

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 XXXIII.

1945 - 1946

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

DEAR FELLOW-BELIEVERS,

When we penned the Foreword to the preceding Volume, the enemy was at our gates, and that Volume bears evidence on many a page of the battle that was fought for its very existence.

We write the present introduction, thank God, with the weight of War removed, but we must still record, to the glory of the God of all grace, that such have been the problems which have beset the publication of *The Berean Expositor* since the cessation of hostilities, that nothing less than the “help of God” (which we acknowledged in November, 1944), would have enabled us to write these words on the completion of Volume XXXIII in November, 1946.

We are encouraged to know that in many lands those of like precious faith have helped us with their prayers and their fellowship, and that our very continuance is an indication that our Witness is approved of God, and desired by many of His people.

With renewed confidence we therefore subscribe ourselves,

Yours for the truth, rightly-divided,

CHARLES H. WELCH,
FREDERICK P. BRININGER,
PHILIP DIVE,
GEORGE T. FOSTER,
LESLIE F. GREEN.

November, 1946.

PEARL OF PARABLES, THE--	
The two sons (Luke xv. 11-32)	107, 108
Give me . . . Make me (Luke xv. 12, 19)	109
He wasted his substance with riotous living (Luke xv. 13)	110
He came to himself (Luke xv. 13-16)	111
No more worthy (Luke xv. 17-19)	113
The father's compassion (Luke xv. 20)	114
The prodigal's acceptance (Luke xv. 22)	115
The real lost son (Luke xv. 25-30)	116
 PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO	 6
 PULPIT OF THE OPENED BOOK, THE--	
Inspiration, and the Holy Ghost	118
Preservation of the inspired documents	120
Inspiration, and right-division of the Scriptures	124
Deity of Christ, and the meaning of the Atonement	126
Synopsis of a year's testimony	130
I will have mercy, and not sacrifice	133
 SELF-DRAWN PORTRAIT OF THE APOSTLE PAUL, THE--	
Dread of officious interference	138
Fear of evil appearance	140
Refined courtesy	142
Self-denying love	144
Impatience of formalism, joined with forbearance	145
Tender grief	147
Freedom from jealousy	149
 TEMPTED IN ALL POINTS LIKE AS WE ARE	 151
 THOROUGHLY FURNISHED--	
An examination of the words used	165
 TIME AND PLACE--	
Scriptural association of chronology & topography with doctrine and purpose	170
 TIMOTHY, THE SECOND EPISTLE TO--	
Crown and Prize (ii. 1-13)	172
The enabling of grace (ii. 1)	176
The transmission of the truth (ii. 2)	180
The good Soldier, and structure of ii. 1-13	185
The Athlete and the Husbandman (ii. 5, 6)	190
Consideration and Understanding (ii. 3-7)	194

TOOLS FOR THE UNASHAMED WORKMAN--	
The Concordance: Its use	199
Lexicons	202
TRUST--	
Seven results of a trust that clings	206
Blessedness of this trust (Psa. xl. 4)	209
Association of trust and hope (Psa. lxxi. 5)	210
Hezekiah's pre-eminence (II Kings xviii. 5)	212
Prayer and deliverance (I Chron. v. 20)	213
TRUTH IN THE BALANCE--	
Figure of the Balances in Scriptures	215
Peter's testimony of the three Creations (II Pet. iii. 1-13)	217
Underlying correspondence of All Scripture	222
Doctrine and Practice	226
WAR IN HEAVEN--	
Underlying principles	230
Effect on liberty of the subject	231
Legitimate use of the Scriptures in a day of darkness and strife	233
Censorship of information	235
Measures of defence and offence	236
WORSHIP--	
Meaning of the term	239
Its relation to leading, gospel, sacrifice, and revelation	242
Further examples and illustrations	246
Essential association of true worship with liberty	250

Epistle to Philippians. **pp. 105 - 108**

An examination of passages that have been adduced as evidence that the Epistle belongs to the period before Acts xxviii. and not to the dispensation of the mystery.

More than one reader has submitted a series of objections to the inclusion of Philippians as an epistle of the mystery, contending that the passages which they advance refer rather to a period before Acts xxviii. than after that dispensational boundary. The matter is of importance to us all, and for the truth's sake we should know what these objections are and what answers the Scriptures provide.

(1) "Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. i. 6).

The suggestion made is that, instead of translating with the A.V., "will perform", the thought is that something commenced by the Lord was now *about to be discontinued* because of the imminence of the dispensation of the mystery.

"Being confident" is the translation of *peitho*, which occurs three times in this opening chapter, subdividing the structure into three sections. In verses 12-18 this "confidence" is associated with "the furtherance", not the "discontinuance", of the gospel and, in verses 22-26, not with Paul's departure and "discontinuance", but with Paul's "abiding in the flesh" and the "furtherance" of the Philippians' joy and faith. If, therefore, it is to this furtherance of what had already been begun by the Apostle that the opening remark refers, why, so far as God's work was concerned, instead of "furthering", was He about to discontinue it? However, while this creates an atmosphere, it is not proof. The word translated "perform" may mean "discontinue", and if it does, that is the end of all argument. Accordingly we examine the original for this word and find that it is the Greek *epiteleo*.

Writing to the Corinthians, the Apostle manifested his great concern that the offering for the poor saints at Jerusalem should be completed:

"Insomuch that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also *finish* in you the same grace also" (II Cor. viii. 6).

"Now therefore *perform* the doing of it; that as there was a readiness to will, so there may *be a performance* also out of that which ye have" (II Cor. viii. 11).

Here we have three occurrences of *epiteleo*, placed in contrast with "begun" and a readiness "to will". It would make nonsense of this chapter to teach that Paul intended

the Corinthians to understand that the collection for the saints was to be discontinued or postponed until some future and remote date. As II Cor. ix. 1-5 makes abundantly clear, the argument is all the other way.

This, however, is not the only occurrence of *epiteleo* in II Corinthians.

“Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, *perfecting* holiness in the fear of God” (II Cor. vii. 1).

Did the Apostle conclude the exhortation commenced in II Cor. vi. 14, by saying “*Discontinue* holiness”, “*Postpone* all practical sanctification until a future date”? To ask the question is to expose its folly.

Paul uses the word *epiteleo* once more in relation with the verb “to begin”:

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

We believe we can confidently leave the question of the correct translation of Phil. i. 6, to the sane judgment of any believer who can weigh evidence, and who believes that all scripture is inspired.

(2) The next objection is that the apostle wrote Philippians in evident expectation of the nearness of the “second coming”, and the passage cited for this is Phil. i. 22-25.

The only word in this passage that can be assumed to refer to the Lord’s second coming is in verse 23 where the Apostle uses the word “to depart”. This word is *analuo*, the origin of the English word “analysis”. It occurs in the noun form, *analusis*, in II Tim. iv. 6, where the Apostle said “the time for my *departure* is at hand”. This of itself is convincing enough, but it is fortified by the use of another word, *spendomai*, “to be offered”, which also occurs only in Philippians and II Timothy. In Philippians Paul said he would “desire” to depart, and he was willing “to be offered” (Phil. ii. 17). In II Timothy he says the time for his departure was at hand, and that he was about to be offered. The fact that out of all his epistles these two words are used by Paul only in these passages is a fact that cannot be ignored in the attempt to translate his meaning into English: the one thing that is certain is that Paul was referring to his own death, “analysis”, and not the “return” of the Lord.

The only other occurrence of *analuo* is in Luke xii. 36, where it means “to break up” the party, the word *erchomai* being the word rightly translated “come” and having reference to the second coming. If the opposition say that this is but a “private interpretation”, we reply by quoting Rotherham’s version, whose author, as far as we know, would not have agreed with the *Berean Expositor* on many points.

“Once he *may break up* out of the marriage feast, that when He cometh, etc.”

In the N.T. *analuo* does not refer to the coming of the Lord. The use therefore of Phil. i. 22-25, as an objection to the inclusion of Philippians as an epistle of the present dispensation is groundless.

(3) The words of Phil. ii. 15 are quoted as containing a phrase that links this epistle with the period before Acts xxviii., the word “nation” being correctly rendered “generation”.

“Sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation.”

Two fallacies are at the base of this objection. One is that the coming in of the dispensation of the mystery had an effect upon the character of the outside world, and the other, that an epistle of the mystery can make no reference to “generations”. If these are not the intentions of the objector, in what do the objections consist? The Saviour called the generation in which He lived and witnessed both “wicked” and “perverse” (Matt. xii. 45; xvii. 17), but they were no less so during the Acts, under the ministry of Peter, nor did they change for the better after Acts xxviii. That the epistles of the mystery do make specific reference to generations, let the following testify:

“Which in other *ages* was not made known” (Eph. iii. 5).

“Throughout all *ages*, world without end” (Eph. iii. 21).

“Hid from the *ages* and from generations” (Col. i. 26).

In these references the A.V. has rendered *genea*, “ages”, twice. In Col. i. 26, they to whom the epistle was addressed were compelled to distinguish between ages and generations. In Eph. iii. 21, the A.V. departs very considerably from the original, which literally should read: “Unto all the generations of the age of the ages.”

The epistles of the mystery therefore have of necessity to refer to (i) Generations past; (ii) The generation present; and (iii) The generations to come. Under what rule of interpretation can past and future generations be referred to without contradicting the truth of the mystery, while a reference to the character of the present generation can do so? If reference to the wickedness and perversity of the generations among which the members of the One Body were obliged to live be an objection, then Eph. ii. 1-3; iv. 17-19, 25-31; v. 3-7, 12, 14 and 16 are enough to remove the Ephesian epistle from the present dispensation.

(4) Another objection is based upon Phil. iii. 3, where Paul said: “We are the circumcision”.

It is well to remind ourselves that any argument that proves too much defeats itself, for by the same reasoning the epistle to the Colossians must also be rejected. There we read:

“In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body (*of the sins*) of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ” (Col. ii. 11).

If Colossians, when it explains spiritual circumcision to be “the putting off of the body of flesh”, is to be retained, why should Philippians be rejected when it also explains spiritual circumcision by “having no confidence in the flesh”? The objection is evidently the offspring of bias and cannot be maintained.

(5) The last objection is the fact that Paul refers in Phil. iv. 3, to “the Book of Life”.

In the book of the Revelation we read of the Book of Life of the Lamb slain since the foundation of the world. This demands careful examination and our own translation associates the words “since the foundation of the world” with the writing of the book, but for the moment we must leave that question. It would be adding to Scripture to suggest that the Book mentioned in Phil. iv. 3, is the “Lamb’s Book of Life”, or that it was not written *before* the foundation of the world, or that there is not a Book of Life for each sphere of blessing. Dispensational changes do not deal with such basic things as sin, death, life, redemption, etc. These retain their original meaning, whether found in Gospels, Acts or Epistles. We should be thankful that the Apostle has indicated that the names of the members of the One Body are in the Book of Life, just as surely as are those of the true seed of Israel.

Having, then, examined these objections we feel that something much stronger and more incisive than the objections we have been considering will have to be advanced before Philippians can be removed from its place among the latest epistles written by Paul, the Lord’s prisoner. With its insistence upon service and reward, this epistle is a balance to Ephesians, with its delineation of high privileges.

We may add that the element of reward is not absent from Colossians (Col. ii. 18; iii. 22-25) and that Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians contain a threefold emphasis on *axios*, “worthy” (Eph. iv. 1; Phil. i. 27 and Col. i. 10), all of which support the retention of Philippians among the epistles of the mystery.

Will Evil Re-enter the Universe? **pp. 129 - 131**

This article is written in reply to the question put by a reader: “What guarantee have we that evil will not once again enter into the universe with resultant conditions like those described in Gen. i. 2?” Our answer falls into two parts:--

- (1) A condition such as that indicated in Gen. i. 2 *is* to recur *before* the ages end, but
- (2) A recurrence *after* the ages have run their course will be impossible.

We must now substantiate these statements, show where they differ and why.

In the first case, the reason for a repetition of chaos lies in the fact that man still has a hand in the direction of events, whereas in the second, God shall be all in all. In each case the answer to the question “Why?” is “Christ”. In the first He is not fully accepted, but in the second He is paramount. The former catastrophe results from the attempt of the creature to stand alone, and the removal of such a possibility results from all, at last, coming under the redeeming aegis.

Both Isaiah and Peter speak of a period at the end of this age that will resemble the chaotic conditions of Gen. i. 2. The words “without form and void” (*Heb. tohu va bohu*) are repeated in Isa. xxxiv.: “And He shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion (*tohu*), and the stones of emptiness (*bohu*)” (Isa. xxxiv. 11).

Closely associated with this prophecy are utterances that compel us to see that they are identical with those recorded by Peter in his second epistle.

“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).

With this prophetic utterance, compare the following words of Peter:--

“But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved” (II Pet. iii. 10, 11).

It is therefore a certainty that before the end of this age is reached, conditions similar to that of Gen. i. 2 will be repeated, and apparently for similar reasons.

This, however, is but one part of our answer. There is a better and more blessed one. Peter himself follows this picture of chaos come again, with the hope, “Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” (II Pet. iii. 13). The guarantee that never again after the realization of this hope shall evil enter God’s universe and bring about a state similar to that of Gen. i. 2 is

found in the promises, the purpose, and the power of God, which find their moral ground and guarantee in the redemptive work of the Son of God.

The Promises.—First, we can add to the promise recorded by Peter such passages as,

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away” (Rev. xxi. 1-4).

This promise is supplemented by an act of creation: “And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new” which, in turn, is followed by the injunction, “Write: for these things are true and faithful” (Rev. xxi. 5). Unless, therefore, we are prepared to admit that God may be unfaithful to His promises; that the “former things” will not pass away; that the blessed “no more” of Rev. xxi. 4 is but an exaggeration or a pious hope; then we have a guarantee that is beyond doubt that evil will not again rear its head.

The Purpose.—We can supplement the certainty that comes from the promises of God by the statement He has made concerning His purposes. Let us put into the scale the following weighty words concerning the purposes of God.

“Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass” (Isa. xiv. 24).
“The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?” (Isa. xiv. 27).
“Every purpose of the Lord shall be performed” (Jer. li. 29).
“The purpose of Him Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will” (Eph. i. 11).

Not only have we these strong statements to rest upon, but the goal toward which this purpose moves also guarantees against future defection:

“Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son” (Rom. viii. 29).

When this image of the heavenly is attained; when all the redeemed are with Christ and like Him, evil will be impossible:

“When all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all” (I Cor. xv. 28).

Here again is strong guarantee—all in the heavenly image; all in Christ; all in perfect agreement, and God all in all.

Left to himself man brings chaos back to the earth. Man placed in Christ; redeemed by His precious blood; made partaker of the Divine nature; the subject of infinite love; guarded by infinite power; vitally and eternally joined with the risen Christ; shall enter a new realm “wherein dwelleth righteousness”.

These are some of the reasons that may be adduced from the Scriptures to give the required guarantee, but they can be strengthened and supplemented by acquaintance with the Scriptural teaching concerning the origin of sin; the end both of the devil, sin and

death; the teaching concerning redemption; the essential meaning of the word “new”; the character of God; the extent and nature of His promises, and the declared purpose of the ages.

The original failures recorded in Scripture are not on the part of God but on that of His creatures, while left to themselves. In the world to come, no creature will again ever be left to himself: all will be in Christ; all will be redeemed; all will, at length, be satisfied. It is written of Christ that “He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied”. In that, we can safely and confidently rest and find the guarantee sought for in the question put to us.

Psychology tells us that in any undertaking there are two essentials to success: the ability to do, and the wisdom to carry out the project. Of a being possessed of infinite wisdom and unlimited power it could safely be predicated that whatever was undertaken would succeed. Christ is “The Wisdom of God and the Power of God”, and Christ crucified, risen, ascended and reigning is the fullest guarantee that heaven can give that never again shall evil enter into the universe of God.

“Because I live, ye shall live also.”—These words also contain a principle that can be extended endlessly. Because sin and death have no more dominion over Him, they can have no more dominion over us. His throne is for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end. As in the personal salvation and hopes of the individual, so in the great purpose of the ages, the key, the foundation, the assurance is Christ.

Anglo-Israelism.

p. 188

Memory is a fickle thing. If by any chance some, so-called, forecast of events made by any of our self-styled modern prophets should approximate to fulfillment, there is a buzz of interest, but how many similar “prophecies”, which were stillborn, are forgotten! In reading through Volume XVIII of the Berean Expositor we came across two small items under the heading “Signs of the Times”, and read them with renewed interest. We believe the reader of the present volume would be well advised to keep them in mind as specimens of Anglo-Israelism and Pyramid “prophecies”.

(1) **ANGLO-ISRAELISM, AND THE THRONE OF DAVID.**

“We are coming to the day, says this organ of *Pentecostalism*, ‘Showers of Blessing’, No. 46, when we will find the nations of the earth bowing at the feet of our king, for the throne whereon he sits is the throne of the Lord.

Do we realize that the eyes of the people are being opened by divine power to see in the young Prince of Wales, not only man, but an office and setting of God? In this way the Scripture is now being fulfilled in this son of David—‘I, If I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me’.”

Our comment in 1928 was: “This is either God’s blessed truth, or the ‘devil’s lie’.” In 1946 it needs little insight to see which such utterings must be.

(2) **PROPHECY OF DISASTER IN WHICH RUSSIA WILL BE WIPED OUT.**

“The next great world war will start on May 28th, 1928, and will continue until September 16th, 1936.”

This “prophecy” was made by Mr. Basil Stewart at the Annual Meeting of the British Israelites, Londonderry House, Park Lane, London. He not only uttered this lying prophecy, but he tied it to that other source of deception, the so-called symbolism of the Great Pyramid, saying: “This date is foretold in exactly the same as was August 4th, 1914.” The reader should keep in mind that “August 4th, 1914” was discovered after the event!

These utterances should be considered in the light of Deut. xviii. 21, 22, and the system that originates them shunned:

“And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him” (Deut. xviii. 21, 22).

