered. Regarding a creed or the Athanasian Creed in particular, the following analytical summary of the contents of a book entitled *The Creed and the Church* by H.H.A.S. seems worth reprinting here.

OBJECT STATED:

Not to challenge the main doctrines of the creed.

- (1) In the present crisis of the church it is important to remove whatever unnecessarily:
 - (a) Gives offence to friends.
 - (b) Gives a handle to foes.
- (2) But no real bulwark of the faith should be touched.
- (3) The Athanasian Creed does:
 - (a) Gives offence to friends.
 - (b) Gives a handle to foes.
- (4) Therefore if it is not an essential bulwark of the faith it should be removed.

That it is not even a *legitimate*, therefore cannot be a *necessary* bulwark of the faith, proved by the two following propositions:

PROPOSITION I:

It is not a right which pertains either to any man or to any body of men acting collectively, to construct a religious creed out of materials asserted to be (or really) Scriptural, and then to hold out a threat of eternal perdition to those of their fellowmen who cannot conscientiously accept that creed.

- (1) Man has *no right* to impose a creed which he has constructed on his fellow men, because he has:
 - (a) No Divine sanction.
 - (b) No Scriptural precedent.
 - (i) In the O.T.
 - (ii) In the N.T.

The Apostles' creed, not a Scriptural precedent; because:

- (1) Not composed by the apostles.

- (2) Not a creed imposed, but a creed professed.
 - (3) Not in the canon of Scripture.
- (2) Man has *no power* to make such a creed, as he cannot distinguish between abstract truths and vital truths.
- (a) All truth is Divine, because all truth is of God: but
 - (b) There are many things that are true, the belief of which is not necessary to salvation, instances
 - (c) In Nature.
 - (d) In Revelation. Of truths not vital.
 - (e) In Mathematics.
- (3) It is God's sole prerogative to curse. Therefore *a fortiori* man has no right to hold out a threat of eternal perdition to those who will not accept that which he had neither the right, nor the power to construct.

PROPOSITION II:

Supposing such a right to exist in certain cases, the Athanasian Creed from the circumstances of its origin and from its intrinsic character does not possess such a right.

- (1) Circumstances of its origin.
- (a) Not composed until five centuries after the closing of the canon of Scripture.
 - (b) The outcome of bitter religious feud.
 - (c) Appearing at the commencement of the dark ages.
 - (d) In an age when mysticism had almost supplanted the true faith.

Hence from the circumstances of its origin it deserves no special exception in its favour.

- (2) Its intrinsic value.
- (a) Bears marks of its origin in the bitterness of its spirit.
 - (b) Demands implicit faith in its own explanation of the doctrine it treats of.
 - (c) The abstract idea of a Trinity in Unity involves no absurdity or paradox.
 - (d) Illustrations of a Trinity in Unity.
 - (i) In Nature—man, with body, soul, spirit.
 - (ii) In Art—a triangle.
 - (iii) In human affairs—a firm with three partners.

It is not suggested by these illustrations that the Trinity in the Godhead can be illustrated by an appeal to nature; what the compiler of this summary intends is, that in the realm of human experience, such trinities are everywhere accepted. Man is body, soul and spirit. Time is past, present and future. Place is length, breadth and height. One human being can be son, father and husband, with correspondingly different responsibilities. He who most stoutly criticizes the doctrine of the Trinity, continually says "I" when he refers to his body, or to his mind. When he says that something 'hurts me' what or who does 'me' involve?

Summarizing some of our findings we first of all quote from two scholars:

- (1) "It is not GOD Himself, but the knowledge He has *revealed* to us concerning Himself which constitutes the material for theological investigation" (Dr. Kuyher).

- (2) “The whole mystery (of the Trinity) is raised *by our bringing them together*, and attempting to reconcile The Scripture delivers certain separate propositions, and *thus it leaves them*” (Dr. Chalmers).
- (3) Many ‘heresies’ may be traced to the misuse or misunderstanding of the word ‘person’.
- (4) The titles ‘Father’ and ‘Son’ are relative. The title “The Only begotten Son” must be taken to mean just exactly what the words imply.
- (5) Those who transfer the title ‘The Father’ from time and make it the title of the Infinite and Unconditional, are forced by their very error, to perpetuate even greater errors, by maintaining that the Father is ‘the proper God’; ‘Eternally and originally God’, destroying by so saying the very quality of the Son that they seek to establish.
- (6) The Trinity is *economical* i.e. not *essential*. It describes the assumed relations of God for the purpose of Creation and Redemption (The Son, The Man), (The Word, The Image).
- (7) All the revealed titles of God are facets of the Godhead assumed like the name Jehovah “for the age” and “unto all generations”, but like the name Jehovah itself, to be so blessedly fulfilled as to be actually so partly quoted as we have seen in Rev. xi. 17, the third part of the title ‘art to come’ being swallowed up in the actual Coming. In like manner will all other titles be ‘fulfilled’.
- (8) Instead of the expression ‘The eternal generations of the Son’ fortifying His Deity, it robs Him. If this teaching be true, for then the Father must *for ever* have precedence over the Son, and the actual begetting, and consequently the glorious reality of His Manhood in the fullness of time is imperilled. Such a statement substitutes mysticism and metaphysics for the sober words of Revelation.
- (9) God Who in times past spake to the fathers by the prophets at the Incarnation of the Saviour, spoke to us “In Son”. Not “by His Son”, not “In His Son” but *en huioi* “in Son”, even as in days of old we read:
 “I appeared unto Abraham” . . . *B’el Shaddai* “in God Almighty” (Exod. vi. 3).
- (10) We are compelled to believe, by the usage of the title in both Old and New Testaments, that the “one Lord” of the N.T. is the Jehovah of the O.T. We can and confess with Thomas, that the Saviour we have believed is “God” and “Lord”.
- (11) We await the consummation of the ages, when not only shall the name Jehovah be fulfilled, but at long last the “Son” Himself shall be subject unto the “Father”, that GOD (not the Father, not the Son, nor the Holy Ghost) but “that GOD”, as never before, “may be all in all” (I Cor. xv. 28). We gladly acknowledge the “Mystery of God in Christ” (Col. ii. 2).

On several occasions, in this series, we have placed the word heresy within quotation marks, “heresy”, for what is heresy to the orthodox at one time, may not be heresy at another. A disinterested reader can see a number of incipient heresies in the language employed by Athanasias in his Apologies and Controversies, and we remember that the Apostle Paul said:

“The way which *they call* heresy, so worship I the God of my father” (Acts xxiv. 14).

Many of the heretical opinions which eventually led to the formulation of the Creeds, arose from the fact that many of the early Christians brought a great deal of ancient philosophy with them into the church and into its teaching.

Tertullian said:

“The heathen poets and philosophers stole many of their notions from the Holy Scriptures” and then, because these men were unregenerate, the spiritual meaning of much which they took escaped them, and the consequent distortion of teaching followed.

“If they found anything in our divine digests which hit their fancies, or might serve their hypothesis, they took it and turned it and bent it to a compliance with their own curiosity.”

“Having dipped into the Holy Scripture, and found there is no God but one, they presently divided into various speculations about the Divine nature.”

Some thirty or more heretics are known by name, who arose during the first five centuries of Christianity and put forward a mixture of Scripture phraseology and metaphysical speculation concerning the Trinity which persists to this day, by reason of the incorporation of the Creeds into Church Service. When these heresies are examined, it will be found that many of them are concerned with the problem of the persons of the Father and the Son, and the argument is further be-clouded by the continual assumption that when we intend God in Absolute and Unconditional Infinity, we must refer to Him as “The Father”.

Arius, who gives his name to the ‘heresy’ called Arianism, endeavoured to substitute rational ideas about the Trinity in place of the mysticism that surrounded the subject. When he raised the question of the ‘external existence of the Son’ if only someone could have done for him as Priscilla and Aquila did for Apollos, and have made him to see the Word of God more perfectly; if only someone had pointed out that where Arius and his opponents used the title ‘Son’ the Scriptures used the title ‘Word’, Arianism may never have seen the light of day, and the mysticism against which Arius raised his voice may not have dominated the thought of centuries.

Another sect were called the *Monarchians*. The name is derived from *monos* ‘alone’ and *archo* ‘to govern’. The *Monarchians* exhibited a praiseworthy zeal in endeavouring to preserve the unity of the consciousness of God, but as they denied any other divine Being than “The Father”, they eventually rejected and misunderstood the Scriptural teaching concerning the *Logos*, and so would give a hesitating approval of the teaching of such a passage as Phil. ii. 10, 11. In their view every knee could only bow to the Father, Who in their estimate, was God alone.

Again Sabellius taught that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are only manifestations of the same *Person*. Had he maintained that the Trinity was the manifestation of *one God*, he might have led the church into fuller light. As it was he so confused the Father and the Son, and further confused the One God with the word “Person” that he ultimately taught that it was the Father that suffered for sin! How many heresies developed because one side sought to defeat the other in controversy, instead of sympathetically seeking to sift the chaff from the wheat in both sets of argument, only the Judgment Seat of Christ will reveal.

Let us note two benedictions from Scripture, both of which are cast in the triple form.

The triple Benediction of the O.T.

“The Lord bless thee, and keep thee;
The Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee;
The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace” (Numb. vi. 24-26).

The triple Benediction of the N.T.

“The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and
The love of God, and
The communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all, Amen” (II Cor. xiii. 14).

To which may be added the triple baptismal formula:

“In the name of the Father,
And of the Son,
And of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. xviii. 19).

And the triple ascription of praise given by the Seraphim as they cover their faces and feet:

“Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts” (Isa. vi. 3).

If the ‘Jesus’ of the N.T. be the ‘Jehovah’ of the O.T., then of necessity the other attributes and offices which particularly inhere in the Person of the Son of God cannot be removed, and should not be divorced from the Lord of the O.T., the God of Israel. While it is most certainly true that in the fullness of time He was born of a woman, and it is most certainly true that the Jehovah of the O.T. is the Creator as well as the Redeemer of Israel, these apparently contradictory attributes are reconciled in the “Mystery of Godliness” where God was manifest in the flesh.

“Out of extreme (but mistaken) reverence for the ineffable Name ‘Jehovah’ the ancient custodians of the Sacred Text substituted in many places ‘Adonai’. These in the A.V. and R.V are all printed ‘Lord’. In all these places we have printed it ‘LORD’ marking the word with an asterisk in addition to the note in the margin, to inform the reader of the fact” (*The Companion Bible*, Appendix 32).

The Massorah contains 134 references where the name ‘Jehovah’ is altered to ‘Adonai’. In some of these places the reason for this alteration is not obvious, but in the majority one can perceive a sensitiveness for the name of God, a desire to protect Him from anything that would approach familiarity or use terms that are far too human to be safely allowed in the sacred Scriptures of the Hebrews. “Extreme but mistaken reverence” may put out its hand ‘to stay the ark of God’ with disastrous consequences.

The first of the emendations occurs in Gen. xviii. 3 where Abraham actually said ‘My Lord’, using the name ‘Jehovah’. In ten or eleven passages, the Sopherim have altered ‘My Jehovah’ to ‘My Adonai’ evidently fearing to allow this approach to the Most High God to become current. In Gen. xviii. 32 we have another illustration of their sensitiveness for the honour of His name, which led them not to scruple at altering the inspired words of Holy Writ. The A.V. reads ‘but Abraham stood yet before the

LORD', whereas the primitive text contains the astounding statement 'JEHOVAH stood yet *before Abraham*'! But what continents of condescending truth they sacrifice in their mistaken zeal. The attitude both of Israel and the Christian to the name Jehovah is so to magnify the "Eternal" (the translation adopted by the French), the Ineffable and the Unspeakable (the attitude of Israel), as to make any link with humanity sound like sacrilege, yet if Jesus Christ be at the same time the "One LORD" of the O.T., and if He be at the same time the Son of Man and the Seed of the woman, we adopt the emendations of the Sopherim to our hurt.

We must remember that He Who was, and is, and is to come, and Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and for ever, is one and the same Person. In the *Form of Sound Words* we quoted Dr. Duncan H. Weir on the usage of the name Jehovah where he says "He (i.e. the Hebrew) says again and again *my GOD*, but never *my JEHOVAH*, for when he says *my God* he means Jehovah". This comment while it is true of the Hebrews attitude, is not true as a statement of fact, for the Scriptures do, as we have seen, use the expression "My LORD" from Abraham, throughout the N.T. until we reach the climax confession of Thomas "My Lord and my God" in a context where the "Lord" Who stood before him, could speak of the nail prints in His *hands* and the spear wound in His *side*, a Jehovah that eyes could *see*, and hands *handle*, a very different Person from that of tradition, a veiled inscrutable Being, Whose name was even almost sacrilege to utter. The conflict at the Exodus of Israel was not only between man and man, with a slave-owning king, and the king of Israel. It was between a 'god' and GOD, for the Pharaoh who sat on the throne of Egypt and said 'I know not the LORD' was himself styled the Son of Isis, Horus sun-god of Egypt, and it was 'against *all the gods of Egypt*' that the Lord said He would execute judgment (Exod. xii. 12). The plagues that fell on that devoted land may seem strange to us, living at this distance in place and time, but they touched Egypt's gods at every turn. The River Nile was an object of worship 'under various names and symbols as *Hapi* i.e. *Apis* the sacred bull, and living representative of Osiris' (Canon Cooke). A hymn addressed to the Nile as a god, contains the lines:

"Great Lord of provisions: Creator of all things
Lord of terrors and of choicest joys."

In the Tel-el Armarna tablets, a governor writes to the Pharaoh of the time saying 'At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, I prostrate myself seven times and seven times'. The usurpation of the titles and prerogatives of the Lord, concentrates particularly upon the primeval promise of Gen. iii. 15 for we shall see in a moment, that a *goddess* with her *son* challenges the claims of Jehovah Himself. It is possible that the reader of Gen. iii. 15 and its promise to the woman of a Seed that should bruise the serpent's head, would not necessarily think immediately of "Jehovah", but it is evident from Gen. iv. 1 that Eve did. At the birth of Cain, Even said:

"I have gotten a man, EVEN JEHOVAH" *Ish eth Jehovah.*

It is gratuitous to assume that Eve was utterly mistaken or that she had no warrant for her assumptions, we know nothing of what she believed or had revealed to her apart from what is recorded. If Eve spoke entirely without revelation or warrant, how does it come

about that she used the name Jehovah? And even though we conclude that Moses, writing later and after the revelation of the Divine Name in Exod. iii., inserted the name Jehovah in the place of the term actually employed by Eve, it amounts to much the same thing—the Person who bears the name of Jehovah, and the Seed of the woman are not so distinct as the orthodox conception would lead us to suppose. Cain was not the promised seed, but that is because from the beginning of the ages Satan has counterfeited every move, and often gets in first. “The second time” is the time note attached to the promises of God, evil being permitted to do its worst first of all.

We have seen that Pharaoh was Horus, the sun-god, born of Isis. Let us consider this a little more closely. Isis is a goddess, a female among the gods, and one who is said to be the mother of Horus, the sun-god, who claims prerogatives that challenge the essential meaning of the name Jehovah, and whose motherhood usurps the promise made to Eve, and, as it was at the birth of Cain, diverts it to the evil line instead. This usurpation likewise is enshrined in one of the myths of Isis. To Apuleius a philosopher, Isis is supposed to have revealed herself saying:

“I am *nature*, the *parent* of all things, *mistress* of all elements, the *beginning* of the ages, *Sovereign* of the Gods, *Queen* of the manes (shades of the departed), the *first* of heavenly beings.”

The instructed reader will have no difficulty in seeing in this series of claims, so many challenges to the prerogatives of the Son of God.

“The parent of all things”	“One Lord Jesus Christ by Whom are all things.”
“Mistress of all elements”	“Even the winds and the sea obey Him.”
“The beginning of the Ages”	“The everlasting Father”—literally “The Father of the Ages.” “The Beginning of the creation of God.”
“Sovereign of the Gods”	“Lord of lords, and Kings of kings.”
“Queen of the manes”	“Lord both of the dead and of living.”
“The first of heavenly beings”	“That in all things He might have the pre-eminence.”