Doctrine and Practice, Inseparable. **pp. 207, 208**

Truth is so vast and its implications so great, that the mind is compelled to analyze, dissect and separate in order to attain to some semblance of understanding, but both teacher and taught should ever remember that truth so dissected is dead: we are but conducting a post-mortem examination. Consequently we differentiate between faith and works, and can consider each separately, yet in strict truth “faith if it hath not works is dead, being alone” (James ii. 17), and so are works without faith. Again, we differentiate most markedly between imputed righteousness and practical righteousness, yet if imputed righteousness never manifests itself in practical righteousness, the original reckoning is vain, being unfruitful.

For the purposes of clearer understanding we speak of Doctrine and Practice, and point out that whereas Eph. i.-iii. contains seven sections devoted to doctrinal truth, Eph. iv.-vi. contains seven corresponding sections devoted to practical truth, but if we imagine it to be possible to receive, believe and enjoy the revelation of the doctrinal section while ignoring the practical teaching of the corresponding section, we are in grievous error. The doctrine cannot be divorced from its divinely described goal, namely, “that we should be holy and without blame”. So also the revelation contained in Eph. i. 15-23 presupposes the enlightenment of the eyes: “the eyes of your understanding having been enlightened” (i. 18, perfect, passive participle). The fact that salvation is by grace, through faith, and not of works is not to be separated from the equally emphasized fact that it is nevertheless “unto good works” (Eph. ii. 8-10). The doctrine of Eph. i.-iii. and the practice of Eph. iv.-vi. make one undivided whole, and any attempt to explain the one without the other is vain and must end in confusion. In John’s Gospel the Saviour has given one or two words that point in this direction.

“If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine” (John vii. 17).

“Will do” is the simple future, but this is not what the original says. The R.V. is correct and reads: “If any man willeth to do His will”, showing that the “will” of the person is involved. The same care is called for in translating John v. 40, where the A.V. reads, “Ye will not come to Me”, which is given a force nearer to that of the original if made to read, “Ye are not willing to come to Me”. Other examples of the truth “WILL TO DO” precedes knowledge of doctrine can easily be found.

“If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed” (John viii. 31).

This word “continue” is the translation of *meno*, a key word of John’s Gospel, mostly translated “abide” (see viii. 35). So John xv. 9 says “*continue* ye in My love”, but John xv. 10 says, “Ye shall *abide* in My love”. While a different word is used in John viii. 44, there appears to be a reference to the danger of the negative side of this truth, for it says of the devil that he “abode not in the truth”.

First then we have “the will to do”, followed by the taking up of a permanent abode, making the word of the Lord our dwelling-place, our atmosphere, our environment: “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free” (John viii. 32). Here the knowledge of truth which flows out of this abiding, leads to liberty, and makes *free*. While the truth is necessarily expressed in language, a knowledge of grammar is essential to its interpretation, yet nothing is said of grammar, of the laws of interpretation, of literary ability: what is stressed is consistent, corresponding practice.

This is one of the primary lessons which all must learn and practice, if they would understand doctrine aright.

TO OLD AND NEW READERS.

p. 228

May we, with becoming humility, invite the reader to consider the testimony supplied by the Index to Volume XXXIII, which is incorporated with the present issue. There will be found valuable *expository* articles, such as those on “The Acts”, “John’s Gospel”, and “II Timothy”; *Dispensational truth* both in its positive presentation, as in “Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth” and “Time and Place”, and in those articles which “contend earnestly for the faith once delivered” the reader will see that the witness for which *The Berean Expositor* was raised up is still living and vigorous. *Devotional* and *Practical* articles also find their place, as such Series as “Worship”, “The Pearl of Parables”, and “Trust” will reveal. The earnest student who seeks the equipment provided by the Word is also catered for, the articles entitled “Ephesia” and “Thoroughly Furnished” being of peculiar interest to all engaged in *ministry*.

We make no comparison with other publications, but we do earnestly commend *The Berean Expositor* to every believer who would obey the injunction of II Tim. ii. 15, and who would emulate the Bereans (Acts xvii. 11).

The Acts of the Apostles.

#55. The Dispensational Landmark (xxviii. 23 - 31). “The Kingdom of God concerning Jesus” (xxviii. 23). pp. 1 - 5

It is common knowledge that the Acts and the Gospel according to Luke come from the same writer, and that the last chapter of Luke’s Gospel is briefly summarized in the opening verses of Acts i., before the new story commences. Consequently, we must remember that the words of Acts i. 3, “Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God”, are Luke’s own summary of several verses found in Luke xxiv., where, with fuller detail, he had given the character and subject-matter of that wonderful teaching. As we draw near to the closing testimony of the Acts, it will help us if we refresh our memory as to the nature of this teaching of the Lord. Where Acts i. 3 summarizes without detail, Luke xxiv. 27 and 44 are more explicit:

“And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself.”

“All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me.”

We now see that Acts i. 1-15 and Acts xxviii. 23-31 present this comparison. In both there is given a careful exposition of the O.T. scriptures, and the leaders of Israel in Rome are given the same testimony as the disciples received in the land of Palestine. Alas! the *results* of the testimony were not comparable but, in many points, there is correspondence between Luke xxiv. and Acts xxviii. Let us acquaint ourselves with this important fact.

(1) THE THEME in both passages is “concerning Jesus”.

The Greek word *peri* occurs in Luke xxiv. 4, 14, 19, 27 and 44; and in Acts xxviii. 23 and 31.

“As they were much perplexed *thereabouts*.”

“And they talked together *of* all these things which had happened.”

“And He said, What things? And they said, *Concerning* Jesus of Nazareth.”

“He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things *concerning* Himself.”

“All things must be fulfilled which were written *concerning* Me.”

“Persuading them *concerning* Jesus.”

“Teaching those things which *concern* the Lord Jesus Christ.”

(We shall have to deal later with the titles of the Lord here used, but for the moment we will continue the comparison of Luke xxiv. with Acts xxviii.).

(2) THIS THEME relates to “Hope”.

“We *trusted* (*elpizo*) that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel” (Luke xxiv. 21).

“For the hope (*elpis*) of Israel, I am bound with this chain” (Acts xxviii. 20).

(3) THE BASIS of this teaching and hope was the O.T. Scriptures.

“All that the prophets have spoken” (Luke xxiv. 25).

“And beginning at Moses and all the prophets” (Luke xxiv. 27).

“In the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms” (Luke xxiv. 45).

“Both the law of Moses and the Prophets” (Acts xxviii. 23).

(4) THE METHOD was that of exposition.

“He *expounded* unto them in all the scriptures” (Luke xxiv. 27).

“He *opened* to us the scriptures” (Luke xxiv. 32).

“He *expounded* and *testified*” (Acts xxviii. 23).

(5) THE OBJECT was persuasion with a view to belief and understanding.

“O fools and slow of heart *to believe*” (Luke xxiv. 25).

“Did not our heart *burn within us*” (Luke xxiv. 32).

“Then *opened* he their *understanding*” (Luke xxiv. 45).

“*Persuading* them concerning Jesus” (Acts xxviii. 23).

“Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not *understand*” (Acts xxviii. 26).

To these close parallels there are added others, more incidental, yet nevertheless having some weight, such as the “lodging” and the “hired house” of the Apostle (Acts xxviii. 23 and 30), and the invitation to abide with the disciples, as it was toward evening (Luke xxiv. 29). Again, the word “slow” in the phrase “slow of heart to believe” (Luke xxiv. 25) is *bradus*, while the word “dull” in the phrase “dull of hearing” (Acts xxviii. 27) is *bareos*, both words being derived from *baros*, “a weight”. The eyes of the two who walked to Emmaus “were opened” (Luke xxiv. 31), but of the eyes of the Jews in Rome it is written, “their eyes have they closed” (Acts xxviii. 27). The rebuke “O fools” follows the words, “they saw not” (Luke xxiv. 24), and this same word “to see” and “to perceive” occurs in Acts xxviii. 26 and 27. The fact that there occurs in both passages, “the evening”, “the third day” or “after three days”, might also be noted. Also that while the name “Moses” has three or four different spellings in the N.T., in Luke xxiv. and Acts xxviii. the spelling is the same. These, however, are but incidental, the five items first noted being sufficient for our purpose.

We have established two important points.

- (1) In the preceding article (Volume XXXII, pp. 208-212), from the Apostle’s own testimony, the close relationship which his witness, even among the Gentiles, had with the hope of Israel.
- (2) A link between the testimony of the Lord Himself “in the land” with that of the Apostle “in Rome”.

What we have not discovered is any statement or allusion to a distinct, high, and heavenly calling for the believing Gentile, independently of Israel, the promises made unto the fathers, or the covenants. We are on the very verge of this revelation, but until the crisis is actually reached and Israel set aside “the mystery” was “hid in God”.

Let us now return to Acts xxviii. and give the record of this interesting and critical day our closest attention.

The Chief of the Jews appointed a day and the Apostle occupied the time “from morning till evening” “expounding and testifying the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the Prophets”, and we can well believe that that all-day exposition would have made the heart of any believer to “burn within” him, even as in the case of the disciples when they listened to the Lord on the way of Emmaus. It may not be given to us to expound the Scriptures as did the Apostle, but we can and do point out that which the Lord has shown us, and pray that it may find a lodging in the heart of many a true “Berean”.

Paul “expounded” and “testified”. What do these two words mean and what do they teach us?

The word translated “expound” is *ektithemi*, literally, “to put out”. The first occurrence of the word is in Acts vii. 21, where it speaks of Moses when he was “cast out”. In English, “to expound” is rarely used in this primitive sense, although Butler in 1678 wrote, “First, he *expounded* both his pockets”, and an Exposition is the name that has been given to an Exhibition, as in 1868. While what we usually intend by “expound” or “exposition”, is the art of setting forth an argument, a commentary or a detailed explanation, we should remember that in both the Greek and English words, the primitive meaning is never quite lost sight of.

There are only two other occurrences of *ektithemi* in the N.T. and they all come in the Acts.

“Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and *expounded* it by order unto them”
(Acts xi. 4).

Here the expansion of the act is illuminative. The rehearsal was “from the beginning”, while the exposition was “by order”, a word used geographically in Acts xviii. 23, and so giving a good idea of what exposition involves.

“Aquila and Priscilla *expounded* unto him the way of God more perfectly”
(Acts xviii. 26).

Again, the word *akribos*, “perfectly”, reveals another aspect of the faculty of exposition, in which not only is item added to item, in order, as did Peter, but there is advance from the lower to the higher, as was the case with Apollos under this fruitful type of teaching. This was one part of the Apostle’s method of teaching. There was another, which supplemented it and made the exposition live. He “testified” (*diamarturomai*). This is the ordinary word “to bear witness”, *marturomai*, with *dia* added, as though to indicate “a thorough witness”, *dia* meaning “through”, and in composition not always so translated, but giving added emphasis.

The Lord had appeared to Paul in a vision and had said:

“As thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome”
(Acts xxiii. 11).

Here, in the next occurrence of the word, we find the fulfillment of the promise. “Witness” differs from “exposition”. It is conceivable that an unbeliever might be able to expose the teaching of the O.T. Scriptures concerning their prophetic utterances and the fulfillment of the same. With certain reservations, he may even be able to compare the “more perfect” way of the gospel with that of the law, but it would be an academic effort and lifeless; he would not be able to add his personal testimony. Paul not only gave a masterly analysis of the O.T. in that characteristic manner of his, “confounding the Jews proving that this is the very Christ” (Acts ix. 22), but he would go over his life from his youth, speak of his conversion, his commission, and of the grace that had been granted him. He would speak of “The Son of God Who loved me, and gave Himself for me”.

This exposition and testimony was twofold. It was “the kingdom of God”, and it was concerning Jesus”. Whatever we may think is the meaning of the phrase “the kingdom of God”, we must remember that:

- (1) It was found in the law of Moses and the Prophets.
- (2) It was something most intimately connected with the hope of Israel.
- (3) It was also closely associated with the teaching of the O.T. Scriptures concerning Jesus.

Before we proceed two or three observations are necessary. Where Matthew uses the term, “The kingdom of *heaven*” (as for example in Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17), Mark uses “the kingdom of *God*” (Mark i. 14, 15). In Mark i. 15, the kingdom of God is said to be “at hand” and “the time” is said to be fulfilled.

Turning to the Acts of the Apostles we find that the Lord’s teaching in the days after His resurrection is summarized as, “Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God” (Acts i. 3), and as a direct outcome of this teaching (as indicated by the word “therefore” in verse 6), the Apostles seize the first opportunity to ask whether the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel would take place “at that time”.

Paul had before “disputed and persuaded” concerning the kingdom of God, notably in the synagogue of Ephesus (Acts xix. 8), and summed up his ministry during the Acts as “preaching the kingdom of God”, in other words, “testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ” and as a declaration to them of “all the counsel of God” (Acts xx. 21, 25, 27).

It is apparent, therefore, that if the Apostle could honestly say that his teaching was “none other than Moses and the prophets did say should come” (Acts xxvi. 22), we must so interpret his use of the term, the kingdom of God, as to include the restoration again of the earthly kingdom which constituted part of the hope of Israel. The term, however, is much wider than anything found in the Gospels, the Acts, or the early Epistles. We find it used after Israel were set aside, and when Luke would describe Paul’s prison ministry he wrote, “Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the

Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him” (Acts xxviii. 31). The revelation of the mystery therefore must be included in the kingdom of God, and Col. iv. 11 does not hesitate to use the term to define the goal of Paul and his fellow-workers. It would appear, therefore, that we must understand the kingdom of God to refer to that all-embrasive sovereignty which includes all spheres of blessing, all callings and all inheritances, and that dispensational truth, seeking to observe the sub-divisions in that all-embrasive kingdom, speaks of the Church, of Israel, and of the Bride, as the case may be. The direct object of Paul’s exposition and testimony was the kingdom of God; the direct object of his persuasion was concerning Jesus. In the next verse the word translated “persuade”, *peitho*, is rendered “believe”. It is the word used by Agrippa and by those who charged the Apostle with having “persuaded and turned away much people” at Ephesus. The way in which the word is used of the centurion in Acts xxvii. 11, “The centurion *believed* the master and the owner of the ship, more than those things which were spoken by Paul”, is rather a foreshadowing of the attitude of Paul’s own people, the Jews, in Rome, for it is recorded of them that “some believed the things which were spoken and some believed not”.

One further item of truth must detain us at verse 23. Paul persuaded them concerning “Jesus”. When the Apostle refers to the Saviour in his Epistles, it is his general practice to give Him His title, “Jesus Christ”, “Christ Jesus”, “Jesus Christ the Lord”, etc., but, on occasion, he uses simply the name “Jesus”. This he does in Hebrews eight times, and in Thessalonians and II Corinthians, where the name occurs eight times, the subject concerned being associated with the resurrection. Romans and I Corinthians contain one occurrence each, and in the seven Epistles written after Acts xxviii., Paul uses the name “Jesus” but twice. When we compare Acts xxviii. 23 with verse 31 we are struck by two things.

- (1) To the Jews, before their rejection, Paul used the name “Jesus”.
- (2) After their rejection the name is changed. While the kingdom of God is retained, the teaching is concerning “the Lord Jesus Christ”.

This change is not accidental.

There is another feature that demands attention, and which arises from an examination of verses 23 and 31, but this must await the next opportunity of meeting together in these pages.

**#56. The Dispensational Landmark (xxviii. 23 - 31).
Paul's use of the O.T., and the structure of the section.
pp. 21 - 24**

We closed our last article with an intimation to the effect that besides the selection by the inspired writer of the name "Jesus", there was another point of nomenclature worth considering in Acts xxviii. 23, as compared with verse 31.

When Paul bore his testimony to the chief of the Jews, the basis of his exposition was the law of Moses and the Prophets. But after Israel were set aside, his testimony is no longer called "expounding" but "preaching" and "teaching", and the Scriptures are unnamed. Now a false argument might be deduced from this absence of reference to the then existing Scriptures, but an examination of Paul's subsequent ministry shows that he still retained a whole-hearted belief and love for the Word of God. In fact, in his last epistle we find the clearest testimony to the inspiration of "*all* Scripture" (II Tim. iii. 14-17), yet, even so, there still remains to be weighed the fact of the absence of any reference to the Scriptures in the last verse of the Acts, which is set in such pointed contrast with the twenty-third verse.

If we turn the page and look at the first epistle that follows, that to the Romans, we observe that the gospel of God is that "which He promised afore by His prophets *in the holy scriptures*" (Rom. i. 2), and that the very doctrine of justification by faith is "*as it is written, The just shall live by faith*" (Rom. i. 17). Indeed "*What saith the scripture?*" (Rom. iv. 3) might well be taken as epitomizing Paul's attitude in these early epistles. Altogether Paul uses the word *graphe*, "scripture", fourteen times. Seven of the occurrences are in Romans, two in I Corinthians and three in Galatians, leaving only two in the epistles written after the setting aside of Israel, namely, I Tim. v. 18 and II Tim. iii. 16. Upon examination we discover that neither of these two latter has anything to do with the teaching of the mystery, for I Tm. V. 18 deals with the recognition of service, a matter of practice that is quite inter-dispensational, and II Tim. iii. 16 is the Apostle's testimony to "All Scripture" which precludes references to any particular doctrine.

The phrase "It is written" is used by Paul some forty times in his early epistles, but is entirely absent from the epistle written after Acts xxviii. 25. Let us then examine Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians and see the manner in which the O.T. Scriptures are used, or referred to, in them.

We read the whole of the first chapter of Ephesians down to the twenty-second verse before we come to a reference, viz., "And hath put all things under His feet" (Psa. viii. 6), but if the reader will compare "what" are here said to be put under his feet, with what are said to be under His feet in Eph. i. 21-23, he will agree that the Apostle owed nothing to the O.T. for what he writes in Eph. i. 21-23. We read on through chapter ii., through chapter iii., through chapter iv. to verse 8 before we meet with the next quotation.