Not only is this usurpation most evident, but the Egyptian myths contain a lengthy plot, in which Isis schemes how she can become “The EQUAL of *Ra*, in the heavens, and the earth, and become mistress of the world”. The specific claim of Isis that places her over against Jehovah is the following:

“I am all that HAS BEEN or that IS, or that SHALL BE.”

This being the claim of Isis in Egypt, makes the revelation of the Divine Name to Moses in Egypt all the more pointed. Further, Isis declared “No mortal has removed my veil” and the child which she brought forth, Horus, the sun-god, was born on DECEMBER 25th! and so has imposed upon Christian credulity ever since. It is therefore clear that Jehovah and the Seed of the woman are linked together both in the Divine Plan *and* in the Satanic attack. When a Christian sees the letters I.H.S. today, he is led to believe that they are either the first Greek letters of the names “Jesus” or that

they stand for the Latin *Iesus Hominum Salvator* “Jesus the Saviour of Men”. An Egyptian however, or a worshipper of Isis in Rome or elsewhere would have understood these letters to represent the Egyptian Trinity *Isis, Horus, Seb*. The title “I AM THAT I AM, JEHOVAH God of your fathers” given to Moses in Exod. iii., and the title “He Who was, He Who is, and He Who is to come” given to John in the Apocalypse are the image of the true, of which the claims of Isis are Satanic counterfeits.

We write this as an appendix to our study of the “ONE LORD”. We need to be aware of the evil seed and the line of attack adopted by the enemy, but we need also to beware of being side-tracked from the pursuit of positive truth. Consequently we leave to every reader the responsibility of choosing how far he should prosecute his investigations into the myths and legends of ancient Egypt; we, in the prosecution of the stewardship entrusted to us, while ‘warning every man’ where necessary, must pursue the positive teaching of all Scripture that focuses our wondering attention on the One Lord, God manifest in the flesh, the Lord Jesus Christ, or our faith, our love and our hope.

The One Mediator

No.1. The spirit of Mediation (I Tim. ii. 1 - 6). pp. 128 - 132

In the series of articles entitled *The Sign of the Times* which have appeared in Volume XXXV of the *Berean Expositor*, we gave reasons for believing that the essence of the apostasy that is spoken of in I Tim. iv. 1, 2, was the departure from the great central doctrine of the Mediation of Christ. That doctrine is implicit in the early use of the word “demon” (‘devils’ in A.V.), and in the juxtaposition of the mystery of godliness of iii. 16 with the beginnings of the mystery of iniquity discoverable in the apostasy of I Tim. iv. 1, 2. The subject is so vital, so central, so basic, and the way in which it is being ignored or denied on all hands more than justifies any attempt on the part of those who know and believe the truth to witness to this glorious and essential doctrine of the Christian faith.

We propose therefore taking I Tim. ii. 5, 6 as the “text” for the present series.

“For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time” (I Tim. ii. 5, 6).

It is clear that this great passage stands in logical sequence to what has gone before, namely verses 1-4; but verse one is connected with the preceding chapter by the conjunction “therefore”. We are driven back to chapter i. 18 “This charge I commit unto thee”, for the commencement of the Apostle’s argument. Verse 18, however, picks up the exhortation with which the epistle opens in ch. i. 13, for the words “Thou mightest charge” translate *parangelo*, and “This charge” translates *parangelia*, which word is also found in verse 5 where it is rendered ‘commandment’. If we credit the Apostle with but ordinary reasoning faculties, we shall be obliged to attend to this sequence of thought; and if we moreover believe that this epistle forms a part of inspired Scripture, it will be our delight thus to recognize the links in the Divine chain. His opening theme is, according to the Revised Text, ‘a dispensation of God’, which is put over against ‘fables and endless genealogies’. The end of this ‘charge’ is love, and is a sacred trust (verse 11). Timothy is especially exhorted to see to it that the conduct of those who gather to worship in the church shall be in harmony with their calling (I Tim. ii. 1-15), as also he was to see to it that those who sought and exercised the office of either bishop or deacon should be worthy, and Paul concludes this part of the epistle with the words:

“These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God” (I Tim. iii. 14, 15).

Coming closer to the passage which forms the basis of this series, we commence a more careful examination at verse one of the second chapter:

“I exhort therefore, that first of all supplications, prayer, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men. For kings”

The translation of *parakaleo* by ‘exhort’ is supported by no less than 22 references in the A.V., but over against this we find ‘beseech’ 43 times, ‘comfort’ 23 times, beside ‘desire’, ‘entreat’ and ‘pray’, and to the English ear, the word ‘exhort’ sometimes conveys a harsher sense than the original intends.

Crabb says:

“Exhortation has more of impelling in it: persuasion more of drawing; a superior exhorts a friend and an equal persuades.”

Parakaleo the word in question is found four times in I Timothy, “I besought thee”; “I exhort therefore”; “intreat him as a father”; “teach and exhort” (I Tim. i. 3; ii. 1; v. 1; vi. 2). While therefore it is not suggested that ‘beseech’ or ‘intreat’ be substituted for ‘exhort’ in I Tim. ii. 1, the gracious element in the world should not be forgotten. Most readers will recognize that the word *Paraklete* “The Comforter” is derived from this same word. The Holy Ghost is more than an “Exhorter”.

Many of the epistles were written to counteract some error of doctrine or practice that was threatening the peace and endangering the witness at the time. Romans, Galatians and Hebrews, have this in common that they both put the “law” in its true place, for there were those in the Church who did not understand the implications of the doctrine “The just shall live by faith”, which text is quoted in each of these three epistles. The Thessalonian epistles were written to counter false views concerning the Second Coming of Christ and of the day of the Lord. The reader will not need further proofs but will be able to supply the necessary information concerning I & II Corinthians, Colossians and Philippians.

When we commence reading I Timothy, we soon discover that the Church was disturbed by those who were ‘desiring to be teachers of the law’, and because of their misunderstanding of the difference between law and grace, they were concerned with ‘endless genealogies’. Returning to the subject matter of this exhortation, namely prayer for all men, we remember that Josephus records that Caius Caesar sent Petronius with an army to Jerusalem, to place his statue in the Temple.

The Jews most strenuously resisted the attempt, saying that they would be willing to allow the whole Jewish nation to be sacrificed rather than allow such desecration, but they added:

“We offer sacrifices twice every day *for* Caesar, and *for* the Roman people” (Jos. B.J. ii. 10:4).

As an estimate of our true attitude toward constituted authority is necessary if we would not misunderstand I Tim. iii. 1-7, the following references should be pondered:

“Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters (even heathens) worthy of all honour, that the name of God and His doctrine be not blasphemed.”

“There are many unruly and vain talkers, especially they of the circumcision: whose mouths must be stopped.”

“Exhort servants (slaves) to be obedient unto their own masters that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.”

“Therefore put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates” (I Tim. iv. 1; Titus i. 10, 11; ii. 9; iii. 1).

It will be obvious that these allusions to insubordination that are found in the Pastoral Epistles, point to a real and present evil, and in perfect harmony with the Apostle’s attitude elsewhere is his exhortation given here in I Tim. ii. 1-7.

The word “therefore” with which the exhortation opens must consequently not be neglected. It links the exhortation to pray for all men with the reference to those who “blaspheme” (I Tim. i. 20; vi. 1) and those who desired to be “teachers of the law” (I Tim. i. 7).

The Apostle uses four words to express the character and nature of the prayer that he calls for “for all men”.

“Supplications, prayers, intercessions, giving of thanks.” St. Augustine is reported to have interpreted these four items thus:

*“Deeseis, deprecations that evil may be averted from rulers;
proseuchas, petitions that good may be obtained from them;
enteuxeis, intercessions that needful graces may be conferred upon them,
eucharistias, thanksgivings, when they have fulfilled the high functions of their stations”*
(Dr. Parr, *Sermons*).

These four phases of prayer provide a background against which the Apostle places the great Intercessor Himself, the Man Christ Jesus. It will enable us to appreciate His mediation the better if we understand something of the nature of that limited mediation which it is the privilege of every praying believer to exercise.

- (1) *Supplications*. Something of the intensity of this aspect of prayer can be gathered from Rom. x. 1 where the Apostle’s “prayer to God” is so selfless and moving. Its association with resurrection power may be gathered from the phrase “Ye also helping together” in II Cor. i. 10, 11, and James v. 16 assures us that such prayer is ‘effectual’.
- (2) *Prayers*. These are included in “all prayer” (Eph. vi. 18), accompanied as they are in that context as in I Tim. ii. 1 with “supplications”.
- (3) *Intercessions*. This is the word translated “prayer” in I Tim. iv. 5, and is attributed to the Spirit Himself (Rom. viii. 26) and Christ the Son, Who make intercession for us (Rom. viii. 34).
It may be of interest to remember that the Greek word which gives us the idea of intercession, enters into the names Tychicus, Synteché and Eutyclus.
- (4) *Giving of thanks*. This is the Eucharistic word of I Cor. xi. 24 and is found in I Tim. iv. 3 and 4.

This fourfold intercession is on behalf of “all men”. How are we to understand the Apostle’s reference to “all men”?

Lifted out of its context, severed from the chain of reasoning, of which it forms a link, or handled by those who decry the place of “logic” in the understanding of any proposition human or divine, the passage could be made to support almost any phase of doctrine, but the only honest method of interpretation is that which keeps the explanation of any separate detail within the scope of the whole.

The Apostle returns to the subject of “all men” of iv. 8:

“Bodily exercise profiteth for a little time (margin); but godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

“All things” here refer both to life now, and the life to come. He continues:

“We trust in the living God, Who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe” (I Tim. iv. 8-10).

While God is the Saviour of all men without distinction, He is the Saviour in a special way only of those that believe. The passage contrasts those whose only enjoyment is reserved to “the life that now is” and “for a little time”, and those whose salvation is “special” and looks to the life to come. In like manner the term “all men” in I Tim. ii. is not left undefined; the expansion immediately follows “For kings, and for all that are in authority”. Now numerically, “kings and all that are in authority” make up a small minority. In a nation of millions today, there is but one sovereign, and “all that are in authority” make up a small percentage of the whole population. It is therefore most certain that the Apostle is not in this passage discussing universal salvation, he is using the words “all men” to mean “all men without distinction” not “all men without exception”. The hesitation to pray for kings and rulers that was evidently felt by many, can be understood when we remember what sort of men they were that sat in the seat of authority, nevertheless, even for Nero and those like him, prayer was to be offered and not withheld. In the light of this we must read the words “who will have all men to be saved” as also the words “Who gave Himself a ransom for all” (I Tim. ii. 4, 6).

The unity of purpose that links verses 1 to 7 in this chapter must not be broken for the sake of any private interpretation. “Thanks for all men” not only introduces the Apostle’s theme, but governs all subsequent references. “All men” indicates “kings” or “*all* that are in authority”. Prayers must not be limited to likely persons, for God will have “all men” even kings and all in authority to be saved. “For all” the Son of God gave Himself a ransom, and for this testimony Paul was appointed, preacher, apostle and teacher of the Gentiles.

That he has by no means forgotten or left the matter of prayer for all men, with which the passage opens is evident by the resumption of the theme in verse 8,

“I will therefore that men pray everywhere.”

The theme, however, of this present series is not so much the matter of “prayer”, but the glorious doctrine of the “One Mediator” which is introduced by the Apostle into his argument; it is most blessedly true, however, and must be remembered continually, that there would be and could be neither prayer nor ransom whether for ourselves or for all men, apart from the Mediatorial office of the Son of God.

To this most wondrous theme we devote the succeeding articles of this series.

**No.2. “There is one God,
and one Mediator between God and men,
the Man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. ii. 5).
pp. 193 - 196**

The unity of the Godhead is a fundamental doctrine of all Scripture, and is in nowise disturbed or invalidated by the revelation that the selfsame Scriptures teach that both the Father and Son in their own right have full title to the name “God”. The doctrine “there is one God” is never discussed or enlarged upon in the N.T. Where the theme is introduced, it is brought in to confirm some argument that is in process of development, but the doctrine itself is never made a subject of revelation. There are seven such passages in the epistles, two in the Gospel of Mark, and one all-covering reference in John. It will clear the way for fuller understanding if these ten references are considered.

Mark xii. 29-32 “Thou hast said the truth; for there is one God; and there is none other than He”. If we turn to the record of this same incident in Matt. xxii. 34-46 we discover the following facts that have a bearing upon the subject of the Lord’s teaching. Both Mark and Matthew give the question put by the lawyer who was “one of the scribes”,

“Master which is the great commandment in the law?” (Matt. xxii. 36).
“Which is the first commandment of all?” (Mark xii. 28).

Mark’s account includes the words “Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord” (Mark xii. 29), but this is omitted by Matthew. Both give the command to ‘love the Lord with all thy heart’, and both add ‘the second which is like unto it’.

It is evident that the reader envisaged by Matthew has no need to have the great text of Deut. vi. 4 repeated, but Mark who wrote for the Roman world, was constrained to put this great protest against idolatry in the forefront. Even so, no comment is made on the doctrine of “one God” by Mark. In the sequel of Matt. xxii. however we read that the Saviour did not let His tempters depart without a challenge:

“What think ye of Christ, Whose Son is He? They say unto Him the Son of David”:

and the challenge that these Pharisees did not dare to meet was:

“How then doth David in spirit call Him Lord how is He his Son?”

In these two records we have:

- (1) The main body of the argument that is concerned with the love to God and to neighbour.
- (2) The emphasis in Matthew upon the Deity of Christ, and the omission of the text concerning “one God”.

The emphasis in Mark of the “one God” and the omission of the Saviour’s reference to David and to His lordship.

It is manifest that neither doctrine is denied by the omission, nor unduly stressed by its inclusion.

Passing to the reference in the Epistles, we come to James. Again James nowhere discusses the Being of God, the subject “There is one God” is introduced, nor for its own sake, but to illustrate and enforce the fact that “faith without works is dead”:

“Thou believest that there is one God: thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble” (James ii. 19).

It is evident that there is no salvation in the belief that there is “one God”, salvation comes through faith in Christ. We shall have to speak more at large concerning the growing evil of stressing “God” to the exclusion of “Christ” later, but cannot refrain from making this protest, however brief. We must confine ourselves however at the moment to the passages that speak of “one God”.

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

It has been computed that between 250 and 300 interpretations of this verse have found their way into commentaries and essays, but most are unsatisfactory because they ignore the demands of the context. The last thing that Paul meditated when he wrote these words or for that matter when he wrote the epistle, was a dissertation upon the nature and being of God. The innate idea of mediator demands *two parties*: a mediator cannot be a mediator of one party. But in the promise made to Abraham 430 years before the giving of the law, “God was one”, for Abraham, the only other who could have been a contracting party, was caused to fall into a “deep sleep” (Gen. xv. 12) in which state he could promise nothing.

“As concerning therefore the eating of things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many), but to us there is but one God, the Father, of Whom are all things and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him” (I Cor. viii. 4-6).

Mediation is implied in this passage although not stated, for that is the office of ‘the lords many’. No doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead can be extracted from these

verses, for by so attempting, we discover that we either prove too much or involve the teaching in self-destruction.

If we maintain that the Father alone is God, then we shall have to exclude from His promise the words “through Whom are all things and we through Him” for these belong only to the Lord. This would cut across the teaching of Rom. xi. 36, where we find that of the Lord it is said, not only are all things “by Him”, as is found in I Cor. viii. 6, but “of Him” and “for Him” which is exclusively ascribed to the “one God” in that same passage. The Mediatorial office of the Saviour is the key to these apparent enigmas.

“There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, Who is above all, and through all, and in you all” (Eph. iv. 4-6).

In this sevenfold unity of the Spirit, the one Lord holds the central place as Mediator, and the references here to the one Lord and the one God fall under the same category as these same terms do in I Cor. viii. 6.

“Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith” (Rom. iii. 30).

Here we approach a parallel argument to that which is found in I Tim. ii. 1-5. There is no question of the Being of God in Rom. iii; the chapter deals with the justification of the believing sinner, whether he be Jew or Gentile.