Again, if the reader will turn to the quoted Psa. lxxviii. he will see that while the ascension of Christ is there revealed, not the remotest indication is given as to what were the “gifts” that He gave to men. For that information we are indebted to the Apostle, and he received it by revelation and observation, not by reading Psa. lxxviii.

We therefore continue our quest for one solitary quotation of the O.T. Scriptures by the Apostle in making known the truth of the mystery. In Eph. v. 30 we read, “For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones”. The Revisers omit the words “of His flesh and of His bones” and so do the Companion Bible and the Numeric New Testament. The passage therefore is too debatable to be admitted. The next verse is a direct quotation from Gen. ii. 24, but the words following, “But I speak concerning Christ and the church” (Eph. v. 32) bring back the subject from the general relationship of man and wife to the particular relationship of Christ and His church, which, though *illustrated* by the quotation is not thereby *revealed*.

In chapter vi. we meet the first direct quotation from O.T. Scriptures upon which a doctrine or a precept is made to depend.

“Honour thy father and mother; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth” (Eph. vi. 2, 3).

This is addressed, not to members of the Body, but to “children” who are exhorted to obey their parents in the Lord “for this is right”—not because they were fellow-members of the Body.

The apparent quotation of Zech. viii. 16 in Eph. iv. 25, “Speak every man truth with his neighbour”, is explained by the fact that Paul’s whole phraseology was tinged with O.T. language, but even if this be included as a direct quotation nothing can be made of Zech. viii. that constitutes any doctrine connected with the subject-matter, except by general analogy.

Philippians contains not a single quotation from the Old Testament. There is an allusion to Isa. xlv. 23 in Phil. ii. 11, and it refers to the Person of the Lord, not to the mystery. Colossians uses no reference, and II Timothy but one, namely Numb. xvi. 5 and 26, in chapter ii. 19. As we have seen, I Timothy uses the law concerning the muzzling of the ox, to which we have already alluded (I Tim. v. 18); but there is no other quotation. This leaves only Titus and Philemon neither of which makes reference to the O.T.

Here then we have seven epistles, and they contain not more than eight quotations from the O.T., possibly but seven, and of this number, not one can be said to teach or reveal any doctrine peculiar to the testimony of Paul the prisoner of the Lord.

We come back therefore to Acts xxviii. 23 and 31 and perceive that the emphasis upon the Law and the Prophets in verse 23 and the pointed omission of any reference to the Scriptures in verse 31 entirely harmonizes with the two dispensations that find their “landmark” in Acts xxviii. 25-28.

salvation of God was “heard” and that believingly. And so the structure leads us step by step to the crisis, the quotation of Isa. vi. 10, the Dispensational Landmark of the N.T.

Our next investigation must be the peculiar place that Isa. vi. 10 occupies in the development of the purpose of the ages, and its association with “Mystery” and “Gentile”.

**#57. The Dispensational Landmark (xxviii. 23 - 31).
The critical importance of Isa. vi. 9, 10 demonstrated.
pp. 57 - 61**

We have seen that the hope of Israel, with its accompanying evidential miracles, continued throughout the Acts to the last chapter, and that Paul associated himself and the Gentile believers entrusted to his care with that hope and kingdom. What we must keep in mind, however, is that the kingdom of Israel had two phases, one earthly, the other heavenly, and that it is with the heavenly phase that Paul associates the believing Gentile, as Gal. iii. 28, 29; iv. 26; Heb. iii. 1 and xii. 22 reveal. That this heavenly phase is, nevertheless, closely linked with the earthly portion of the kingdom Rom. xv. 12, 13 makes clear. We are not now attempting proof of these statements, but simply indicating to the reader that we are fully alive to the fact that the churches under Paul’s care were not expecting to participate in the restored kingdom of Israel, even though their own heavenly hope could not materialize until Israel was restored. For this reason the Apostle used the wider, all-comprehensive, term “The kingdom of God”, which we have seen from Acts i. 3 and 6 could be used to indicate the kingdom of Israel only, yet is wide enough to include not only the heavenly phase of this kingdom (Acts xxviii. 23), but the mystery itself, when the hope of the lower aspects of the kingdom went into abeyance (Acts xxviii. 31). Again, we remind ourselves and our readers that these fragmentary references cannot be considered as proof, but as our immediate concern is the general teaching of this part of the Acts we pass on to consider the peculiar place which Isa. vi. 9, 10 occupies in the dispensational teaching of the N.T.

The first quotation of this passage in the N.T. is in Matt. xiii., and an examination of the context and what leads up to its quotation by our Lord will throw light upon its use by Paul in this great climax of the Acts. The Gospel according to Matthew is purposely limited in its scope. In face of the unambiguous words of Christ in Matt. x. no one who believes the inspiration of Scripture can deny this:

“Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not;
but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. x. 5, 6).

This limitation was reaffirmed in Matt. xv. where the Lord said in the hearing of the Syro-phoenician woman:

“I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. xv. 24).

That a woman of Samaria was nevertheless saved and that this woman of Canaan was nevertheless blessed, does not alter the fact that neither the apostles nor the Lord were, at that time, “sent” to any other than Israel. This restriction is endorsed by the apostle Paul in Rom. xv. 8.

The Lord’s public ministry was heralded by a great succession of miracles which were witnessed throughout the land from Galilee, Decapolis, Jerusalem and Judaea to beyond Jordan. The Divine purpose of these miracles is indicated in the lament of Matt. xi. 20: “Then began He to upbraid the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done, because they repented not.” It is obvious that the repentance of the people was the prime object before the Lord in these miracles, and in this they failed. In Matt. xii. the shadow of rejection deepens: One “greater than the temple”, “greater than Jonah”, “greater than Solomon” was in their midst and they knew Him not (Matt. xii. 6, 41, 42). Here we see the growing rejection of Christ as Prophet (Jonah), Priest (Temple) and King (Solomon). Then comes parable, mystery, and the quotation of Isa. vi. 9, 10 in Matt. xiii. 14, 15.

The disciples were struck with the new form of teaching which the Lord adopted. Until then “He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes” but now His symbolic language was contrasted with His former plainness of speech by both apostles and people. He had used the symbol of a Shepherd, and the people said: “If Thou be the Christ, tell us *plainly*” (John x. 24). He had said to the grieving disciples, “Our friend Lazarus sleepeth”, but upon their evident misunderstanding of his words He “said unto them *plainly*, Lazarus is dead”* (John xi. 11, 14), and in John xvi. 29, the disciples say: “Now speakest Thou *plainly*, and speakest no proverb.”

(* - This has a bearing upon the absence of the figure “sleep”, for death, in the epistles of the mystery.)

The word translated “proverb” here is translated “parable” in John x. 6, where the people first ask for plainness of speech. Upon hearing the parable of the Sower, the Apostles asked the Lord the question: “Why speakest Thou unto them in parables?” (Matt. xiii. 10). The Lord’s answer (partly postponed until verse 35, when Matthew adds his own inspired comment) introduces *for the first time in the N.T.* the words (1) Mystery, (2) The foundation of the world, and of (3) Isa. vi. 9, 10. In answer to the question, the Lord replied:

“Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given Therefore speak I to them in parables and in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand, etc.” (Matt. xiii. 11, 13, 14).

and in verses 34 and 35 the added explanation is given:--

“All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake He not unto them: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world” (Matt. xiii. 34, 35).

The parables were spoken “unto them” (xiii. 10, 11, 13, 34), “in them” (xiii. 14), “this people” (xiii. 15), and to him that “hath not” (xiii. 12), referring to the multitude in contrast with the disciples, who are referred to in the passages which say, “It is given unto you to know” (xiii. 11), “whosoever hath” (xiii. 12); “blessed are your eyes ears” (xiii. 16). The disciples are even compared favourably with “prophets and righteous men” (xiii. 17).

The “mysteries” of the kingdom of heaven were not revealed until it became evident that Israel were going to reject their King, and that the manifest, open, course of the kingdom would be suspended while a secret aspect, hitherto unknown, would operate. The “secret” phase of the kingdom of the heavens has its effect upon Gentile dominion which was also running its course. By the time our Lord came to Bethlehem, the prophetic period of 490 years (Dan. ix.) was well-nigh exhausted. The fourth kingdom was ruling the habitable earth and would have easily produced the Monster with which Gentile rule will close (Rev. xiii.), if Israel had accepted their King. Tiberius, Caligula and Nero had all the making of the Beast, and Herod (Acts xii.) exhibited characteristics that could easily have become the Antichrist. The Lord had definitely said, “The time is fulfilled” (Mark i. 15), and Peter declared that if Israel would but repent the times of refreshing and restitution would begin which had been the theme of all the holy prophets since the world began (Acts iii. 19-26). It is impossible to think that had Israel repented, God would have failed to respond. Israel did not repent, however, and the kingdom, in all its phases, including Nebuchadnezzar’s line and successors, entered on its “mystery” phase.

A parallel difficulty may be found in the case of John the Baptist, but the difficulty also provides a principle which can be applied to the matter before us. Was John the Baptist Elijah? No (John i. 21). Yes (Matt. xi. 14, and xvii. 12). It would be as easy to create a faction concerning this problem as to create controversy over the question whether Rome was or was not the Fourth Beast. The presence of the word “if” in our Lord’s answer in Matt. xi. 14 provides the answer to the question concerning the mystery of the kingdom, and the Fourth Beast. Was Rome the Fourth Beast? Yes, for the time was fulfilled. Yes, “*if*” Israel had repented. Will there be another Beast at the time of the end, after the gap in prophetic times which “our eyes have seen” but which was hidden till the time of the Lord’s rejection? Yes, for the kingdom has entered into its mystery phase and Babylon, at the end, is called “Mystery, Babylon” (Rev. xvii. 5), and when, at the sounding of the seventh trumpet the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, the “mystery” of God shall be finished (Rev. x. 7; xi. 15).

The reader will have noticed where the statement comes which introduces the problem about Elijah. It is in Matt. xi. 15, at the moment when the rejection of the Lord becomes evident. It takes its place as a part of the mystery of the kingdom with which Matt. xi., xii. and xiii. are connected.

Associated with these mysteries of the kingdom of heaven is the time period, "The foundation of the world". The full expression, "From the foundation of the world", occurs seven times in the N.T. and is associated with the following items of truth.

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Matt. xiii. 35. | The secret, associated with the parables of Matt. xiii. |
| Matt. xxv. 34. | The kingdom, prepared for those of the nations who were kind to the Lord's brethren, even though not consciously acting as unto Him. |
| Luke xi. 50. | The blood of the prophets, shed for the truth's sake, commences with that of Abel, and so the expression, "From the foundation of the world", goes back at least to the days of Adam. |
| Heb. iv. 3. | Speaks of the institution of the Sabbath and its fulfillment, and the finishing of the work of God in connection with this period. |
| Heb. ix. 26. | An argument is used in which this period is introduced in order to show the folly of the reasoning in question in the passage. |
| Rev. xiii. 8. | The book of life of the Lamb slain which had been written from the foundation of the world. |
| Rev. xvii. 8. | Names not written in this book of life. |

The first time in Matthew that the Gentiles are mentioned with approbation (see Matt. iv. 15; vi. 32; x. 5, 18), is in Matt. xii., that is upon the Lord's rejection.

"Then the Pharisees went out, and held a counsel against Him, how they might destroy Him should not make Him known: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying He shall show judgment to the Gentiles and in His name shall the Gentiles trust" (Matt. xii. 14-21).

In the immediate context of the first quotation of Isa. vi. 9, 10 in the N.T. we have, therefore, the following suggestive features:

- (1) The rejection of Christ as Israel's Messiah and King.
- (2) The introduction of the "if" into the problem of John the Baptist.
- (3) The first occurrence of the word "mystery".
- (4) The first occurrence of the phrase "From the foundation of the world".
- (5) The first reference to the Gentile as an object of blessing. (In Matt. x. the word was "Go *not* unto the Gentiles").

The reader who has already entered into the blessedness of the dispensation of the mystery made known through Paul, the Lord's prisoner, will need no lengthy exposition of the close parallel that exists between Matt. xiii. and Acts xxviii. At the latter:

- (1) Israel, who reject the Lord, are rejected.
- (2) "The mystery" is made manifest for the first time in those epistles written by Paul from prison.
- (3) Those thus blessed are "Gentiles", particularly (Eph. iii. 1-13).
- (4) And they were chosen in Christ "*before* the foundation of the world".

The two passages are parallel, but they deal with vastly different parts of the great kingdom of God: the one with the mystery phase of the kingdom of the heavens, the other with the dispensation of the mystery, which has its sphere "far above all" where Christ sits at the right hand of God. Just as Christ turned from the multitude and began to speak of secrets to His disciples, secrets which had been kept since the foundation of the

world, so Paul, the servants of Christ, no longer free and therefore unable to speak openly to the multitude, made known to the saints secrets that were hid in God from before the foundation of the world.

We therefore appreciate the aptness with which Isa. vi. 9, 10 was quoted by the Apostle at this great moment of Israel's rejection.

We do not believe that the reader who has pondered these things will need any argument by us to justify our sub-heading:

"The Dispensational Landmark."

Israel, as in Matt. xiii., did not hear. The Gentiles, who, up till then, had been kept outside ("Go not", "Aliens", "Strangers"), now become the object of grace.

At the moment when the Apostle could utter the words, "The salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles", then, the dispensation of the mystery began, and, then, Israel became *lo-ammi*, "Not My people".

When this day of matchless grace shall close, with every member of the Body safely brought into living relation with the exalted Head, then the thread of prophetic truth shall once more be taken up by God. Israel will look upon Him Whom they pierced, the Day of the Lord will set in, the purpose of the kingdom, including that of Gentile dominion, will finish its course, all Israel shall be saved, and the two aspects of the kingdom be realized, on the earth, and in the heavenly city.

There are further items of truth in Acts xxviii. that must be dealt with before we have covered the ground of its teaching: these we reserve for the next, and concluding, article of this series.

**#58. The Dispensational Landmark (xxviii. 23 - 31).
The quotation of Crisis (Isa. vi. 9, 10).
pp. 100 - 105**

In the preceding article we spent the whole of our time examining the close correspondence that exists between Matt. xiii. and Acts xxviii., and established the fact that in both cases “mystery” follows “rejection”, although in the one the mystery was that of the kingdom, and in the other it was the mystery of the present dispensation. We were, however, unable to consider the passage itself, quoted from Isa. vi. Because of its importance, this we must now do.

“And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word” (Acts xxviii. 25).

This “one word” constituted Israel’s solemn dismissal, for the word translated “they departed” is in the passive and should be translated “They were dismissed”. *Apoluo*, which is the word used in the original, not only means “to send away” in a general sense, but in a good sense, “to release”, as in Heb. xiii. 23, and, in a bad sense, “to divorce” a wife, as in Matt. i. 19; v. 31, 32, the first four occurrences of the verb. *It is this figure* that must be kept in mind when considering Israel’s rejection in Acts xxviii. for, throughout their history, Israel’s relationship with the Lord has been construed in terms of marriage.

“*They agreed not.*”—The word thus translated is *asumphonos*, which is derived from *sumphoneo*, the origin of our “symphony”. It is used once in connection with the marriage relationship (I Cor. vii. 5) where husband and wife “agree” to temporary separation for the Lord’s sake. The separation of Israel from their Lord, however, was not by consent, but because there was no “concord” that could make the relationship possible, although there will be when the repentance of Israel is brought about by grace.

This “divorce” of Israel, which had cast its shadow even over the Gospels, and is anticipated in the first miracle of Acts xiii., is now pronounced, and the word used to seal the dreadful dismissal is that quoted from Isa. vi.

The place that chapter vi. occupies in the prophecy of Isaiah, its structure and other important details, will be found in Volume XXX, pp. 169-176; 195-200, in the series entitled “Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth”. But we draw attention here to the testimony of the closing verses, viz., the answer to the cry of the prophet, “Lord, how long?” which speaks of cities wasted and land forsaken, with but a remnant that shall return and which shall constitute the holy seed. We cannot now stay to expound these verses, but must concentrate upon the passage quoted. To the Apostle, this prophecy was the word spoken by the Holy Ghost: “Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias unto your fathers” (Acts xxviii. 25).

An early testimony against Israel in the Acts accuses them of “resisting the Holy Ghost” even as their fathers did (Acts vii. 51). This resistance was accompanied by an uncircumcised condition of “heart and ears”, and is linked with the word spoken by angels, namely the giving of the law.

The reader will perceive that Stephen’s initial testimony is brought to its full conclusion by the man who, in his ignorance and misdirected zeal, was found “consenting unto his death”. In both passages the Holy Ghost is associated with the Word of God. “Heart and ears” are involved, and just as Stephen says “your fathers”, not “our fathers”, so the revised text (also L. T. Tr. A.) of Acts xxviii. 25 reads “your” fathers. Here is a far-off echo of that pronouncement, “*Your* house is left unto you desolate” (Matt. xxiii. 38).

When the Apostle would impress his Hebrew hearers with the solemnity of their position, he wrote, “Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith” (Heb. iii. 7), not merely, “Wherefore as it is found in Psa. xcv.”. It is a misconception that limits the doctrine of the Holy Ghost either to supernatural gifts or to the N.T. It is true that the Holy Ghost was manifested at and after Pentecost as never before and that His office of *Paraklete* was new, but there are many references to the Spirit of God in the O.T. that indicate the Person just as surely as the N.T., and the fact that Paul, when speaking to unsaved Jews, could attribute the authorship of the prophecy of Isaiah to the Holy Ghost, teaches the same lesson:

“Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive” (Acts xxviii. 26).

Earlier in the Acts than the witness of Stephen, already alluded to, comes the testimony of Peter:

“Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; Him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever He shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroy from among the people” (Acts iii. 22, 23).

Israel had “heard” the words of the Lord, but not in the spiritual sense, and the record of Paul’s conversion in the Acts supplies a good illustration of the double meaning of both seeing and hearing:

“And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man” (Acts ix. 7).

“And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of Him That spake to me” (Acts xxii. 9).

Here men who *heard*, “heard not”, and who *saw*, “saw not”. They heard a “sound”, *phone*, and they saw a “light”, *phos*, but they saw “no man” and they heard no intelligible words, but, like the multitude in John xii. 29, for all they knew, it might have been thunder.

Israel “heard”, but they did not “understand”; they “saw” but they did not “perceive”, and the seat of the trouble was not in the eye or the ear, but in the heart:

“For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed” (Acts xxviii. 27).

Pachunomai, “waxed gross”, occurs in the N.T. only in Matt. xiii. 15. The word is used as early as the prophetic song of Moses, when he described the very symptoms and disease from which Israel ultimately suffered. He spoke of the way in which the Lord had found Israel in a waste and howling wilderness and how He had kept him as the apple of His eye.

“But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked: thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation” (Deut. xxxii. 15).

Derived from *pachunomai* is *pachne*, “frost”, and *pachnoo*, “to freeze”, and *pachos*, “thick”, a condition that described Israel at this time. To describe a specially dull-witted fellow, we use the modern expression, “He has a skin as thick as an elephant”; thus we can realize that such a “thick skinned” animal is a “pachyderm”, and that the modern figure and the ancient ascription are therefore akin.

The heart having “waxed gross” the ear became “dull”. *Bareos*, the word translated “dull”, is derived from *barus*, a weight or burden, and when used metaphorically indicates the hardening of the heart (Exod. viii. 15, 32; ix. 7, 34; x. 1). Being used of Pharaoh in Exodus it provided a dreadful object lesson for Israel as they heard the word of the Holy Ghost. Isaiah uses the word in a good sense when he speaks of one who “stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood” (Isa. xxxiii. 15). He uses it also in the statement, “Behold, the Lord’s hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither His ear heavy, that it cannot hear” (Isa. lix. 1). Had Israel heard with understanding and seen with perception they would have been “converted” and “healed”. Where Paul, quoting Isaiah, said “hear” and “see”, Peter said, “Repent ye therefore, and be *converted*” (Acts iii. 19), and if the reader will consult the articles dealing with the healing of the lame man and its prophetic import (Acts iii. and iv., Volume XXVI, pp. 78-81) he will see that this repentance and conversion is spoken of as “the healing” (Acts iv. 12), as the word translated “salvation” actually means. When we remember the many miracles of “healing” wrought by the Lord to bring Israel to repentance (*see* Matt. xi.) the close association of these different elements of witness and Israel’s failure to understand and perceive becomes the more tragic.

The repentance, the conversion, the healing of Israel, was the threefold goal of the ministry both of our Lord during His earthly life and of the apostles after His ascension. That goal has never been completely set aside. Temporarily, Israel are not God’s people, but at last “All Israel shall be saved”; they shall look upon Him Whom they pierced and mourn for Him, and at this repentance their conversion will become a fact, and the time of restitution will have come. But that day is “not yet”. A new dispensation has taken the place of that which obtained through the Acts which, it is important to remember,

covered the period of the early epistles of Paul, and that new dispensation is ushered in by the epoch-making words: “*The salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and they will hear it*” (Acts xxviii. 28).

Since the days of Abraham there is no record of any Gentile being “saved” *independently of Israel*. We say advisedly “There is no record”. We do not limit the Holy One of Israel, but we are rightly and necessarily limited by the written word. The apostle in Gal. i. 9 made a staggering statement. Having made it he still seemed to fear that it would not be taken literally, so he repeated it: “As we said before, so say I now again.” We have just made the statement, “Since the days of Abraham there is no record of any Gentile being *saved independently of Israel*” and lest the reader should miss the challenge to orthodoxy that such a statement makes, we ask for one reference from the O.T. or the N.T. to disprove it. If it cannot be disproved, then we must perforce acknowledge the great change indicated in Acts xxviii. 28.

In Acts xiii., at the commencement of his separate ministry, the Apostle introduced the great doctrine of justification by faith, without works of law, with the words, “Be it known unto you therefore” (Acts xiii. 38). At the commencement of his new and separate ministry (that of the mystery) he introduced the key thought once again with the self-same words, “Be it known unto you therefore” (Acts xxviii. 28). In Acts xiii., moreover, we have a warning, “Beware therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets” (Acts xiii. 40). In Acts xxviii. 23-27 that warning is fulfilled.

On the ground that Paul had earlier announced that he was turning away from the Jews to the Gentiles, there are some who refuse to admit that Acts xxviii. 28 marks a dispensational crisis. Before Acts xxviii. 28 can be proved to be THE CRISIS, the passages which record this turning to the Gentiles must therefore be considered. After Paul had spoken in the synagogue at Antioch, the Gentiles who were attached desired that they might hear the message the following Sabbath. This however provoked the envy of the Jews, and they spoke against the testimony of Paul and Barnabas, who then boldly said,

“It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles” (Acts xiii. 46).

But this was merely a local action, as is proved by continuing our reading until we come to the words, “And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews” (Acts xiv. 1). Again, the Jews assaulted the apostles and, again, they turned to the Gentiles, for in Lystra his hearers were idolators. Here also the nature of their action was as local as at Antioch. When the Apostle returned to Antioch in Syria, he did not report the setting aside of the Jew and the introduction of a new dispensation for the Gentile, but “rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles” (Acts xiv. 27). This is the inspired interpretation of Acts xiii. and xiv.

A perusal of Acts xv. will clearly show the relative ascendancy in the church at that time of the Jew over the Gentile, and in Acts xvi., while neither synagogue nor Jew is mentioned, the fact that Paul and his companion joined the women gathered together on the sabbath day for prayer is proof enough that those women were Jewess. In Acts xvii. "Paul, *as his manner was*", went into the synagogue. How could Luke say that, if Paul had turned to the Gentile? Even at Athens, it is the Jews in the synagogue who are mentioned before the philosophers (Acts xvii. 17, 18), and upon his arrival at Corinth, Paul went at once to the Jewish quarter and found a certain Jew, and once again we read: "He reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greek" (Acts xviii. 4). But here, too, the Jews resented the teaching of the Apostle, calling forth his condemnation in the words, "Your blood be on your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles" (Acts xviii. 6).

It may not have particular significance, or it may be typical, that the next verse tells us that he entered into a house which was "hard by the synagogue" and that Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord, and from I Cor. i. 1, we gather his successor, Sosthenes (xviii. 17) also. But the objector may say that Paul's words in xviii. 6 are final "from henceforth". Yet we have only to read on to verse 19 to find him once again in the synagogue and reasoning with the Jews.

After his visit to Jerusalem we once more find the Apostle speaking boldly in the synagogue, occupying the space of three months in this public ministry (Acts xix. 8). Again his testimony was followed by opposition, and for two years he conducted his ministry among the disciples in the school of one Tyrannus (verse 9), where both Jews and Greeks heard the word of the Lord Jesus.

Still the opposition of the Jews persisted, for it is found again in Acts xx. 3; and, in verse 22, the Apostle's testimony as a free man draws to an end. His own summary of it says nothing of any turning from the Jews to the Gentiles, but, on the contrary, his own words are, "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks".

No valid opposition can be discovered in the record of the Acts to the position we have reached, namely, that at Acts xxviii. 28 a door was opened to the Gentiles *that had never been opened before* and that there the dispensation of the mystery was given to the imprisoned apostle; there the high glories of heavenly places were, for the first time, revealed. Acts xxviii. 28 is the dispensational landmark.

**#59. The Dispensational Landmark (xxviii. 23 - 31).
The Testimony of the Lord's Prisoner (xxviii. 30, 31).
pp. 134 - 139**

“And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him; preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no forbidding him” (Acts xxviii. 30, 31).

With these words the narrative of the Acts ends. “The hired house” is in correspondence with “lodging” of verse 23, but the words used differ, *xenia*, from *xenos*, a stranger or foreigner, and indicating “a lodging”, being used in verse 23, but *misthoma*, “a hired house”, derived from *misthos*, “hire” or “reward”, being used in verse 30.

Not accused of any definite transgression against Roman law, Paul was permitted to hire a house, but he was never without the Roman soldier to whom he was chained wrist to wrist. While, as was the case in his second imprisonment (II Tim. ii. 9) he was not treated as a “malefactor”, his words, “remember my bonds” (Col. iv. 18), reveal how keenly were felt the conditions under which these “two whole years” were passed. Nevertheless the Apostle was free to receive all that came to him and fulfilled his obligation “to enlighten all as to what is the dispensation of the mystery”.

In order to appreciate the ministry of this hired house, let us travel back in thought to the days of the Apostle and wend our way to the house of a believer in one of the towns or cities—say Ephesus—and there assemble with the church. Upon entering the little assembly we are conscious of a strange atmosphere. Gloom, or perhaps perplexity, takes the place of joy and certainty. Where, before, “one had a psalm, another a doctrine, another a tongue, a revelation, or an interpretation”, now there is silence. Miraculous gifts seem to have ceased, the gift of healing appears to have been withdrawn, and yet, no new-found grace or privilege appears to have taken their place. Turning to one of the brethren, we ask what might be the cause of this brooding silence, and the following is intended to give a fairly accurate idea of the resultant conversation and happy sequel.

Alpha.—No, we have no uncertainty regarding our salvation, brother; we are still in the blessed state of justification by faith. No condemnation and no separation is ours, thank God, by indefeasible grace, but what troubles us is that a change has come over our assembly. With as bright a faith as yesterday, brethren now find themselves unable to produce the “signs following”. Where even a “handkerchief” sent from the Apostle would at one time effect a cure, we are bewildered to discover that some have even been advised “to take a little wine” to help alleviate bodily weakness.

Beta.—There are strange rumours traveling round the churches. Some say that Paul at Rome has announced a dispensational crisis, and that Israel as a people have been set aside, and their hope suspended.

Gamma.—But, brethren, even though Israel be set aside, and even though we rightly sorrow at such a tragic happening, why should that plunge us into gloom for ourselves? We were not saved by Israel, but by Israel's Lord.

Alpha.—True, brother, Christ and Christ alone is our rock foundation; upon Him, and upon Him alone, we rest for our salvation. That is not our problem. It is this. We learned from the Apostle to discriminate between “doctrine” and “dispensation”, between that salvation which is “in Christ” and the dispensational position and privilege which was “with faithful Abraham”. While we were told we were justified by faith and had peace and access, yet we were also reminded that we were nevertheless “wild olives” grafted into the Olive Tree of Israel. While that Olive Tree stood our dispensation position was known and accepted. But the disquieting news that we have received of Israel's rejection, together with the cessation of many evidential signs and miracles, seem to indicate that we can no longer be joined to Israel, nor partakers of the fatness of the Olive Tree. Our problem is not, Are we still saved? but, Who or what are we? Are we a distinct company? If so, what is our basis? We possess the Scriptures, and have searched Moses and the Prophets, and we rejoiced to perceive, that although Israel may fail and be temporarily set aside, a blessed day of restoration is sure, because God will keep His covenant with Abraham. But, though we have searched diligently, we can find no word to tell us what God would do, should Israel not repent, or what position the Gentile believer would occupy if Israel and its hope be set aside. Therefore unless there be granted to Paul or to some of us a new revelation, we can have no intelligent conception of either our calling or our hope.

Beta.—Brethren, if any lack wisdom, let him ask of God; we can at least pray, we still have access there, and surely it will be well-pleasing to the Lord that we enquire of Him for light in our present darkness.

We will not transcribe the prayer that followed, but will give the sequel. As Daniel experienced, so did this little assembly. “While I was speaking in prayer”, said Daniel, the angel came, and while this little company confessed their ignorance and desired illumination, an “angel”, or a “messenger”, arrived with a blessed and full answer of peace. Into the little assembly entered a travel-stained man. His steps were weary, but his heart was light. He was the harbinger of tidings the equal of which mortal ears had never heard.

Angelos (The Messenger) speaks: Brethren, lift up your heads! Listen to the tidings I bring! Grace has indeed super-abounded, blessings beyond our dreams have been revealed as ours! The apostle Paul has indeed pronounced the doom of Israel, and, with their setting aside, the hope and promises belonging to them must go as well. You must be prepared to lose that you may gain. You must be emptied that you may be filled. Brethren, never again will the Apostle speak to you of Abraham; never again will he minister the New Covenant; never again will his hands bring healing to the sick or life to the dead. These things you must be prepared to forego, but I will not dwell upon the negative side—let me advance to my real message. God has revealed to Paul that he is now “The prisoner of Jesus Christ *for you Gentiles*”; that to him in that new capacity

God has granted a new dispensation! This dispensation is concerned with a secret, a secret *not discoverable in the Scriptures*, because it has been “*hid in God*” since the ages. Now, since the setting aside of Israel, God has made manifest this secret purpose, and I bring you the glad message, that God chose, before the overthrow of the world, Gentile believers to be associated with Christ, as members of His body, and to be seated with Him where He now sits at the right hand of God, blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places!

But beloved, I will not stand between you and the real message I bring; here is an epistle sent by the Apostle to the assemblies, and to be read and interchanged with the epistle to Laodicea, which I also am entrusted to deliver.

At this, Angelos produced a letter, the letter which we now call “The Epistle to the Ephesians”, which gives us the basis of the teaching that Paul dispensed in his own house throughout the two years of his imprisonment.

Five epistles bear the mark of prison: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and II Timothy. When, however, we think of the new revelation and its conveyance to ourselves in the N.T., we speak of the “Four Prison Epistles”.

In verse 23 of Acts xxviii. neither “preaching” nor “teaching” is mentioned, but “exposition”, “testimony” and “persuasion”; in verse 31, however, we have “preaching” and “teaching”.

A number of words are translated “preach” but the two chief are *euaggelizo* and *kerusso*. So far as Acts is concerned, *euaggelizo* occurs sixteen times, and *kerusso* eight, but, looking at the N.T. as a whole, the two words occur almost an equal number of times, so that we must be careful before drawing inferences. The word used in Acts xxviii. 31 is *kerusso*, which is allied with *kerux*, a herald, a word not used in the early epistles of Paul, but which is found in I Tim. ii. 7 and II Tim. i. 11, where the Apostle solemnly asseverates that he was “appointed a preacher (*kerux*), and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles”. This is therefore a reason why the “preaching” of Acts xxviii. 31 should be a “heralding” rather than an “evangelizing”, and this harmonizes with the making known of the new phase of the kingdom of God that included, for the first time, the dispensation of the mystery.

Didasko, “teaching”, is one of five Greek words so translated. The other words are: *Kataggello*, “to teach”, but only so translated once (Acts xvi. 21). This need not detain us here, for it so obviously means “to announce tidings”, as to need no proof. *Katecheo*, “to instruct”, *Matheteuo*, “to disciple”, and *Paideuo*, “to chasten” or “train”, as a child”, while having their place, would be out of place in Acts xxviii. 31.

Didasko, the word used, is associated with *didache* and *didaskalia*, “doctrine”, and is used to denote the new revelation of grace which constitutes the mystery. Specific teaching was necessary on many important subjects. When the Apostle wrote to Timothy: “Thou hast fully known my doctrine” (II Tim. iii. 10), he presupposes that

some definite teaching had been given. The word *didaskalos* is used in I Tim. ii. 7 and II Tim. i. 11, passages already referred to in connection with *kerux*. Paul *heralded* the kingdom of God, and *taught* those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ.

The nature of his witness in verse 23 necessitated a stress upon the name “Jesus”, and, equally, the nature of the witness of verse 31 necessitated a stress upon the full title, “The Lord Jesus Christ”. The peculiar revelation of the epistles of the mystery demand emphasis upon the ascension and the seating of Christ at the right hand of God, in the heavenly places, and consequently the full title of the Saviour is given. Moreover it should never be forgotten that if we know and teach the distinctive association which Christ holds with any part of the purpose of the ages, we know and teach the most important part. For example, it would be unintelligible had Paul stressed membership of the BODY before stressing the HEADSIP of Christ; he must of necessity “teach” the things that concern the Lord Jesus Christ first. How could any saved Gentile contemplate a seat in the highest heavens, until and unless he had received instruction concerning the ascension and seating of the Lord.

The word “concerning” should not be passed over without comment. *Peri*, the word so translated, means, in composition, “round about”, and it is a splendid conception of teaching, preaching and witness, when Christ is seen to be at the centre, and that all teaching and preaching revolves around Him. This at least was gloriously true of the Apostle’s teaching, for it is not possible to imagine a Pauline epistle without a central and glorious Christ.

The closing words of the Acts are suggestive, “With all confidence, unforbidden”.

Parrhesia is variously translated “openly”, “freely”, “plainly”, as well as “confidence”, but there is never absent from the word the thought of freedom of speech; *rhesis* means “a speaking”. The words of the A.V., “No man forbidding him”, represents one word in the original—*Akolutos*. While this is the only occurrence of the word in the N.T., the positive form of the verb, *koluo*, “to forbid” or “to hinder”, occurs many times. Paul had been “forbidden” of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia (Acts xvi. 6); and admitted to the Roman saints that he had been “let” in his endeavours to visit them (Rom. i. 13). He had been “forbidden” by the Jews to speak to the Gentiles (I Thess. ii. 16). Now, Satan hindered no longer (I Thess. ii. 18), for, although we can well believe that the enemy of all truth had moved the opposition that had eventually led to the curtailment of the bodily liberty of the Apostle, upon the revelation itself, he had not, blessed be God, been able to put bonds. Prison did not hinder the Apostle in his ministry. The Jews had “forbidden” him to speak to the Gentiles, but their enmity had but placed him in a sphere where their hatred was inoperative. He could preach and teach with gyves on his wrist but with liberty in his heart. Once he had been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, but the Holy Ghost forbade no longer, for he was in the very centre of God’s purpose: it was a Gentile dispensation and therefore neither Antioch nor Jerusalem was so fitting a centre as Rome.