“There is no difference”, Jew and Gentile alike stand guilty before God, and are justified freely by the same grace, through the exercise of the same faith. Because of this, the Apostle says “Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also”, and proceeds to demonstrate this by saying “Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by (*ek*) faith, and the uncircumcision through (*dia*) faith”. Exactly what distinctions the Apostle intended by *ek* and *dia* may be difficult to decide. Not a few commentators bluntly say that there is no difference, but this hardly accords with the scrupulous choice of language that we have found marks the Scriptures of truth. Calvin suggests a shade of irony: “This is the grand difference: the Jew is saved *ex fide*, the Gentile *per fidem!*”

At the moment we are not concerned about this question. What is to the point is that the Apostle introduces the expression “one God” as a proof and a protest against any exclusion of “all men”, whether Jew or Gentile, and if the reader were to be asked, what does the writer of this article mean here when he says ‘all men’, can he by any possibility be advocating “Universalism”, the reply would have to be—NO, the context decides most emphatically that he uses the term ‘all men’ to mean all *without distinction* not all *without exception*, and this is the meaning of the Apostle in I Tim. ii. 1-6.

When he says that prayers should be offered for “all men” he immediately follows by explaining his intention, saying “For kings, and for all that are in authority”. It is understandable that the early Christians, living as they were in an atmosphere of persecution and oppression, might hesitate to include kings and rulers in their prayers.

The Apostle counters this. Again when he says that God will have “all men to be saved”, this governing limitation must still be kept in mind. Christ is the one Mediator between God and *men*, He is not a Mediator of the New Covenant only, He is the one and only Mediator for Jew and Gentile, bond or free, male or female, high or low, rich or poor, king or peasant; He is the one and only Mediator for all.

One further use of the word “all” is found in verse 6 “Who gave Himself a ransom for all”, but this is a subject of such importance that it must be reserved for a separate study. The one all covering reference in John’s Gospel is that of John x. 30 “I and My Father are one”, where the same word is used that is found in the passages already quoted. If we maintain that the Father and the Son must be thought of as being “two” even though the Saviour makes this stupendous claim, what is to prevent us from tampering with the selfsame word “one” in the other passages that affirm the Oneness of God? Let us admit that the doctrine “God is one” is never introduced into the N.T. except as part of an argument that deals with the question of Mediation in some aspect or other, and we shall be well on the way to understanding the different passages wherein these references occur.

The Pleroma

No.1. Introduction and Chart.

Some lessons taught by the parable of the patch.

pp. 166 - 172

- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - - (BE-XLI.167).

The problem of the ages is the problem of the presence of evil, of the apparent necessity for suffering, accompanied with a baffled feeling of frustration. Men like Job, and Asaph, and books like Ecclesiastes ventilate these feelings, but the consciousness of redeeming Love, enabled these men of God to trust where they could not trace. The present study is set forth with an intense desire, to borrow the words of Milton, "To justify the ways of God with men" (see also Rom. iii. 4), to show that there is a most gracious purpose in process, and that there are indications of that purpose in sufficient clearness, to enable the tried believer to say with Job "When He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold".

In the opening study, we commence with the primary creation of Gen. i. 1 which is followed by the 'rent' of Gen. i. 2. This we denominate "The Beginning" and conclude with "The End" of I Cor. xv. 24-28. The New Heavens and Earth, with its Paradise restored, relates, not to "The Beginning", but to the subsequent creation of Adam and the Heavens and Earth of the six days. By observing the parallel between the words of Eph. i. 4 and II Tim i. 9 we are able to show that the ages commence with the reconstruction of the earth in Gen. i. 3. What follows is a series of "fillings" in the person of men like Adam, Noah, Abraham or Nebuchadnezzar with the economies associated with them, but all such are provisional, they are failing and typical only, and for this reason we call them but "fillings". They but carry the unfolding purpose on to "the fullness of time" when "The Seed should come to Whom the promises were made", in Whom alone all the "Fullness" dwells. Adam was but a "filling", he was not "the fullness", that title belongs only to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

The only company of the redeemed who are themselves called "the Fullness" is the Church of the Mystery, the church of "heavenly places", the church which is now closely associated with the seated Christ.

Two words, found in Matt. ix. 16 must ever be kept together in the course of this study, they are the words "fullness" and the "fuller". We shall see presently that God is preparing during the ages, as it were, a piece of "fulled" cloth, so that at last there may be a perfected universe, the "rent" of Gen. i. 2 healed, and "God all in all". Fulling involves several processes, most of them drastic and rigorous.

“Clooth that cometh fro the wevyng is noight comely to were til it be fulled under foot” (Piers Plowman).

Nitre, soap, and the teasle, scouring and bleaching at length make the shrunken cloth “as white as snow” (Mark ix. 3). We can say therefore concerning the fulfillment of the purpose of the ages “No FULNESS without FULLING”.

We do most earnestly desire that consummation when the Son of God shall deliver up to the Father a perfected kingdom, with every vestige of the “rent” of Gen. i. 2 gone. We do most ardently desire to be found, in that day, as part of that blessed *pleroma* or fullness, but we remind ourselves that every thread that goes to make that “filling” will have passed through the Fuller’s hands; “fulled under foot” must precede being “far above all”.

Accompanying this introduction the reader will find a chart which endeavours to set forth in diagram the way in which the Divine purpose in the Fullness is accomplished. At either end of the chart stand between the “Beginning” and the “End” the two creations, the black division that immediately follows the one representing the condition of Gen. i. 2 “Without form and void”, and the black division that immediately precedes the consummation, represents the corresponding state of dissolution foreshadowed in Isa. xxxiv. 4 and II Pet. iii. but associated with “the last enemy”. Running along the bottom of the chart is “the deep”; that was the vehicle of judgment in Gen. i. 2 and which is to pass away at the end, for John says “and there was no more sea” (Rev. xxi. 1). By comparing Eph. i. 4 “Before the foundation of the world” with II Tim. i. 8, 9 “before the world began (literally, before age times)”, we have the start and the finish of the ages indicated. What follows is a series of “fillings”, “stop-gap” types and shadows pointing on. The fullness of time (Gal. iv. 4) did not come until 4,000 years after Adam, and the fullness of the times (seasons) will not arrive until the day which is about to dawn ushers in the glory that will be, when all things in heaven and on earth are gathered together under the Headship of Christ.

As we have seen, it is not until we reach the dispensation of the Mystery, that we come to a company of the redeemed which constitute a “fullness”, and there we read of the Church which is His Body, “the FULNESS of Him, that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23). The Fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily in Christ, and the heavenly places, far above all, with which both the seated Christ and His church are associated, constitute a sphere untouched by the catastrophe of Gen. i. 2. This does not pass away. The heavenly places where Christ sits, are far above all heavens (Eph. iv. 10) that is, far above the temporary heaven called “the firmament” which is likened to a spread out curtain and which can be folded up and put aside. This “tabernacle” character of the Adamic earth is of extreme importance; it places the whole purpose of the ages under a redeeming aegis, and the reader is advised to give the article which deals with this aspect careful attention. The chart which accompanies this article should be at hand throughout the series.

To the reader of *The Berean Expositor*, the principle of Right Division needs neither introduction nor commendation. Its recognition underlies every article that has been

printed in its pages and determines both the Gospel we preach, the Church to which we belong, and the hope that is before us. Dispensational Truth is not confined to one aspect or phase of the Divine purpose, for every dealing of God with man, whether under law or grace, whether with saint or sinner has its own dispensational colouring which is inherent in its teaching and is in nowise accidental. Much has yet to be written and presented along these suggestive and attractive lines of study, but the particular application of this principle now before us, focuses the reader's attention upon one fact, namely, that while in the mind of God the whole purpose of the ages is seen as one and its end assured, in the *outworking* of that purpose, the fact that moral creatures are involved, creatures that can, and alas do, exercise their liberty to disobey as well as to obey the revealed will of God; this fact has had an effect upon the manifest unfolding of the purpose of the ages. This is seen as a series of "gaps" and "postponements" which are filled by new phases and aspects of the purpose until at length He Who was once "All" in a universe that mechanically and unconsciously obeyed, will at length be "All in all" in a universe of willing and intelligent creatures, whose standing will not be that of Creation and Nature, but in Redemption and Grace.