Commentators have advanced many ingenious reasons for the “unfinished” character of the Acts. We, however, can well believe that it accomplished the Divine purpose for which it was undertaken, and that it was not the intention of the writer to go beyond the arrival at Rome. How Paul fared before Nero; how many times he was heard; whether Poppæa had any influence over Nero at the time, and the thousand and one points to which the imagination and enquiring mind seek an answer, these are apparently no concern of the inspired historian and consequently should be no concern of ours. Let us be glad of that concluding phrase, “With all confidence, unforbidden, unhindered”, and rejoice that during that confident and unhindered period of his bondage, the Apostle was moved to pen those immortal epistles, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians.

It is with great joy, yet with reluctance, that we bring this series to a close. We are confident that whoever approaches the Acts of the Apostles with a clear eye for its dispensational teaching will realize the importance of Acts xxviii. in the development of the purpose of the ages. For the testimony of Luke, the beloved physician and faithful minister with the Apostle to the Gentiles, every believer should give thanks, for, without the Acts of the Apostles, we should have little or no historic background for the ministry of the ascended Christ.

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

#1. The primary significance of the passage considered.
pp. 209 - 211

The words that form the title of this series of articles occur at the close of a very remarkable Psalm; remarkable in that it insists upon Israel's peculiar earthly *mission* among the nations, to whom they will extend the privilege of citizenship of Israel, a sentiment far removed from the narrower exclusiveness of Jewish interpretation. Two lines of teaching regarding Israel's place in the earth are found in the scriptures, but they must be conceived of as parallels, not divergent or antagonistic. One emphasizes Israel's unique position among the nations of the earth; the other that the Divine purpose is the blessing of all nations through Israel. Speaking of the exclusiveness that marked the false interpretation of the divine will for Israel, *Perowne* says:

“It was pervaded by a jealous exclusiveness which was remarkable even among the nations of antiquity, and which derived its force and sanction from the precepts of its religion. The Jews were constantly reminded that they were a separate people, distinct, and intended to be distinct, from all others The Jewish church was not a missionary church. So far as the Jews looked upon the world around them, it was with feelings of antipathy, and with the hope, which was never quenched in the midst of the most terrible reverses, that finally they, as the chosen race, should subdue their enemies far and wide, and that, by the grace of Heaven. one sitting on David's throne would be king of the world.”

While, alas, this is only too true, there are abundant evidences in the Prophets that the wider purpose of Israel's call was understood, and never allowed to sink out of sight. The initial promise made to Abraham combines both aspects of the truth. God promised that He would make of him a great nation; that He would bless him and make his name great. But He also promised that he should *be* a blessing; that in him all families of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii. 1-3).

The prophet Isaiah not only saw that in a future day “the mountain of the Lord's house would be established in the top of the mountains”, but that “all nations should flow unto it”. The nations will voluntarily go up to the house of the God of Jacob, for there the nations will be taught the ways of the Lord, and Zion shall become the centre from which shall radiate the word of the Lord (Isa. ii. 2, 3). In the glorious day that is coming “there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek” (Isa. xi. 10).

Some of these nations are specified, and the fact that such old enemies as Egypt and Assyria are included in this great brotherhood of nations is an evidence of grace indeed:

“In that day shall Israel be third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land: whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance” (Isa. xix. 24,25).

The growing fear of war, the increasing terror of modern weapons, the shrinkage of space by reason of wireless and air transport, the sudden worthlessness of frontiers as defences, are driving the nations of the earth to seek some means of bringing about international unity. This will ultimately lead to the rise of Babylon, and the advent of the last and greatest of the world's dictators. But what the nations vainly seek to establish by policy and through fear, God intends to bring about by grace. Rome attempted some such uniting of the nations when it extended to them the rights of citizenship of that Empire; Greek philosophy groped amid the shadows after universal citizenship, and by its system of proselytizing even Judaism made some attempt to attain this end.

In Psalm lxxxvi., which immediately precedes the one under review, Davie foresees the conversion of the nations, saying:

“All nations whom Thou hast made, shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord; and shall glorify Thy name” (Psa. lxxxvi. 9).

Coming to the Psalm from which the title of these articles is taken, and which has started this line of thought, we observe the following features. The opening superscription, “A Psalm or Song for the sons of Korah”, is balanced by the closing subscription, “A Song or Psalm for the sons of Korah, to the chief Musician upon Mahalath Leannoth”. The key to these Psalm titles was discovered by *Dr. J. W. Thirtle* while examining two independent Psalms, namely the one in Isa. xxxviii. 9-20, and that in Hab. iii. In each of these the relationship of Title and Subscription is clear. The complete Psalm is as follows:

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

This subject forms the material of Appendices 64 and 65 of *The Companion Bible*, in which great work all the Psalms are set out in conformity with this pattern.

The words *Mahalath Leannoth*, therefore, instead of being part of Psalm lxxxviii., form the *sub*-scription of Psalm lxxxvii. *Mahalath* means “The great dancing”, for this is how *Aquila* translates the word in his revision of the Septuagint. *Leannoth* means “shouting”, or “great shouting”.

“We have only to read the Psalm in the light of I Sam. vi. 14, 15 to see the obvious connection with David's bringing the Ark to Zion. In verse 2 of the Psalm there is a distinct allusion to the other places where the Ark had found a temporary dwelling. Shiloh (I Sam. i. 3; ii. 14; iii. 21; Psa. lxxviii. 60); Bethshemesh (I Sam. vi. 13); Kirjath-jearim (I Sam. vii. 1); Gibeah (II Sam. vi. 3, 4); the house of Obedom (II Sam. vi. 10-12). But none of these was the dwelling place Jehovah had chosen. Hence, Zion is celebrated as ‘the Mount Zion which He loved’ (*Companion Bible*, Appendix 65 x.)”

The association of the removal of the Ark with “dancing” is established by II Sam. vi. 14.

Many commentators see in Psalm lxxxvii. a reference to the days of Hezekiah, when it was said of him “that he was magnified in the sight of all nations from henceforth” (II Chron. xxxii. 23). Yet again, it has been assigned to the fulfillment of the promise that the Lord would return unto Zion, and dwell in the midst of Jerusalem (Zech. viii. 3), when the temple was once again built and when Zerubbabel was installed as prince of the house of Judah. There is no reason to limit the Psalm to any one particular period of rejoicing, so long as the rejoicing is definitely associated with the choice of Zion.

Where the A.V. reads, “I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon *to them that know Me*”, the R.V. reads “I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon *as among them that know Me*”. This is in keeping with the prophecy of Isaiah: “And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day” (Isa. xix. 21). Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre and Ethiopia are addressed by the Lord as entering into the glorious privilege of citizenship, “This man was born there”. The glorious things that are spoken of Zion, the city of God, include this all-embracing blessing of the nations. It will be the highest dignity that any can attain, to be able to say, “I was born there”.

The “bringing forth of children” is a figure of frequent use in the prophets, and as it is physically impossible for all the nations specified to be born in Zion, its meaning must be extended to cover the privilege of inclusion by citizenship:

“Shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream” (Isa. lxvi. 8-12).

The time of this travail is immediately before the second coming of the Lord, “The bringing of sorrows” (Matt. xxiv. 8). These “sorrows” are not unto death, but pregnant with life, for the word *odin* is translated “travail” in I Thess. v. 3, and means “birth pains”, even as the verb *odino* is translated in Gal. iv. 19 “To travail in birth”. The prophetic day to which this looks is called in Matt. xix. 28, “The regeneration”, the time of rebirth for Israel and the nations. It is to this blessed fact that thought is directed in Psalm lxxxvii. Primarily therefore the exultant cry, “All my springs are in Thee”, refers to Zion, the mother of all the nations, together with Israel, who shall enter in to the kingdom of that day.

Having seen this, we are at liberty to extend the passage to cover the greater and more glorious truth that the believer to-day, as at all times, can look up to the Lord and exclaim, “All my springs are in THEE”. It is this aspect of truth that we hope to develop in the subsequent articles of this series.

The Dispensational Keystone.

#1. An examination of objections to the teaching that Acts xxviii. is a dispensational boundary of the first importance. pp. 153 - 159

No reader of *The Berean Expositor* needs reminding that the keystone of the truth for which it stands is the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. With this contention the first number of the publication opened, and all the light that has subsequently been received on the great dispensational teaching of the New Testament has radiated from this epoch-making chapter of the Acts.

In perfect symmetry on either side of this keystone, are ranged the fourteen epistles of Paul, and across the arch can be written the three statements, "The Jew Prominent", which is true of the early ministry of the Apostle, "The Jew Absent", which is most obviously true of his later ministry, and "The Jew Dismissed", which is the truth of Acts xxviii. itself. These features we have visualized in the following diagram, which also indicates further features of the two ministries associated with the two sets of epistles.

- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - - (BE-XXXIII.153).

The primary reason for reopening this question is the necessity which has arisen to deal with an objection that has been made by a reader and fellow-student of the Word. The dispensational importance of Acts xxviii. has been challenged, and the statement has been made, that the dismissal of the Jew in Acts xxviii. is "local" and neither "national nor final".

By a "local" dismissal we understand such a turning from the Jew as is recorded in Acts xiii. 44-48, for in the opening verse of the next chapter we find the same apostle again entering a synagogue, with the result that "a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed" (Acts xiv. 1). Acts xiii. and xiv. have a dispensational importance in that they,

- (1) *Prefigure* the national blindness which has since settled upon all Israel (Acts xiii. 11).
- (2) The related salvation of the Gentile (Acts xiii. 12).
- (3) The warning of impending judgment (Acts xiii. 40, 41).
- (4) The close association of "Paul" with the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 9).
- (5) The opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles (Acts xiv. 27).
- (6) The recognition that the Jew was "first" (Acts xiii. 46).

In Acts xxviii. the prefigured blindness fell (Acts xxviii. 25-27). Consequently, for the first time, the salvation of God was sent to the Gentile without the mediation of the Jew. Here in this chapter the hope of Israel comes to a temporary end; here the impending judgment falls, and from this time, the Jew passes from the scene; his covenants, promises, and hope are suspended, a mystery is made known, and a newly-created "New Man" takes the foremost place.

The history and fortunes of the people of Israel are very closely associated with their city and temple. This can be seen by reference to the structure set out in Volume XXIX, page 208, where every reference to "The house of God" in the O.T. is recorded, together with a most perfect structure of Israel's spiritual history, drawn from the books of Chronicles.

In A.D.70 Jerusalem was destroyed and the temple razed to the ground. Titus ordered his soldiers to dig up the foundations of the temple and the city, and Terentius Rufus, who was left in command, actually ploughed up the site of the temple, thus unwittingly fulfilling the prophecies of Micah and of the Saviour:

"Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps" (Micah iii. 12).

"Your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. xxiii. 38).

"There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down" (Matt. xxiv. 2).

It can, we trust, be assumed without further evidence that the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D.70 (forty years after the crucifixion) was not merely a "local" incident, but that it was "national" and "final".

The date of Acts xxviii. is given in the notes of the A.V. as A.D.63. The chronology of the Acts is discussed and exhibited in our work entitled "The Apostle of the Reconciliation", pages 13-20, and is too complicated a theme to be reconsidered here. The question as to the date of Acts xxviii., however, does not arise; we merely indicate that it is very near to the national calamity that has made Israel *lo-ammi*, "not My people", for the past nineteen centuries.

The "dismissal" of Israel pronounced with such solemnity in Acts xxviii., and the dismissal of Israel pronounced with equal gravity in Matt. xiii., xxiii., xxiv. are related to one another as *de jure* is to *de facto*. Often a period intervenes between the sentence as pronounced and the sentence as executed. Moreover, there are occasions when an appeal or an extension of leniency may interpose, which, to the uninstructed, may appear to nullify the original sentence. So in the case in point we hope to show from the Scriptures that the following are the facts:

- (1) The "dismissal" of Israel was the putting into effect the long threatened "divorcement" of that people.
- (2) The dismissal *de jure* took place during the Saviour's public ministry.
- (3) A stay of execution was granted, and a second appeal made at Pentecost.

- (4) The dismissal, however, became *de facto* at Acts xxviii. where the Jew of the dispersion is seen to manifest the same unbelief and unrepentance as was manifested by the Jew in the land.
- (5) That the immediate consequence of Israel's failure, both in Matt. xi.-xiii., and in Acts xxviii., was to give prominence to the Gentile, to introduce a "mystery" and fulfil Isa. vi. 9, 10.
- (6) That the dismissal of Israel received its seal at the destruction of the Temple in A.D.70, and
- (7) That the prison ministry of the apostle Paul was a ministry intended to bridge the gulf between the dispensation that closed with Israel's rejection and opened with the dispensation of the mystery.

If we can justify these seven assertions from Scripture, we can settle at once the question as to whether the dismissal of the Jew in Acts xxviii. was "local" or "national".

(1) *The "dismissal" of Israel was the "divorcement" of that people.*—It is common knowledge with students of prophecy that the figure of divorce is used of Israel's *lo-ammi* condition, even as the receiving back of an erring wife is the figure used of Israel's restoration to divine favour (Isa. i. 1; Jer. iii. 1-8; Ezek. xvi.; Isa. lxii.). The word translated "dismissed" (departed) in Acts xxviii. 15 is *apoluo*, which, while meaning to release, or to let go generally, is used specifically for "divorcement" fifteen times in the N.T.

"He was minded to put her away privately" (Matt. i. 19).

"Whosoever shall put away his wife" (Matt. v. 31, 32).

"Shall marry her that is divorced" (Matt. v. 32).

These are the first four occurrences of *apoluo* in the N.T. In view of this common usage of the word the significance of its choice for use in the passage in question is unmistakable.

(2) *The dismissal de jure took place during the Lord's public ministry.*—The rejection of Israel hinged upon Israel's rejection of Christ: "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers" (Matt. xxiii. 32).

The righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, "shall come upon this generation", said the Lord (Matt. xxiii. 34-36).

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Matt. xxiii. 37-39).

"Fill ye up"; "This generation"; "Ye would not"; "Your house"; "Not henceforth".

No prophetic utterance in Scripture could be more explicit. The temple is no longer "My Father's house"; it had become "Your house". It was left "desolate", a word used of Judas Iscariot (Acts i. 20), and in another form of Babylon (Rev. xviii. 19), and of the

abomination of desolation (Matt. xxiv. 15). Luke records that the Saviour said, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the *desolation* thereof is nigh", and that "the times of the Gentiles" were commensurate with the treading down of Jerusalem (Luke xxi. 20-24).

Israel is never considered as under divine favour at the same time as "the days of vengeance" are upon them (Luke xxi. 22), and these days are associated with the destruction of Jerusalem and with the destruction of the temple (Matt. xxiv. 1, 2).

(3) *At Pentecost a stay of execution was granted, and a second appeal made.*—The prayer from the cross, "Father, forgive them", was heard. The Apostles were bidden to tarry at Jerusalem until endued with power from on high, and then to preach once again to this same people. The answer of the Lord to the Apostles' question, "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts i. 6) showed that He knew that the extended period of mercy would not bring about Israel's repentance, and with the stoning of Stephen and the call and commission of Paul, preparation began to be made for a new dispensation, on new conditions, that would be consequent upon Israel's rejection, and which would demand a further revelation and a different ministry.

(4) *The dismissal de facto.*—The sentence pronounced in Matt. xxiii., and postponed during the years covered by the Acts during which the Lord said, "All day long I have stretched forth My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people" (Rom. x. 21), became *de facto* after the Apostle had held his all day conference with the leaders of the Jews in Rome. The period of leniency covered by the Acts, simply revealed that these Jews of the dispersion manifested the same hardness of heart that had characterized the Jews in Palestine.

" the Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins always: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (I Thess. ii. 14-16).

Why does Luke end the record of the Acts with the words "No man forbidding him"? Because the Jew had now been removed from the scene and, under the persecution against them that was about to commence, their hindrance of the evangelization of the Gentiles would no longer be possible.

(5) *The immediate consequence of Israel's failure, both in Matt. xi.-xiii. and in Acts xxviii. was to give prominence to the Gentile, introduce a "mystery" and fulfil Isa. vi. 9, 10.*—The miracles wrought by Christ should have led Israel to repentance (Matt. xi. 20-24), but instead, though greater than prophet, priest and king (Matt. xii. 6, 41, 42), the Lord stood rejected by them. In Matt. xii., for the first time in that Gospel, the Gentile comes into prominence and favour, introduced by a quotation from Isa. xlii. 1-4. In Matt. xiii. (even as in parallel circumstances—in Acts xiii.—the Apostle quoted the same passage) the kingdom of heaven enters what can be called its "mystery" phase (Matt. xiii. 11). This mystery is associated with a period called "from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xiii. 35). Many prophets and righteous men had

desired to see these things, but had not (Matt. xiii. 17), and in Israel, at that time and in these circumstances, was fulfilled the saying of Isa. vi. 9, 10 (Matt. xiii. 13-15).

Reference to the fulfillment of prophecy in Matthew's Gospel is usually introduced by the phrase, "That it might be fulfilled", using the Greek word *pleroo*. This is so in Matt. xiii. 35, but in verse 14 of the same chapter, where Christ said, "In them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah", He departs from this custom and uses the intenser form *anapleroo*, the only occurrence of the word in the four Gospels. It is this word that is used by Paul in the passage which we have already quoted, namely, "To fill up their sins away" (I Thess. ii. 16).

No word could more definitely indicate that this prophecy was at that time completely, nationally, and finally fulfilled. When we come to Acts xxviii. 1-9, again we find miracles that included the taking up of serpents and the laying on of the hands on the sick, as in Mark xvi. 18, the turning to the Gentile (Acts xxviii. 28), a ministry of the mystery (Eph. iii. 13; Col. i. 23-27), which mystery went back to a period known as "*before* the foundation of the world" (Eph. i. 4), a subject which in other ages had not been made known as it had now been revealed (Eph. iii. 5), and all this confirmed by the selfsame quotation from Isa. vi. 9, 10.

There are two points concerning the quotation that must be considered, and their importance recognized.