Here we can do little else than indicate the presence of these "gaps", and consider the terms that are employed in the Hebrew of the O.T. and the Greek of the N.T. and of the LXX. The well-known example of the Saviour's recognition of a "gap" in the prophecy of Isa. lxi. must be repeated for the sake of completeness and for the value of its endorsement. We learn from the fourth chapter of Luke's Gospel, that the Lord attended the service in the synagogue at Nazareth, and, apparently, after the reading of the law by the official, He stood up "for to read" the *Haphtorah*, or the recognized portion from the Prophets that was appointed for the day. He found the place, and commenced to read Isa. lxi. Now it is laid down by Maimonides that "He that reads in the prophets, was to read at least one and twenty verses" but he allowed that if "the sense" was finished in less, then the reader was under no necessity to read so many. Even so, it must have caused a deal of surprise to the congregation that gathered for Christ to read what is one verse in our Bible, an one sentence of the second verse, shut the book and sit down. He did so because "the sense" was indeed finished in "less than twenty-one verses". He was about to focus attention upon one aspect of His Work, and said:

"This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke iv. 21).

The sentence with which the Saviour closed His reading of Isa. lxi. was "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord". The next sentence, separated in the A.V. by but a comma read "And the day of vengeance of our God", yet that comma represents a gap of at least nineteen hundred years, for the day of vengeance are not referred to until Luke xxi. 22 where the Second Coming and the end of the age is in view.

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". The three references in the Gospels are:

"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 garment upon 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).

“That which is put in to fill up”, is the translation of the Greek *pleroma* a word of extreme importance in the epistles, and there translated “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 “fulled”, or dressed from *gnapheus*, a “fuller”, and *kainos* which is used in Luke v. 36, meaning “newly made”. In place of “put unto” 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 *sumphoneo*. 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 which is derived from *pleroo* “to fill”, occurs seventeen times in the N.T. Two of these occurrences occur in Matthew and 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 of 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. “The earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof” Psa. xxiv. 1, 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 in Jer. viii. 16; xlvii. 2; 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 *kataklyzomai*, *kataklysmos* and variants, a word used with dispensational significance in II Pet. ii. 5 & 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 I Pet. i. 1 of the “dispersed” or “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 Hebrew 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 sope (Mal. iii. 2; Mark ix. 3) is employed. A piece of cloth thus treated loses its original harshness. The whole process 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 sope”. 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. Job xiv. 12 reads “Till the heavens be no more” which in the Septuagint reads “Till the heavens are unsewn”. The bearing of this upon the argument of II Pet. iii., the present firmament and the fullness will appear more clearly as we proceed.

No.2. Creation and its place in the Purpose. **pp. 183 - 186**

In the vision of Ezekiel, recorded in the opening chapters of his prophecy, the prophet saw the living creature which he afterward identified with the cherubim (Ezek. x. 20). Those not only had the four faces, namely that of a man, a lion, an ox and an eagle (Ezek. i. 10) but were associated with dreadful rings and wheels, and among other things it was noted “as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel” (Ezek. i. 16). This element of complication, one wheel within another, seems to be a reflection of the way in which one dispensation encloses another, so that between the annunciation of the opening phase of the purpose and the attainment of its purpose and goal, a great gap intervenes which is filled by another and yet another succeeding dispensation until in the “fullness” of time Christ came (Gal. iv. 4) born of a woman, with a view to the fullness of the seasons (Eph. i. 10), when He in Whom all the fullness dwells (Col. i. 19) shall bring the purpose of the ages to its blessed consummation. In harmony with the fact that this purpose is redemptive in character, various companies of the redeemed during the ages have been associated with the word “fullness”, even the earth itself and its fullness, being linked with the glory of the Lord (Isa. vi. 3 margin). The outrunning of the purpose of the ages therefore can be represented (very crudely it is true) thus:

Phil. iv. 15 it is used once again in its ordinary time sense. While God knows the end from the beginning, and nothing which He has caused to be written for our learning can ever be anything but truth, we must nevertheless be prepared to find that much is veiled in the O.T. until, in the wisdom of God, the time is ripe for fuller teaching.

If we leave Gen. i. 1 and go straight over to the last book of Scripture, namely the book of the Revelation, we shall see that the words “In the beginning” acquire a fuller sense than was possible at the time when they were first written by Moses. *Arche* occurs in Revelation four times, as follows:

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

“These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, *the beginning of the creation of God.*” (iii. 14).

“And He said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, *the beginning* and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely.” (xxi. 6).

“I am Alpha and Omega, *the beginning* and the end, the first and the last.” (xxii. 13).

Here, in the last book of the Bible, *arche* ceases to bear merely a time significance, it is the *title of a Person*, a Person in Whom creation and the purpose of the ages find their meaning and their goal. Paul uses *arche* eighteen times, the word having the time sense “beginning” in five occurrences (Phil. iv. 15, the only occurrence with this meaning in the Prison epistles), once in the earlier epistles (II Thess. ii. 13) and three times in Hebrews (i. 10; ii. 3; vii. 3). The remaining references save one use *arche* to indicate “principalities”, “rule” or “principles” (Rom. viii. 38; I Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21; iii. 10; vi. 12; Col. i. 16, 18; ii. 10, 15; Titus iii. 1; Heb. vi. 1). The Hebrew word *rosh* which gives us the word for “beginning” is translated “head” in Gen. iii. 15 and both “beginning” and “head” in Exod. xii. 2 & 9 respectively. In Col. i. 18 Paul uses *arche* of Christ in a somewhat similar sense to the usage of the word in the Revelation:

“Who is the Image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature, for by Him were all things created and He is the head of the Body the church: who IS THE BEGINNING, the Firstborn from the dead in Him should ALL FULLNESS DWELL” (Col. i. 15-19).

The two phrases “by Him” all things were created, and “in Him” all fullness dwells, are obviously complementary. It is a fact that the preposition *en* is translated many times “by”, but it is difficult to understand how it is that in Col. i. 16 *en auto* should be translated “BY Whom” while in Col. i. 19 *en auto* should be translated “IN Him”. Moreover the preposition *en* occurs in the phrases “in heaven”, “in all things”. Again, the A.V. reads in verse 17 “By Him all things consist” where the preposition is *dia*, which only makes the need more felt that *en* should not be translated “by” in the same context. There does not appear any grammatical necessity to depart from the primary meaning of *en* “in” in Col. i. 16, and this is the considered opinion of such exegetes as Bishop Lightfoot and Dean Alford, and the translators of the R.V.

“In Him” therefore, all things were created (Col. i. 16). He Himself is “the Beginning” in the Creation of God (Rev. iii. 14). We therefore return to Gen. i. 1 and read with fuller insight and meaning “In the BEGINNING God created the heaven and

the earth". When dealing with the word *pleroma*, this passage in Colossians will naturally come up for a more detailed examination. Christ is "the Beginning" of Gen. i. 1, although at the time of Moses such a truth was not perceived, just as the purpose of the name Jehovah was not known to the world before the revelation given in the days of Moses. What was known as the Creation of the Almighty, is subsequently revealed to have been the work of Jehovah, the God of Redemption. In Gen. i. 1 we learn that *Elohim* "God" created the heaven and the earth, and subsequently we learn that all was the work of Him Who is "The Word", "The Image", "The One Mediator". From the beginning creation had in view the redemptive purpose of the ages, but just as it would have been impolitic to have answered the question of the Apostles in Acts i. 6 before the time, so the true purpose of Creation was not revealed until Man had sinned and Christ had died for his redemption.