- (a) The quotation made both by our Lord and by Paul in Matt. xiii. and in Acts xxviii., differs in certain, but the same, respects, from the LXX version, i.e., Paul *repeats* word for word the quotation as it is found in Matt. xiii. Paul was indeed repeating, verbally, the doom pronounced by the Lord before His crucifixion on this same generation.
- (b) The use of the word *anapleroo*, in Matt. xiii. indicated that, then and there, the terrible condition prophesied by Isaiah had come to pass. In repeating this passage Paul does not say that it was "fulfilled", but only, "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers", and it is noteworthy that in John xii., where Isa. vi. 9, 10 is once more quoted, the word "fulfilled" is again omitted, the blindness exhibited by Israel being the result of a foretold blindness already finding its fulfillment in them: "Therefore they could not believe, because Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes", etc. (John xii. 39, 40). Isa. vi. 9, 10, while repeated in Acts xxviii., was really fulfilled in Matt. xiii.

(6) *The dismissal of Israel received its seal at the destruction of the Temple in A.D.70.*—The desolation, both of the temple and the city, had been foretold by Christ, and in it was summed up Israel's rejection. Within a few years of the last chapter of the Acts this judgment fell, and the days of Israel's opportunity and hope closed until the future awakening comes, when "All Israel shall be saved".

(7) *The prison ministry of the apostle Paul bridges the gulf between the dispensation closing with Israel's rejection and the opening with the dispensation of the mystery.*—The "prison ministry" of the Apostle, which covers the "two whole years" of Acts xxviii. 30, 31, is contained in those epistles where he is found to be "The prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles", namely, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon

and II Timothy. The ministry there in exercise was given “for the perfecting” (the re-adjusting [*katartismos*], see Matt. iv. 21, “mending”; Gal. vi. 1, “restore”) “of the saint”, until all should arrive at the unity of the faith, the perfect man, the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (Eph. iv. 12, 13), words utterly foreign to any promise made before Acts xxviii.

If these things (Nos.1-7 above) are so (and chapter and verse have been given for each point discussed), then we must reach the conclusion that the dismissal of the Jew at Acts xxviii. is *national* and *final*, that the present dispensation intervenes as a foreknown parenthesis in the purpose of the ages; that Israel and Israel’s hope are in abeyance; that a calling, constitution and sphere related to a “mystery” is here made known for the first time; that neither the covenants nor the promises nor the miracles belonging to Israel are functioning to-day, and that they are superseded by an entirely new set of conditions opened to the far-off Gentiles; a salvation and a calling of such amazing grace that it would be unbelievable were it not written in these epistles of Paul the prisoner, given by inspiration of God.

If Acts xxviii. is the dispensational boundary, if it is national and final, then we have no need to go into all the side issues that have been or can be raised. But if Acts xxviii. be, after all, “local”; if the hope of Israel extended beyond this chapter; if the ploughing of the site of the Temple be not the judgment threatened in Matt. xxiii. and xxiv.; if the olive tree of Israel still stands; if Gentiles believers are still grafted in as wild olive branches; then all that has been brought out of the epistles of the mystery in these pages becomes an empty dream; we are found false witnesses of God; our preaching is vain; the words “far above all” and “seated together” are emptied of significance; the mystery, instead of being a secret hid in God, has been known as far back as the call of Abraham; the “one new man” instead of being so “created” (*ktizo*) (Eph. ii. 15), is but an evolution from the conditions of the Acts; the unique reference to a period “before the foundation of the world” has no special significance; the equally unique phrase, “in heavenly places”, is nothing more than a reference to Israel’s “heavenly calling”; the unique equality indicated by the word *sussoma*, “the same body”, or a “joint body”—the outcome of that gospel whereof Paul was made a minister—means nothing more than we could have learned by reading Gal. iii. 28, 29; the three distinct “adoptions” (Rom. ix. 1-5; Gal. iv. 5 and Rom. viii. 23 and Eph. i. 4, 5) are merged and spoiled, and there is nothing left for us but to repent, to confess to colossal failure, and to stand discredited.

From time to time we have in these pages acknowledged the pioneer’s liability to mistake and have retraced our steps; and this we will do again, should truth so demand, but the theme, “Acts xxviii. the Dispensational Boundary”, which opened our ministry in The Berean Expositor in 1909; has been before the reader for these thirty-seven years; has been examined and re-examined, and challenged but never refuted. We have again re-considered its claims, and return to our ministry with strengthened conviction that in this matter we have the truth of God. This being so, questions as to the relationship of Ephesians with Hebrews and similar arguments, do not arise. They can

only be admitted by those who do not perceive Acts xxviii. as the great boundary for this dispensation.

We are exceedingly sorry to forfeit the fellowship or regard of any believer in Christ, but we must not allow these things “to move us” but, with or without such fellowship, we must pursue the course before us, remain true to the good deposit entrusted, and leave the final arbitrament to the Lord in “that day”.

**#2. An examination of the suggestion
that the epistle to the Hebrews contains
what has been called “Ephesian truth”.
pp. 173 - 177**

In the course of correspondence with one reader of this magazine, he put forward the following parallels between Hebrews and Ephesians, with the appended comment.

<i>Hebrews.</i>	<i>Ephesians.</i>
vi. 17. Heirs.	iii. 6. Joint Heirs.
xiii. 3. Body.	iii. 6. Joint Body.
iii. 1. Partakers.	iii. 6. Joint Partakers.

“The mystery then appeared to me in quite a new understanding. Acts xxviii. would not then necessarily mean a new sphere of blessing in locality, but in jointness with Israel. After all Heb. iii. 1 ‘heavenly calling’ is I understand the same word as is used in Eph. i. 3. In going through Hebrews these points seemed to stand out. Heb. iii. 1 ‘The calling’; iv. 14 ‘passed through (R.V.) the heavens’; ix. 12 ‘entered into the holy place’; x. 12 ‘sat down on the right hand of God’. It was just like reading Ephesians to me, but one thing more was wanted, and x. 19 seemed to seal the whole question, ‘boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus’. I felt at once, This is Ephesian truth.”

It must first be remembered that much turns on what we mean by “Ephesian truth”. For instance, the glorious fact that Christ ascended and sat down at the right hand of God, is not “Ephesian truth”. It is a fact, but a fact which would remain had the mystery never been made known. Boldness of access into the holiest by the blood of Jesus is not “Ephesian truth”, but a truth foreshadowed in type and symbol by the Holy Ghost, until the times of reformation, and is consequent upon the finished work and one sacrifice of Christ, not upon any revelation of the mystery. By “Ephesian truth”, if we mean anything, we must mean some peculiar revelation of truth found in Ephesians and nowhere else.

Now, upon reading through Hebrews, our brother was struck by certain expressions in it similar to others in Ephesians, and says, “I felt at once, This is Ephesian truth”. Let us give this matter our attention, for the hope of our calling is involved.

Heb. vi. 17 is said to be “Ephesian truth”. Let us see if this can be substantiated.

“For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, he swore by Himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee, and so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise” (Heb. vi. 13-15).

These are the words that introduce the first similarity named, the “heirs” of Heb. vi. 17. The reference in Heb. vi. is to Gen. xxii., where, after Abraham had manifested the reality of his faith in the offering of Isaac, the Lord intervened saying, “By Myself have I sworn”. The Apostle did not quote the whole of Gen. xxii. 16-18 for he was writing to Hebrews, who were thoroughly familiar with the context of the passage and the inheritance that was in view. To-day, however, it seems that it is necessary to quote the remainder of the passage. It is as follows:

“I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Gen. xxii. 16-18).

Now “Ephesian truth” is directly connected with an election that took place “before the foundation of the world”, and with the revelation of a “mystery” which had been hid in God and not made known until the defection of Israel at Acts xxviii. These things being so, the attempt to link the “heirs” of Heb. vi. 17 with those of Eph. iii. 6 is a palpable error.

Let us take the next similarity, “The Body” (Heb. xiii. 3).

“Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body.”

The way in which this verse is written is reminiscent of the correspondence and expansion so characteristic of Hebrew poetry. It can be set out thus:--

A | Those that are in bonds.
B | As bound with them.
A | Those which suffer adversity.
B | As being yourselves in the body.

That there is no reference here to “the church which is His body” is evident from the Syriac version which renders the passage, “As men who are clothed with the flesh”. Dr. Weymouth’s translation is, “For yourselves are still in the body”. Paul uses the phrase, “in the body”, to indicate the present life in the flesh, in II Chron. iv. 10; v. 10 and xii. 2, and we might just as well see “Ephesian truth” in these references to “the body” as in Heb. xiii. 3, “which”, as Euclid would say, “is absurd”.

The third similarity is Heb. iii. 1, where the word “partakers” is linked with Eph. iii. 6. If there is one thing that is distinctive of Ephesian truth, it is the overwhelming grace that makes the calling there revealed absolutely sure; completely

removed from “ifs” and “buts”. The word “partakers” in Eph. iii. 6 is specifically related to “His promise in Christ by the gospel, whereof I (Paul) was made a minister”, whereas the partaking of Heb. iii. is placed in a context that takes us back to the wilderness experiences of Israel, where it is definitely recorded that God was grieved with most of those who wandered the forty years in the wilderness. It is in this connection that the word “partaker” applies as we can see by the contingent statement, “For we are made partakers of Christ, *if* we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end” (Heb. iii. 14). Is *that* “Ephesian truth”?

Again, this same people are reminded that this failure to “go on unto perfection”, typified in the wilderness, is a truth for them to consider; the words are:

“For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made *partakers* of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, *if* they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance” (Heb. vi. 4-6).

Is *that* “Ephesian truth”?

It is abundantly evident that the mere occurrence of similar words in any two epistles does not necessarily make those two epistles teach the same calling, hope, or sphere of blessing. Let us therefore leave this very unsatisfactory method of arriving at truth, and let us compare the two epistles to discover where they are at one and where they diverge.

The epistle to the Hebrews opens with a reference to “The fathers” to whom God had spoken by the prophets (Heb. i. 1). These selfsame “fathers” “tempted” God in the wilderness (Heb. iii. 9). Is this “Ephesian truth”? It must not be objected that only selected portions of Hebrews are “Ephesian truth”; the whole comprises all its parts. We read of these “fathers” in Rom. ix. 5 where they are exclusive to “Israel according to the flesh”. No such reference is found in Ephesians; there “the fathers” are entirely out of place.

In Heb. i. there is great insistence upon “angels”. Do angels figure in Ephesian truth? They are found in I Corinthians and in II Thessalonians, where they are in entire harmony with the dispensational place of these epistles, but they are never mentioned in Ephesians. There, we read of “principalities and powers” being beneath the feet of Christ, but Peter, who was a minister of the circumcision, includes “angels” when he speaks of “principalities and powers” being beneath the Lord’s feet. This links Hebrews with the circumcision, but severs it from Ephesians. Angels are intimately associated with Israel, their hope, and their calling, consequently they have a prominent place in Hebrews. They are closely connected with the inheritance of this epistle, where, associated with the heavenly Jerusalem, we have an “innumerable company of angels” (Heb. xii. 22). Clearly this is not Ephesian truth.

Again, when the Apostle would stress the fact that the Saviour became man, he said, “For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him *the seed of Abraham*” (Heb. ii. 16). Inasmuch as Abraham is never mentioned in Ephesians, and that

it is to the Gentiles, as such, as aliens, that “Ephesian truth” is addressed, this limitation to the seed of Abraham in the epistle to the Hebrews cannot but indicate that that epistle does not contain or comprehend the distinctive calling of Ephesians: it would rather exclude the far-off Gentiles.

The zenith of Hebrews is in chapter x., where, in direct contrast with every other priest, Christ is said to have “*sat down*” (Heb. x. 12), but He sat down ALONE, and it is here, *where Hebrews ends, that Ephesian truth begins*, for in Eph. ii. the astounding revelation is made that the Gentile believer, under the terms of this new dispensation, is not only “raised up together, but made to *sit together* in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 6). THIS is Ephesian truth, a truth entirely foreign to the epistle to the Hebrews.

A great deal that it will not bear has been made of the word translated “the same body” in Eph. iii. 6. This passage is not the only one in Ephesians that uses the prefix “*sun*”, translated in that verse “fellow” heirs, and “same” body. Fourteen such combinations occur in that epistle, and it is impossible to attain to a true rendering of the three found in chapter iii. 6 if we ignore the remaining occurrences and their bearing upon the meaning intended by the Apostle.

Here are the passages, each one being consonant with the word that is sometimes translated “joint body” and which our correspondent would make to mean “joint body together with the members of the heavenly calling”.

- Eph. ii. 5 . . . *Suzoopoieo*, “quickened together” (“jointly quickened”).
- Eph. ii. 6 . . . *Suneguei*o, “raised together” (“jointly raised”).
- Eph. ii. 6 . . . *Sugkathizo*, “sit together” (“jointly seated”).
- Eph. ii. 19 . . . *Sumpolites*, “fellow citizens” (“joint citizens”).
- Eph. ii. 21 . . . *Sunarmologeomai*, “fitly framed together” (“jointly framed”).
- Eph. iv. 16 . . . - same - “fitly joined together” (“jointly framed”).
- Eph. ii. 22 . . . *Sunoikodomeomai*, “builded together” (“jointly builded”).
- Eph. iii. 6 . . . *Sugkleronomos*, “fellow heirs” (“joint heirs”).
- Eph. iii. 6 . . . *Sussoma*, “the same body” (“joint body”).
- Eph. iii. 6 . . . *Summetochos*, “partakers” (“joint partakers”).
- Eph. iii. 18 . . . *Sun katalambano*, “comprehend with” (“jointly comprehend”).
- Eph. iv. 3 . . . *Sundesmos*, “the bond” (“joint bond”).
- Eph. iv. 16 . . . *Sumbibazo*, “compactd” (“jointly knit”).
- Eph. v. 11 . . . *Sugkoinoneo*, “fellowship” (“joint holding”).

In the brackets we have retained the word “joint” or “jointly”, but we do not intend this as a serious interpretation. While it makes good sense in some passages, in others it is cumbersome. The great objection to using the term “a joint body” is that it tends to create in the mind the necessity of the presence of some other company of believers, in this case, for example, the heavenly calling of Heb. iii. 1, with which the members of the Body of Christ can be “joined”. Seeing, however, that the emphasis on the prefix *sun*, “together”, in the words listed from Ephesians, is not so much a union with some outside body, as a deep seated equality *within*, such an interpretation is an error. The words “fitly joined together” of Eph. iv. 16 can refer only to members within, not to any relationship without.

If there are very few actual parallels between Hebrews and Ephesians, the reverse is true when we compare Hebrews with Philippians. They are too numerous to set out here, and a review of them would occupy a whole article, but a selection will suffice.

The Parallels between and Philippians.

- (1) The same key words. “Perfection” or “Perdition”
(Heb. vi. 1; x. 39; Phil. iii. 12-19).
- (2) The same figure. “The Race”, “The Prize” (Heb. xii. 1; Phil. iii. 14).
- (3) The “better”, or the “out” resurrection (Heb. xi. 35; Phil. iii. 11).
- (4) Cross related to crown—example (Heb. xii. 1, 2; Phil. ii. 5, 9).
- (5) Not certainty, but contingency—IF (Heb. iii. 14; iv. 1; Phil. iii. 11).
- (6) The danger, “one morsel of meat” (Heb. xii. 16; Phil. iii. 19).
- (7) City and citizenship (Heb. xi. 10; xii. 22; Phil. iii. 20).

Here are seven parallels selected from dozens of others. Now a parallel truth is not an identical truth. The parallels between Hebrews and Philippians reveal that in both callings God works along similar lines, but this parallel working does not make the race, the prize, and the city *identical*, otherwise they could not be spoken of as being *parallel*. Hebrews is to Romans as Philippians is to Ephesians. Romans is basic and concerned with standing in grace. Its great text is “The JUST shall live by faith” (Rom. i. 17). Hebrews assumes the standing in grace, and urges the believer to endure, to run, to hold fast, to work out, to show, “the things that *accompany* salvation” and emphasizes “reward”. Its great text is “The just shall LIVE by faith” (Heb. x. 38).

Again, there are parallels between Hebrews, Philippians and the sermon on the mount which can be worked out. This however does not make Hebrews or the sermon on the mount identical with the revelation of the later epistles. The sermon on the mount is to the gospel of the kingdom what Hebrews is to the heavenly calling, and what Philippians is to the calling that is “Far above all”. There is a “city” in each sphere (Matt. v. 35; Heb. xi. 10; Eph. ii. 19), but this fact no more reduces the heavenly Jerusalem to the level of the earthly, than it reduces the citizenship of Ephesians and Philippians to the level of the New Jerusalem.

It has been suggested that Eph. ii. contains more spiritual teaching than Eph. i. 3-14, and in this very suggestion is revealed the false system of exegesis we are here combating. True, there may be a fascination in delving into the possible meaning of the “twain” and the “both”, but it is unforgivable so to interpret them as virtually to deny the basic teaching of Eph. i. 3-14. This passage we have called, we believe rightly, *The Charter of the Church*. It reveals a choice made before the foundation of the world. This is unique, and colours every subsequent expression found in Ephesians. It reveals a sphere of blessing “far above all where Christ sits in heavenly places”, which again is unique and colours all subsequent statements. It reveals an adoption that must differ both from Israel’s, which is according to the flesh, and from the other adoption, which is linked with Abraham and the heavenly Jerusalem.

We are thankful for anything that sends us back to the Word to re-examine the foundations upon which we build. We are thankful to state that our re-examination in the present case has but the more confirmed that the dispensation, fellowship, sphere, and constitution of the Ephesian company is unique, is in no way related to the heavenly calling of Hebrews, and that Hebrews itself is more concerned with urging the believer to “go on unto perfection” than with the calling and standing of the believer in grace.

Faith must stand the test; doctrines must be proof against attack; we are enjoined to “prove all things”, and to “hold fast that which is good”. This we believe we have done, and in its results we rejoice.

EPHESIA.

#10. To the saints which are at Ephesus.