Bara, the word translated create, must now be given a consideration. Metaphysics "the science of things transcending what is physical or natural" attempts to deal with the question of "being", and in that department of thought the question of "creating something out of nothing" naturally arises. Scripture however never discusses this metaphysical problem. Even in Gen. i. 1, it does NOT say "In the beginning God created the basic matter of the universe", it commences with a highly organized and differentiated universe "heaven and earth". The Hebrew word *bara* in its primary meaning of "create" is reserved for God as Creator, not being used of man, except in a secondary sense (and that in five passages only), out of fifty-four occurrences namely Josh. xvii. 15, 18; I Sam. ii. 29; Ezek. xxi. 19; xxiii. 47. Adam is said to be created, although the "dust of the ground" from which he was made was in existence long before. God is said to be the Creator of Israel (Isa. xliii. 1, 7, 15), yet Israel was a nation descended from Abraham. *Bara* gives us the Chaldaic word *bar* "son", which but perpetuates the idea already recognized in *bara*. The Septuagint translates Josh. xvii. 15 and 18 "thou shalt clear it", which the A.V. renders "cut down", thereby revealing, as the lexicographers point out, that *bara* primarily means "to cut, to carve out, to form by cutting". When we remember that "the world" *kosmos* is derived from the word *kosmeo* "to adorn" as with "goodly stones", with "gold" and "to garnish" with all manner of precious stones (Luke xxi. 5; I Tim. ii. 9; Rev. xxi. 2, 19) we perceive the reason for the choice of *bara* and the words with which revelation opens "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" begin to bear deeper significance. It will also show that "the world" necessarily includes the earth as its sphere. Creation was dual, from the start. Not heaven only, but the heaven and the earth. Man was created male and female, and before we read of the generations of Adam, namely of his descendants, we read of the "generations of the heavens and of the earth" (Gen. ii. 4). Heaven is intimately concerned with the earth; in the heavens God is "ALL" ("the Heavens do rule", "as it is in heaven") and when at last the will of God is done on earth as it is in heaven, the goal of the ages will be attained, and God will not only be "All" but "ALL in ALL". Such are faint shadows of His ways. By searching we shall never find out God into perfection, but to stand as we have in a cleft of the rock while His glory passes before us, and be permitted to behold but the "back part" of His ways is joy unspeakable.

"Lo these are but the outlines of His ways; A whisper only, that we hear of Him;
His wondrous pow'r, who then, can comprehend?" (Job xxvi. 14 Dr. Bullinger's *Metrical Version*).

No.3. The First “Gap”. “Without form and void.” pp. 203 - 206

Whatever the ultimate purpose of creation may prove to be, it is certain that it will not be attained without much sorrow and great sacrifice. “The Fuller” will be at work, and between the opening announcement of creation in Gen. i. 1 and the bringing in of the New Heavens and New Earth (Rev. xxi. 1; II Pet. iii. 13) and the “End” (I Cor. xv. 24) roll the eons or the ages with their burden of sin and of redeeming love. When the new heaven and earth was seen by John in the Apocalypse, he adds the words “and there was no more sea”. That is a most evident reference back to Gen. i. 2, where darkness and the deep take the place of order or *kosmos*.

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

It is of importance that we remember that in the LXX, “the deep” is the same Greek word that is translated “the bottomless pit” in the Apocalypse.

When we read in Genesis that man “became” a living soul we immediately gather that he was not a living soul *before* he breathed the breath of life. When we read that Lot’s wife “became” a pillar of salt (Gen. xix. 26) we understand that this was consequent upon her looking back. When Cain said “And it shall come to pass” (Gen. iv. 14) we understand his fears concerning what would happen *after* others had heard of his deed. So, when we read “the earth was without form and void” and realize that the same verb that is here translated “was”, is translated “became” or “come to pass” in these other passages in Genesis, we realized that here in Gen. i. 2 we are looking at the record of the first great gap in the outworking of the Divine purpose, and must read:

“And the earth BECAME without form and void.”

The translation “was” in Gen. i. 2 however is perfectly good, for in our own usage we often mean “became” when “was” is written. If writing on two occasions concerning a friend we should say (1) “He *was* a man” and (2) “He *was* very ill”, everyone would understand that in the second case, this friend had “become” ill, and so “was” ill at the time spoken of, but it would be impossible to think that anyone would understand by the words “he was ill” that he had been created, or born in that state!

Darkness both in the O.T. and in N.T. is associated with death, judgment and evil, and Paul’s use of Gen. i. 2, 3 in the words “God, Who commanded the light to shine out of darkness” (II Cor. iv. 6) most surely indicates that in his estimation, the darkness of Gen. i. 2 is a fit symbol of the spiritual darkness of the unregenerate mind. Two words however are found in Gen. i. 2 which are so used in subsequent Scriptures as to compel everyone that realizes what a great place “usage” has in interpretation, to acknowledge

that nothing but catastrophic judgment can be intended by this verse. The two words that describe the condition of the earth in verse 2 are the Hebrew words *tohu* and *bohu* “without form and void”. *Tohu* occurs twenty times in the O.T. and *bohu* twice in addition to Gen. i. 2. The only other occurrence of *tohu* in the writings of Moses is in Deut. xxxii. 10 where it refers to “the *waste* howling wilderness”. The use which Isaiah makes of this word is highly suggestive and full of instruction.

Isa. xxiv. This chapter opens with a judgment that is reminiscent of Gen. i. 2 “Behold the Lord maketh the earth *empty*, and maketh it *waste*, and turneth it *upside down*, and scattereth the inhabitants thereof the land shall be *utterly emptied*, and utterly spoiled” (Isa. xxiv. 1, 3). When Isaiah would once again refer to this state of affairs, he sums it up in the epithet “The city of confusion (*tohu*)” (Isa. xxiv. 10), and there can be no doubt but that the desolation here spoken of is the result of judgment. Another example of its usage is found in Isa. xlv. 18 “For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens, God Himself that formed the earth and made it; He hath established it, He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited”. Here the A.V. treats the word *tohu* as an adverb, “in vain” which the R.V. corrects, reading “a waste”. Whatever rendering we may adopt, one thing is certain, Isa. xlv. 18 declares in the name of Him Who created the heavens, Who formed the earth and made it, that *He did not* create it TOHU, it therefore must have become so. Even more convincing are two passages other than Gen. i. 2, where *bohu* is employed, for in both instances the word is combined with *tohu*. The first passage is Isa. xxxiv. 11. The context is one of catastrophic judgment and upheaval. The presence of such terms as “indignation”, “fury”, “utterly destroyed”, “sword” and “vengeance” in the first eight verses are sufficient to prove this, and one verse is so definitely prophetic of the upheaval at the time of the end, as to leave no option in the mind:

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

This passage is almost identical with the language employed by Peter when he speaks of the signs that shall precede the coming of the day of God at the setting up of the new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (II Pet. iii. 12). The words *tohu* and *bohu* occur in Isa. xxxiv. 11, to which all these symbols of judgment point:

“He will stretch out upon it the line of confusion (*tohu*) and the stones of emptiness (*bohu*)”,

nor it is without significance that unclean birds like the cormorant and the bittern possess the devoted land, that nettles and brambles appear in the fortress, and that dragons, wild beasts, screech owls and satyrs gather there. The whole is a picture in miniature of what the earth “became” in Gen. i. 2. Isaiah’s usage of *tohu* and *bohu* is convincing, but “in the mouth of two or three witness every word shall be established”, and accordingly we find the prophet Jeremiah using *tohu* and *bohu* in a similar context.

In the structure of Jer. iv. 5-7 are in correspondence with verses 19-31.

“The lion is come up from his thicket, and the destroyer of the Gentiles is on his way; he is gone forth from his place to make thy land *desolate*; and thy cities shall be *laid waste*, without an inhabitant” (Jer. iv. 7).

“Destruction upon destruction is cried.” “I beheld the earth, and lo it was *without form and void*; and the heavens, and they had *no light* broken down by His fierce anger” (Jer. iv. 20-26). Here then are the three inspired occurrences of the two words *tohu* and *bohu*, Gen. i. 2; Isa. xxxiv. 11 and Jer. iv. 23. If Gen. i. 2 does not refer to a day of “vengeance” or “fierce anger” should we not have to acknowledge that both Isaiah and Jeremiah by the use of these peculiar words, have misled us? And if once that be our conclusion, inspiration is invalidated, and it does not matter much what Gen. i. 2 means, for our trust is shaken, and Moses too may be wrong! This however cannot be. We have in faith put into practice I Cor. ii. 13, and have founded it blessedly illuminating. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and Moses, Isaiah and Jeremiah speak with one voice, because inspired by one Spirit. Nothing is said in Gen. i. 2 concerning the cause of this primeval judgment, any more than any explanation is offered to explain the presence of the serpent in the Garden of Eden, but there are evidences that can be gathered from various parts of Scripture to make it clear that there was fall among the angels, that Satan is a fallen being, and that the catastrophe of Gen. i. 2 is associated with that fall. Into the gap thus formed, the present six day creation is placed as a “fullness” carrying the Redemptive purpose to the threshold of Eternity, and it is here also the “age-times” begin.