Tois ousin: The participle.

pp. 6, 7

We have already discussed the MSS evidence for the retention of the words *en Epheso*, “in Ephesus”, which occur in Eph. i. 1, and found every reason for believing that this epistle was actually addressed to the saints at Ephesus, even though subsequently it may have been used as a circular letter in making known the new revelation of the mystery.

Few commentators follow the “puerile conceit”, as Middleton calls it, of Basil, who attempted to make some profound sense of translating Eph. i. 1, “To the saints that *are*”. Basil accumulated instances where the true God is called *ho on*, “He Who is”, and then fixed upon this passage in Eph. i. 1 to prove that the true Christians are called *hoi ontes*, “Those who *are*”, in opposition to the heathen *Ta me onta*, “The things that are not” (I Cor. i. 28).

We leave this matter and turn our attention to the words *Tois ousin*, “To those who are”. “Are” is a part of the verb “to be”, and as we write for those who desire help all along the line, we venture to make sure that even this English term is understood. Words in the Greek are usually classified under eight heads, called “parts of speech”. These eight heads are: Article, Noun, Pronoun, Verb, Participle, Adverb, Conjunction, and Preposition. For the moment we are concerned only with one of these parts of speech, the participle. We must, however, include the verb in our study if we are to understand the participle. The name “verb” indicates the importance of this part of speech, for it means “THE WORD”, and no true sentence can be made without it.

“A verb is a word which signifies *to do*, *to suffer*, or *to be*.” Hence “There are three kinds of verbs, *active*, *passive* and *neuter*”.

“A verb *neuter* expresses *being*, or a *state* or *condition of being*; when the agent and the object acted upon coincide, and the event is properly neither action nor passion, but rather something between both; as *I am*, *I sleep*, *I walk*.” (Bp. Lowth).

The verb “to be” is therefore a *neuter* verb. Now we do not say “I be” or “You be”, but “I am” and “You are”, and the “pattern” to which any particular verb conforms is called its *paradigm*. Now the paradigm of the verb “to be” is as follows:--

<i>Indicative Present.</i>			
1st Per. Sing.	I am.	1st Per. Plur.	We are.
2nd Per. Sing.	Thou art.	2nd Per. Plur.	You are.
3rd Per. Sing.	He is.	3rd Per. Plur.	They are.

The paradigm of the Greek verb *eimi*, “to be”, is as follows:--

<i>Indicative Present.</i>			
<i>Singular.</i>		<i>Plural.</i>	
<i>Eimi.</i>	I am.	<i>Esmen.</i>	We are.
<i>Ei.</i>	Thou art.	<i>Este.</i>	Ye are.
<i>Esti.</i>	He (she or it) is.	<i>Eisi (n).</i>	They are.

Now while all this is intensely interesting and of great importance to the point at issue, we have not arrived at the actual word used in Eph. i. 1. *Ousin* is a participle, derived from *eimi*, “to be”. What then is a “participle”? As the name implies, a participle is so called because it *partakes* at once of the nature of a noun and of a verb. It is really a particular kind of adjective derived immediately from a verb, expressing both an attribute or property of a person or thing, and a time to which it relates.

Ousin is the present participle of *eimi*, and means “being”. It is plural and agrees with *Tois hagiois*, “To the saints”, and so is in the dative case. *Tois ousin*, therefore, is “To the being”, but this needs to be re-cast to make English, and so we may say, “To the ones being”, or better still, “To those which are (at Ephesus, etc.)”.

To those unacquainted with the foundation of language all this may look formidable, but grammatical interpretation is the very backbone of truth, and no pains must therefore be spared if we value the testimony of Holy Scripture.

#11. “At Ephesus.” Notes on the preposition *en*. pp. 24, 25

On the last occasion we occupied the available space in arriving at the meaning of the participle *ousin*, “being”. This must be read with *en Epheso*, “at Ephesus”.

We must now consider the preposition *en*. The reader will remember that the meaning of the name “preposition” and some features common to prepositions, were discussed in Volume XXXII, pp. 29 and 30. We come immediately, therefore, to *en*. This preposition corresponds with the English “in” but is not quite so restricted in its use, being translated “among”, “at”, “by” and “with”.

Every preposition is associated with the idea of *place*, and where the *dative case* is used, as with *en*, something fixed or stationary is intended, and *en* denotes the space within, in, upon, at, or near, which anything is.

<i>En</i> is used of place . . .	“ <i>In</i> their synagogue” (Matt. ix. 35). “ <i>On</i> my throne” (Rev. iii. 21). “ <i>At</i> the right hand” (Rom. viii. 34).
<i>En</i> is used time . . .	“ <i>In</i> the days of” (Matt. ii. 1). “ <i>Upon</i> (or <i>during</i>) the Sabbath” (Matt. xii. 2). “ <i>At</i> the last trump” (I Cor. xv. 52).

En is used of number . . . “Among the princes of Juda” (Matt. ii. 6).
En is used of agency . . . “By His blood” (Rom. v. 9).
 “With thy mouth” (Rom. x. 9).
 “For their much speaking” (Matt. vi. 7).

En may also indicate the business *in* which one is employed (Rom. i. 9), the society to which one belongs, or matters in which one has a share (Matt. xxiii. 30) and the state or condition of the mind (Eph. iv. 15).

The epistle therefore was written to the saints; to those who were *in* or *at* Ephesus.

The preposition *en* occurs some 120 times in Ephesians. We cannot refer to all these here, but we will give an example of each of the different ways in which it is translated in these occurrences.

AT.—“At Ephesus” (i. 1).
 IN.—“In Christ Jesus” (i. 1).
 WITH.—“With all spiritual blessings” (i. 3).
 WhereIN.—“Wherein He hath made us accepted” (i. 6).
 AMONG.—“Among whom also we all had our conversation” (ii. 3).
 THROUGH.—“In His kindness toward us *through* Christ Jesus” (ii. 7).
 BY.—“Made nigh *by* the blood of Christ” (ii. 13).
 ThereBY.—“Having slain the enmity *thereby*” (ii. 16).
 OF.—“The prisoner *of* the Lord” (iv. 1).
 WhereBY.—“Whereby ye are sealed” (iv. 30).
 FOR SAKE.—“Even as God *For Christ’s sake*” (iv. 32).
 WhereWITH.—“Wherewith ye shall be able” (vi. 16).
 ALWAYS.—“Praying *always* (lit. *in every season*)” (vi. 18) and
 “THAT I MAY OPEN (lit. *in the opening of*)
 MY MOUTH BOLDLY (*in boldness*)” (vi. 19).

The reader may meet with some who will assure him that they are not blessed *with* all spiritual blessings but *in* them; that Paul was not the prisoner *of* Christ Jesus, but *in* Him, etc., etc. If so he will now possibly be the better fitted to treat such intrusion at its true worth. If anyone apprises us what this or that word is in the original; that it is this or that preposition, he renders us a service, but if, with irritating literality, he attempts to reduce all such counters of living thought to a dead level, his service becomes a disservice.

#12. The conjunction *Kai*, “And” (Eph. i. 1). p. 37

The addressees of this epistle are given a double title, “The saints which are at Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ Jesus”. This double title is joined together by the conjunction “and” which is Greek is *kai*.

Conjunctions come under the heading of “Particles”, a term that includes a number of minor parts of speech, and, as their name implies, they are connectives. The most general translation is “and”, but there are occasions when the exact shade of meaning demands some other English equivalent, “also” and “even”. *Kai* unites things that are strictly co-ordinate, things that can be “added”, having something in common.

ALSO.—“Yea I beseech thee also” (Phil. iv. 3, R.V.).

In Matt. v. 39 it would be almost impossible to translate *kai* other than “also”, “turn to him the other also”, yet the original reads *kai ten allen*.

EVEN.—“Children of wrath, *even* as others” (Eph. ii. 3).

Occasionally the translation *and also* seems called for:

AND ALSO.—“*And will also* raise us up” (I Cor. vi. 14).

Other renderings found in the A.V. are:

MOREOVER.—“*Moreover* ye see and hear” (Acts xix. 26).

THOUGH.—“*Though* He bear long with them” (Luke xviii. 7).

No good purpose would be served by occupying precious space with examples of such renderings as “withal”, “likewise”, “both”, “very”, “the same”, etc., etc.

We might take note of one or two peculiarities in the use of *kai* given by *Winer*.

Kai before interrogatives, as in Mark x. 26. *Kai dunatai sothenai*, “Who then can be saved?”, which is better than the literal “And who can be saved?” Rom. viii. 24: *Ti kai elpizo*, “Why doth he yet hope for?”, which is better than the literal “What and hoping?” *Kai* never occurs as strictly an adversative. Where two circumstances, one encouraging and the other favourable, are stated as jointly detaining the Apostle in Ephesus (I Cor. xvi. 9), he uses *kai* as the simple copula. *Kai* is used epexegetically, that is, in elucidation of something immediately preceding, by the addition of a word or words: “Of His fullness have we all received, *and* grace for grace” (John i. 16). In the expression *Theos kai Pater*, the meaning is simply *and* “God, Who is at the same time Father”, not “God, namely the Father”.

As we meet this conjunction in our progress through “Ephesia” we shall become acquainted with its usage and the shades of meaning that it conveys. In every usage,

however different they may appear superficially, there is always present the primitive sense of *addition*.

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth. (Second Series).

ISAIAH.

#18. Comfort and Controversy.

**Isa. xl. 1-11: With special reference to the true interpretation
of the words translated, “Her iniquity is pardoned”.
pp. 25 - 28**

If we enquire what is the particular “comfort” that the prophet would minister to Jerusalem, we may find help by considering his own expansion given in Isa. xl. 2.

“Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received of the Lord’s hand double for all her sins.”

Here, to “speak comfortably” is literally “to speak to the heart”; it is the language of love.

“And his soul clave unto Dinah the daughter of Jacob, and he loved the damsel; and he spake *to the heart* of the damsel” (Gen. xxxiv. 3, margin).

It was the language of Joseph, the great foreshadower of Christ, the Saviour, Preserver and Restorer of His people, when he said to his brethren in Egypt,

“Now therefore fear ye not: I will nourish you and your little ones. And he comforted them and spake *to their hearts*” (Gen. l. 21, margin).

It is the language of God Himself when the day of Israel’s *restoration* (Gen. l. 21) and *bethrotal* (Gen. xxxiv. 3) is in view.

“Therefore, behold, I will allure her, and bring her unto the wilderness, and speak *to her heart* (margin) I will betroth I will sow I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art My people, and they shall say, Thou art my God” (Hosea ii. 14-23).

The comfort of the people of Israel as intended by the prophet in Isa. xl., touches, in the first place, two things.

- (1) The end of her warfare.
- (2) The pardon of her iniquity.

This twofold annunciation is followed by a prophecy concerning the One Who, alone, could terminate all conflict or pardon iniquity. “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord.” Then, facing the utter inability of human nature to accomplish such an end—for all flesh is grass—the prophet is assured that this

glorious consummation shall be attained, “for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it”. The prophetic utterance is then rounded off by a vision of the coming of the Lord, and His twofold character of Ruler and Shepherd, uniting in His Person and work of the office of Kinsman-Redeemer and the Avenger of Blood.

The first expansion given by the prophet of what is intended by the ministry of “comfort”, with which this great section opens, is found in the words, “Her warfare is accomplished”. The reader will note that for “warfare” the margin reads “appointed time”. The Hebrew word translated “warfare” is familiar to the English reader in the Divine title, “The Lord of Sabaoth” (Rom. ix. 29), which is taken from the Hebrew *Tsaba*, “Hosts”. *Tsaba* occurs in the O.T. 485 times, of which 394 occurrences are translated “host”, 42 translated “war” or “warfare”, 29 translated “army”, and 6 translated “battle”. The glad tidings that at length shall be proclaimed in Jerusalem is that her “warfare” is “accomplished”. This will be incomparably good news, for Israel’s history is deluged in blood and soaked in tears. War, both on the physical and spiritual plane, has been theirs, and is even threatened at the close of the Millennium (Rev. xx. 8, 9). The prophet Daniel was staggered by a vision that revealed “warfare great” (Dan. x. 1) for the word translated “appointed time” is *tsaba*. Peace however shall come; Israel’s warfare shall one day cease; it shall be “accomplished”. This word “accomplished” is a translation of *male*, “To fill”, and is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures. Isaiah uses the word in a very forceful manner when he speaks of hands being “full of blood” (i. 15); loins “filled with pain” (xxi. 3); lips “full of indignation” (xxx. 27); but in Isa. xl. 2 he uses the word in a slightly different sense, indicating that Israel’s experience of war will at length be “filled”. It will indeed have been a full measure, for the prophet’s own comment is that Israel has received of the Lord’s hand “double” for all her sins.

The prophet Ezekiel, referring to the punishment of Israel at the hands of the King of Babylon says, “Let the sword be doubled” (Ezek. xxi. 14). The prophet Jeremiah says, “First I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double” (Jer. xvi. 18); and again, “Bring upon them the day of evil, and destroy them with double destruction” (Jer. xvii. 18). In all probability there is a literal fulfillment of the law in all this, for failure to keep faith was punished by restoring the amount involved “double” (Exod. xxii. 4, 7, 9). This same principle is seen at work at the judgment of Babylon:

“Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double” (Rev. xviii. 6).

This however would be no word of “comfort” to Jerusalem, but there is another side to the matter. The same Isaiah, when he looks forward to “the acceptable year of the Lord” and the day of Israel’s restoration, says:--

“For your shame ye shall have double; and for confusion they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore in their land they shall possess the double: everlasting joy shall be unto them” (Isa. lxvi. 7).

and the prophet Zechariah says:--

“Turn you to the stronghold, ye prisoners of hope: even to-day do I declare that I will render double unto thee” (Zech. ix. 12).

In these references we have however been dealing with two different Hebrew words and two different ideas. The word used in Isa. xl. means “full”, thorough”, “complete”, whereas the word used in Isa. lxi. 7 refers rather to the double portion that belongs to the firstborn (Deut. xxi. 17).

The prophet therefore comforts Israel by announcing that her warfare is accomplished, that she has received double, or full measure, for her sins, and that now she is to receive the firstborn’s portion—“possess double”, and that “everlasting joy” shall be with them.

“Therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things; and he shall put a yoke upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee and the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shall have none assurance of thy life: In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning!” (Deut. xxviii. 48-67).

The inquisition, the ghetto, the gabardine, the pogrom, the concentration camp—all are included in the dreadful curse that was pronounced upon disobedient and gainsaying Israel.

The reader may wonder why we have not elaborated the evangelical doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, seeing that the very words “her iniquity is pardoned” await us, and seem to be the prophet’s own added explanation. Israel are to be pardoned, yea, they are to be justified, their iniquity being laid upon Him Who bare our sins and carried our sorrows, but, wondrous as the theme of redeeming love may be, faithfulness prevents us from introducing the subject here. We are sensitive of the reader’s surprise and possible displeasure, and for the truth’s sake, not for our own, we depart from our rule, and quote an authority.

Dr. Robert Young in his literal translation, reads, “that accepted hath been her punishment”, where the A.V. reads, “her iniquity is pardoned”. This translation will be found in the margin of the R.V. and merits examination. To the evangelical mind, there is something extremely objectional in this new translation, and if intruded into the New Testament it would indeed be intolerable, but we must not forget that, however full of evangelical grace this most glorious of prophecies may be, it was originally uttered, “concerning *Judah and Jerusalem*” (Isa. i. 1), and doctrines that are foreign to the gospel of the grace of God may be in perfect harmony in the dealings of God with Israel. If Israel knew the law of Moses they also knew the conditions that were attached to its cessation and their restoration to favour. The passage that illuminates Isa. xl. 2 is found in Lev. xxvi.

“If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they trespassed against Me, and that also they have walked contrary unto Me; and that I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then ACCEPT of the PUNISHMENT of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant” (Lev. xxvi. 40-42).

Here the word “accept” is the Hebrew *ratsah*, and the word “punishment” is the Hebrew *avon*, which two words appear respectively as “pardon” and “iniquity”. This same word *ratsah* supplies us with “the *acceptable* year of the Lord” (Isa. xl. 2), and the *acceptance* of the offerer because of the vicarious sacrifice (Lev. i. 4), which facts have their place in the final and complete acceptance, in grace, of this disobedient and gainsaying people.

We have not yet arrived at Isa. liii., and must therefore expound Isa. xl. 2 by principles of truth, and not by feelings and wishes. If the reader will read the prayer of Nehemiah (Neh. i.), and of Daniel (Dan. ix.), he will perceive that these two men of God knew and understood the principles of God’s dealing with His ancient people that are implied in the translation of Isa. xl. 2 offered in this article. Moreover, the reader may be glad to see another example of the dual meaning that attaches to such words as “iniquity”, “acceptance”, “punishment” and “pardon”, by referring to Gen. iv. 3, “And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear”, and consulting the margin, which reads: “Or, Mine iniquity is greater than that it may be forgiven.” We do not propose, however, to enter into the question of Gen. iv. and its interpretation, but merely draw the reader’s attention to the fact that these dual meanings are recognized by all Hebrew scholars. We can at least learn one lesson from this feature, namely, that, in the eyes of the Lord, “iniquity” and “punishment” are but two sides of one subject, even as are “pardon” and “acceptance”.

ISAIAH.

#19. The Forerunner (xl. 3-5).

The relation of John the Baptist with Elijah considered.

pp. 38 - 42

Is there any evident connection between verses 2 and 3 of Isa. xl.? The new section (verse 3) commences with the words, “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness”. Whose is this “voice”, and what connection is there between his message and that already written in verses 1 and 2? To answer the question we must look back to these verses and note their content. The passage that supplies the link is that which we found it necessary to retranslate “That accepted hath been her punishment”, and the word translated “comfort”, which we discovered was many times translated “repent”.