No.4. The Temporary Nature of the Present Heaven and Earth. pp. 223 - 226

“The things which are seen are temporal” (II Cor. iv. 18).

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

“And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, and God said, Let there be light; and there was light” (Gen. i. 2 3).

With the words of Genesis the first movement toward the goal of the ages is recorded. That it indicates a regenerative, redemptive movement is made clear by the allegorical use that Paul makes of it when writing to the Corinthians.

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

When we come to consider the place that Israel occupies in the outworking of the purpose of the ages, we shall find that there will be repeated in their case these allegorical fulfillments of Gen. i. 2, 3.

“And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations” (Isa. xxv. 7).

The “veil” plays a big part in the imagery of II Cor. iii. and iv. Like the rising light in Gen. i. 3, Israel’s light shall dispel the gross darkness that has engulfed the nations (Isa. lx. 1, 2), and both in this passage, in II Cor. iv. 6, and Isa. xi. 9 “The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea”, it is evident that that “light” symbolizes knowledge, and prepares us to find in the midst of the garden not only the tree of life, but the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. These matters, however, are anticipatory of future studies, and the parallel of Israel with the six days’ creation will be better seen when we reach the Scriptures that speak of their call and destiny. In the present study we must confine ourselves to the consideration of the fact that here, in calling into existence the creation of the six days, we meet the first of a series of “fullnesses” that carry the purpose of the age on to their glorious goal. When we traverse the gap formed by the entry of sin and death, and reach in the book of the Revelation, the other extreme of this present creation, we find that, instead of natural light as in Gen. i. 3, “The Lamb is the light thereof”, “The Lord God giveth them light”, and we read further that the heavenly city “had no need of the sun, neither of the moon”. Instead of the stars which are spoken of in Gen. i. 16, we have the Lord holding “the seven stars in His right hand”, and He himself set forth as “the bright and morning Star”. These are indications that “the former things” are about to pass away. Perhaps the most suggestive item in the six days’ creation, apart from man who was made in the image of God, is the provision of the “firmament”.

“And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters and God called the firmament Heaven” (Gen. i. 6-8).

The first fact that emerges from this passage, whatever for the moment the word “firmament” may prove to mean, is that this firmament that was “called” heaven must be distinguished from that one which was created “in the beginning”. Here is something peculiar to the *present temporary creation*, and destined to pass away at the time of the end. The margin of the A.V. draws attention to the fact that the Hebrew word *raqia* translated “firmament” means literally an “expansion”. *Raqa*, the verb is used by Jeremiah to speak of “silver *spread* into plates” (Jer. x. 9). Job speaks of Him “which alone *spreadeth out* the heavens” (Job ix. 8), and who “*stretcheth out* the north over the *empty place*” (*tohu*, ‘without form’ of Gen. i. 2) (Job xxvi. 7). The stretched out heavens are likened to a tent or tabernacle.

“That stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in” (Isa. xl. 22).

“He that created the heavens, and stretched them out” (Isa. xlii. 5).

“That stretched forth the heavens alone” (Isa. xliv. 24; li. 13; Zech. xii. 1).

Not only is the firmament spoken of in language that reminds of the Tabernacle, there is a reference in Job that suggests that the earth too is looked upon as the ground upon which this tabernacle in the sky rests.

“Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened?” (Job xxxviii. 6).

At first sight there may not appear anything in this passage to link it with the Tabernacle, but when it known that the same word which is translated “foundations” is

rendered “socket” fifty-three times, and that fifty-two of the occurrences refer to the sockets on which the Tabernacle rested in the wilderness, then the references in Job xxxviii. takes on a richer and deeper meaning. The firmament of Gen. i. 6 is a lesser and temporary heaven, destined to pass away when the ages come to an end. This firmament is not only the distant heaven of the sun, the moon or stars, it is also the place where birds can fly (Gen. i. 17). Consequently we can understand that when Christ ascended, He is said to have “passed through” the heavens *dierchomai* not “passed into” (Heb. iv. 14). In Heb. vii. 26 Christ is said to have been “made higher” than the heavens, while Ephesians declares that He ascended up “far above all heavens”, with the object that He might “fill all things” (Eph. iv. 10). Christ is said to have passed through the heavens, to have been made higher than the heavens and to have ascended up far above all heavens. Thus it is impossible for Him to be far above all heavens, and yet be at the same time seated in those very heavens if one and the same heaven is intended, for even though knowledge of heaven and heavenly things may be very limited, we can understand the simple import of the language used. Consequently when we discover that two words are employed for “heaven”, one is *ouranos* which includes the highest sphere of all, but nevertheless can be used of that heaven which is to pass away (Matt. v. 18), of the air where birds fly (Matt. vi. 26), the heaven of the stars (Matt. xxiv. 29) and of the angels (Mark xiii. 32).

The other word is *epouranios*. We perceive that in many passages *ouranos* refers to the firmament of Gen. i. 6, while *epouranios* refers to the heaven of Gen. i. 1 which was unaffected by the overthrow of verse two, and will not be dissolved and pass away. This is where Christ now sits at the right hand of God “Far above all of the heavens”. Heb. ix. 24 speaks of this sphere as “heaven itself”. In two passages the heavens are said to be rolled together or to depart “as a scroll” (Isa. xxxiv. 4; Rev. vi. 14). The present heaven and earth is a temporary “tabernacle” (Psa. xix. 4) in which the God of creation can dwell as the God of Redemption. This creation is to be folded up as a garment (Heb. i. 11, 12), the firmament is likened to the curtains of a tabernacle, which will be “unstitched” at the time of the end (Job xiv. 12 LXX), and pass away as a scroll. The figure is one that appeals to the imagination. A scroll of parchment stretched out and suddenly released, is a figure employed to indicate the sudden departure of the “firmament”, “the stretched out heavens”. The word used in Rev. vi. 14 is *apochorizomai*, which occurs but once elsewhere, and speaks of a departure that followed a violent “paroxysm” or “contention” (Acts xv. 39). *Chorizo* which forms part of this word means “to put asunder” (Matt. xix. 6) and “separate” (Rom. viii. 35). Isa. xxxiv. 4 which speaks of the heavens being rolled together as a scroll, and so speaks of the “firmament” of Gen. i. 6, leads on to the repetition of the condition of Gen. i. 2, for in Isa. xxxiv. 11, as we have seen, “confusion” is *tohu* and “emptiness” is *bohu*, the two words translated “without form and void”.

The position at which the record of the ages has now reached is as follows:

«-----“Heaven itself” which does not pass away-----»
 “Above the heavens”

Gen. i. 1 Heaven and Earth The Beginning	Gen. i. 2 Gap <i>tohu</i> <i>bohu</i>	The Firmament stretched out The Ages <i>The Pleroma</i>	Isa. xxxiv. Gap <i>tohu</i> <i>bohu</i>	Rev. xxi. New Heaven and New Earth and on to The End
--	--	--	--	---

Into the gap caused by the overthrow of Gen. i. 2 is placed the present creation which together with its temporary heaven is to pass away. This present creation, headed by man, constitutes the first of a series of “fullnesses” that follow a series of “gaps” until we at length arrive at Him, in Whom “all fullness dwells”.

We read in Gen. i. 28 “Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth” where the word “replenish” is the verb *male*, a word which as a noun is translated “fullness” in such passages as “The earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof” (Psa. xxiv. 1). The Septuagint uses the verb *pleroo* to translate *male* in Gen. i. 28.

Before we pass on to the next “gap” we must examine the Scriptures and endeavour to discover where the ages begin. In the above diagram it is suggested that the ages begin with the overthrow of Gen. i. 2 and end with the New Creation. This inquiry therefore, must be the subject of our next article.