At first glance we may not see the principle embedded in this evangelical prophecy and consequently miss the point. God made it abundantly clear to Israel that His attitude to them would be a reflection of their attitude to Him. He is a “God of recompenses”

(Jer. li. 56). “The days of recompense are come” said Hosea (ix. 7), and, reviewing the history of Israel, the apostle Paul spoke of “a stumbling block, and a recompense” (Rom. xi. 9). Under the free grace of the gospel such “recompense” would be entirely unscriptural and undispensational, but we remember that even in Matt. v.-vii. there is such a principle as “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors” (Matt. vi. 12), and, lest we should feel inclined to tone this down, the Lord, in verses 14 and 15, makes the matter unmistakably clear, fortifying it later with the parable of the unforgiving servant (Matt. xviii. 23-35). So we read:--

“With the merciful Thou wilt shew Thyself merciful; with an upright man Thou wilt shew Thyself upright; with the pure Thou wilt shew Thyself pure; and with the froward Thou wilt show Thyself froward” (Psa. xviii. 25, 26).

According to verse 24, this is “recompense”. We shall find that preceding the passage in Lev. xxvi., where “acceptance of punishment” is found (a passage that bears intimately upon Isa. xl. 2, as was found in our last article), there is the same principle at work:

“. . . . If ye walk contrary unto Me I bring I will send I chastise If they shall confess that also they have walked contrary unto Me, and that I also have walked contrary unto them” (Lev. xxvi. 14-46).

So, too, in Joel ii. we again have repentance of a mutual character:

“Turn ye even to Me with all your heart turn unto the Lord repenteth in Him of the evil. Who knoweth if He will return and repent” (Joel ii. 12-14).

So in Isa. xl. when the prophet passes on the Lord’s word, “Comfort ye”, he uses the Hebrew word *nacham*, which is also rendered “repent”, and John the Baptist, who partly fulfilled the prophecy of Isa. xl. 3-5, had as the key-word of his ministry to Israel, “Repent”. If therefore these things are discerned, a very palpable link between Isa. xl. 2 and 3 will be seen to exist.

When Isa. xl. 3-5 is read and associated with John the Baptist two things stand out for consideration. One is that while he did fulfil much that is written here, it could never be said that “all flesh” saw the glory of the Lord. Let us consider the way in which this passage is introduced into the Gospels.

“In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matt. iii. 1, 2).

The statement is followed by the assertion:--

“For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness” (Matt. iii. 3).

With this quotation and its application to John the Baptist, Mark opens his Gospel (Mark i. 1-3). Luke also speaks in the same strain (Luke iii. 1-6). John, in his Gospel, lays great stress upon the witness of John the Baptist but, instead of affirming, as do the other Evangelists, that John’s ministry was according to the prophecy of Isaiah, he allows the Baptist to speak for himself:--

“He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias” (John i. 23).

Nevertheless, every reader of the N.T. knows that John only partly fulfilled this prophecy of Isaiah. It is important that we should know not only what the Scriptures teach on any given subject, but in what part of the Scriptures the teaching is found, and this is true of the teaching concerning John the Baptist.

In Matt. iii. there is no hesitancy, no proviso: John’s ministry might easily have fulfilled the prophecy of Isa. xl., but we find that, so far from this being the case, John is thrown into prison, and himself began to hesitate at the turn of events (Matt. xi.). After the Baptist had been cast into prison, the Lord opened His public ministry, and endorsed the announcement of His forerunner:

“From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matt. iv. 17).

but following His rejection (Matt. xi.-xiii.) a dividing line is reached, and the Lord makes a new revelation:

“From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto His disciples, how that He must go into Jerusalem, and suffer be killed raised again the third day” (Matt. xvi. 21).

and the next reference to John the Baptist has a different aspect, introducing somewhat of mystery, where before all was straight-forward. The disciples asked the Lord:

“Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things” (Matt. xvii. 10, 11).

The Scribes were right. Elijah indeed *cometh*, but John was already dead. Elijah indeed *cometh first, and shall restore all things*. This, John the Baptist never did. All flesh did not, then, see the glory of the Lord.

Three statements relative to John the Baptist and Elijah are given in the N.T. Taken separately they appear to contradict one another; taken together they manifest a uniting principle.

- (1) John said he *was not* Elijah, but “the voice” of Isa. xl.

“Art thou Elijah? And he saith, I am not” (John i. 21).

- (2) The Saviour said that John *was* Elijah.

“This is Elijah, which was for to come” (Matt. xi. 14).

“Elijah is come already, and they knew him not the disciples understood that He spake unto them of John the Baptist” (Matt. xvii. 12, 13).

The Lord's statement in Matt. xi. 14 however is not so simple as our quotation makes it appear. He introduced His statement with an "If". "If ye will receive it" (namely, John's testimony and the presence of their King) then, most surely, Elijah had come. But Israel did not receive, and so Elijah had not come, nevertheless John had foreshadowed and anticipated the ministry of that great prophet, which is foretold in Malachi.

(3) Just before the birth of John the Baptist, an angel spoke to Zacharias, his father, and said:

"And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before Him in *the spirit and power* of Elijah" (Luke i. 16, 17).

It could never be said of Elijah himself, that he went before the Lord in "the spirit" and "power" of Elijah, for that would make no sense.

Taking all that is written, we understand that while John was *not* Elijah, he anticipated Elijah's coming, much as the first advent of Christ anticipated His second coming in glory. Both John and the Lord preached repentance in view of the kingdom, but both were rejected and the promised kingdom is still future.

When we return to Isa. xl. 3-5 and ask of whom does the prophet speak, we have to reply: He speaks of John the Baptist, in an anticipatory sense, but, primarily and fully, of Elijah who shall come before the second advent of Christ, as Malachi has said:

"Behold, I will send unto you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. iv. 5).

Elijah's ministry will be preparatory; "prepare", "make straight", "valley exalted", "hill low", "crooked straight", "rough places plain". While all the references here have to do with the actual, physical, preparation of roadways for the advent of a great personage (a preparation rendered very necessary because of the bad state of the roads, made worse by the custom of throwing out stones and rubbish on the highway), they but shadow forth a spiritual preparation. When John the Baptist went before the Lord to "prepare the way of the Lord", he did so in fulfillment of the prophecy uttered before his birth:

"He shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, *to make ready a people prepared for the Lord*" (Luke i. 17).

Again, the Lord said: "Elijah verily cometh first, and restoreth all things" (Mark ix. 12). We are not surprised therefore to find that the word translated "prepare" in Isa. xl. 3, although it occurs over 132 times in the O.T., is only so translated 6 times. Its primary meaning is "To turn the face towards anything", *panah* "to prepare" being cognate with *panim*, "face". In Mal. iii. 1 both words, *panah* and *panim*, are used. "He shall prepare (*panah*) the way before Me (*panim*)."¹ The following passage, quoted from *The Land and the Book* by Dr. W. M. Thomson, will enable the reader to appreciate the symbolism of the language of Isa. xl. 3, 4.

“Isaiah says, ‘Prepare the way of the Lord: cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones’ (Isa. lxii. 10); and not only do modern *ways* prove the need of such preparation, but modern customs show how, when and why it is done. When Ibrahim Pasha proposed to visit certain places on Lebanon, the emeers and the sheiks sent forth a general proclamation, somewhat in the style of Isaiah’s exhortation, to all the inhabitants, to assemble along the proposed route, and prepare the way before him. The same was done in 1846, on a grand scale when the present * sultan visited Brusa. The stones were gathered out, crooked places straightened, and rough ones made level and smooth the exhortation to gather out the stones is peculiarly appropriate. These farmers do the exact reverse—gather up the stones from their fields, and cast them into the highway; and it is this barbarous custom which in many places renders the paths so uncomfortable and even dangerous.” (* Published in 1888.)

The two-fold use of the word “way” needs no lengthy dissertation. The “highway”, *mesillah*, is from the verb *Salal*, “To cast up”, as in Isa. lvii. 14 and lxii. 10. The “highway” is used figuratively in such passages as Psa. lxxxiv. 5 and Prov. xvi. 17. Among the prophetic preparations for Israel’s restoration is this “highway”. Isaiah says: “There shall be an highway for the remnant of His people” (Isa. xi. 16). Jeremiah says: “Set thine heart toward the highway” (Jer. xxxi. 21).

Again, the highway is to be made “straight, and the crooked made straight”, and this too has a moral significance. The Psalmist prayed: “Make Thy way *straight* before my face” (Psa. v. 8). This word, which is translated “to make straight”, *yashar*, gives us the adjectives “right”, “just”, and “upright”. When Elihu would speak of sin, he used the figure of the road, saying, “If any say, I have sinned, and perverted that which was *right*” (Job xxxiii. 27), where he uses the same word as is translated “crooked” in Lam. iii. 9, “He hath made my paths crooked”, and the same word as is translated “make straight” in Isa. xl.

The reader however can sense the twofold nature of this figure: “Walk”, “way”, “path”, “crooked”, “straight”, etc., retain their twofold meaning today.

This spiritual “preparation” for the coming of the Lord, a preparation that includes “the heart” and “the people”, may be seen in Peter’s exhortation, “In holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God” (II Pet. iii. 12).

Let us be glad and rejoice that at last all hindrances, all obstacles, all stumbling blocks; all that prevents the coming of the King shall be removed.

“And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together” (Isa. xl. 5).

ISAIAH.

#20. The Frailty of Flesh, and the Power of the Word (xl. 6-9). pp. 84 - 87

The reader may remember that the structure of Isa. xl. 1-11 is as follows:--

- A | 1, 2. Message of comfort to Jerusalem. Pardon.
- B | 3-5. The VOICE. The Forerunner.
“The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”
- B | 6-8. The VOICE. The Prophet.
“The word of our God shall stand for ever.”
- A | 9-11. Good tidings to Zion. Protection.

We have heard, by prophetic anticipation, “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness”. Now we hear another voice, and unless we are careful we shall be somewhat confused by the inter-change of speakers. “The voice said, Cry.” The voice is the voice of the Lord, addressing the prophet and urging him to take up the glad message of Isa. xl. 1, 2: “Cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished.” But the prophet can hardly believe his ears, for the gladness and graciousness of the message. He looked at the people: a people of whom he had said, in the opening vision of his prophecy, “Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity; a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters” (Isa. i. 4), and his heart failed him. Can restoration be anything more than a dream, a vision, a hope; but a hope doomed to perpetual disappointment?

“The voice said, Cry”, and Isaiah replied, “What shall I cry?” (or What is the use of crying?) for “all flesh is grass”, destined to wither away.

Back comes the word of the Lord, which, to make clear the meaning, we take the liberty of expanding a little:

Yes, Isaiah, the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but you have been looking in the wrong direction. Israel’s restoration will not be accomplished by the arm of flesh, or by the wisdom of the world. No leagues or covenants or movements will ever plant Israel back into the land of promise; that is the glorious prerogative of the Lord Himself. He that scattered Israel, shall gather him; He will watch over His word to perform it. Isaiah, for the moment, you have forgotten one thing:

“The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”
“The word of our God shall stand for ever.”

In this “green and pleasant land” of England there is nothing so ubiquitous and persistent as “grass”. It grows everywhere, enduring the cold of winter and the heat of summer, but, in Bible lands, grass is a fitting symbol of that which is transitory. When He would speak of something that was passing, our Saviour referred to the grass of the field “which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven” (Matt. vi. 30).

Peter quotes Isa. xl. 6 and places the symbol of frailty between references to the incorruptible seed of the Word of God and that enduring Word of the Lord, which, by the gospel, was preached by the apostles (I Pet. i. 23-25).

When he would speak of the fleeting character of riches, James also uses the same figure, saying, "So also shall the rich man fade away in his ways" (James i. 10, 11).

Allusions in the Psalms also indicate this same tendency of the grass to wither and fade; "For they shall soon be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb" (Psa. xxxvii. 2). Again the figure is used in that magnificent Psalm of Moses, where he calls upon men to number their days, and describes them as spending their years as a tale that is told:

"They are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth" (Psa. xc. 5, 6).

In another Psalm we are told that,

"He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust. As for man, his days are as grass; as the flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more, BUT THE MERCY OF THE LORD IS FROM EVERLASTING TO EVERLASTING" (Psa. ciii. 14-17).

If, despite the frailty of the flesh emphasized in his prophecy, Isaiah had no cause to doubt but that the Lord would fulfil His promise, he is nevertheless inspired later in the same prophecy to enforce the lesson, saying, concerning the return of the redeemed to Zion:

"I, even I, am He That comforteth you: who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and the son of man which shall be made as grass" (Isa. li. 12).

Consequently we may learn from Isa. xl. and Isa. li. that the frailty of man will neither accomplish nor frustrate the purpose of God.

"The voice said, Cry", and we now see that the basis of the blessed proclamation to be cried and the hope of its glorious fulfillment are found in the words: "The mouth of the Lord had spoken it."

"Word of God, hath He then spoken,
And shall He not make it good?
Never can His word be broken
Ever faithful it has stood."*

(* - From our book "Hymns of Praise".)

Having heard the voice of the forerunner and the voice which called upon the Prophet to cry and declare the good news of Isaiah's restoration, the theme returns to those words which were spoken to Jerusalem:

“O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountain; O thou that tellest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!” (Isa. xl. 9).

In Volume XXXII, page 224, we have already discussed the question of the translation of this passage, and in the light of Isa. lii. 7 feel obliged to adopt the marginal alternative.

The Hebrew word which is translated “good tidings” is *basar* and the Hebrew word which is translated “flesh” is also *basar*, and, extraordinary as it may at first appear, both “good tidings” and “flesh” come from the same root. It may be useful to the student unacquainted with the language if we show how these apparently unrelated ideas can possibly grow from a common root.

Basar.—According to Gesenius, the primary sense is that of “beauty”, and since the face is made more beautiful by joy, so, by an easy transition, that which makes one joyful is called by the same name. The word however quite naturally took another direction. Beauty, says the proverb, is “skin deep”, and *basar* came to mean the exterior skin, then the flesh which the skin covered, and so, at length, by following two figurative pathways, the one word came to stand for “flesh”, which was likened to fading grass and “the gospel”, which endures for ever. Any student of English will be able to provide parallel examples of this diversity growing from a common stock. The LXX translated this word, “to bring”, (or to tell), “good tidings”, by the Greek *euaggelizo*, which in English became “evangelize” and gives us the “evangel” or “gospel”.

What was the “gospel” that brought comfort to Zion? It was one of few words but of vast import, “Behold your God”. This is expanded in the verses that follow, but all that these verses can say, and much more, is implicit in these three words. Let us examine this all-embracing evangel.

“BEHOLD!”—This is an interjection, and such particles of language are illusive words, difficult to trace to their origin, but it appears that *hen*, “behold”, is derived from the verb *henah* “to be ready” (Deut. i. 41), which in turn means “to be present”. The particle “behold” or “lo” generally indicates the *presence* of any one or thing, and the evangel of Isa. xl. opens with the exhortation to behold, and gives the assurance that the Lord is present.

One has only to call to mind the condition of the people that resulted in, and from, the loss of the presence of God, to become conscious that Isaiah’s “Behold!” indicates the end of separation and suffering and the beginning of nearness and blessing.

“YOUR.”—While God is God, quite independent of all human or angelic recognition, Isaiah’s evangel is not so much the fact that “God *is*” as that “God is *yours*”.

A part of the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham is expressed in the words, “I will be a God unto thee I will be their God” (Gen. xvii. 7, 8). The title “The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob”, carries with it the very essence of the covenant

relationship. When the time came for Israel to be delivered from Egypt, Moses was sent to tell the people that God had remembered His covenant, and that He was about to redeem and deliver them, saying: "I will take you I will be to you a God" (Exod. vi. 7).

Coming to Isaiah's prophecy itself we have abundant testimony to the importance of this possessive pronoun:

"Should not a people seek unto *their* God" (Isa. viii. 19).

"Lo, this is *our* God; we have waited for Him" (Isa. xxv. 9).

"O Lord *our* God; (other) lords beside Thee have had dominion over us" (Isa. xxvi. 13).

"Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not; behold, *your* God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; He will come and save you" (Isa. xxxv. 4).

We will not multiply references; the subject is one that can be explored by all.

We cannot conclude this part of our study without referring to the parallel in Isa. lii. 7:

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, *Thy God reigneth!*"

"Behold your God!" "Thy God reigneth!"

But there is the other side to the matter that must not be forgotten. The fact that Isaiah could say to Israel, "Behold your God" suggests what is found to be so in fact, that God can say of Israel, "*My* people".

So, in the Exodus, God is said to see the affliction of His people, to demand of Pharaoh the release of His people, and Hosea condenses into one brief verse the great day of restoration, saying:

"I will sow her unto Me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not My people, THOU ART MY PEOPLE; and they shall say, THOU ART MY GOD" (Hosea ii. 23).

We could, of course, have found the whole matter expressed for us in the opening words of Isa. xl.: "Comfort ye, comfort ye MY people, saith YOUR God". Verses 10 and 11, with which this first section of Isa. xl. closes, are but an expansion of this blessed evangel of restored fellowship and relationship. It is expressed there in a number of propositions, not set out formally, but nevertheless there. These may be visualized as follows:

- (1) This God who is "your God" is "The Lord God".
- (2) This God "will come".
- (3) This God will come with a strong hand (or against the strong).
- (4) He is accompanied by both "reward" and "work".
- (5) He is likened to a Shepherd, feeding, gathering, carrying and gently leading.

Owing to the exigencies of space we must be content either to give scant attention to these blessed features, or to devote another article to their consideration. We trust that no reader is of two minds over this matter, and that all will gladly concur with the course taken of giving this great subject a respectful hearing. Accordingly, fuller comment is reserved until the necessary space can be devoted to these verses, which we hope will be in the next article of the series.

ISAIAH.

#21. The Second Advent. Its Rule and its Reward (xl. 10, 11). pp. 117 - 121

The reader will remember that we found in Isa. xl. 10 and 11, an expansion of the comfort and good tidings of verse 9 implied in the words, "Behold your God!"

The first thing we observe is that "Your God" is now expressed as "The Lord God". The Hebrew title here is *Adonai Jehovah*. *Adonai* is one of three related titles, which the Companion Bible distinguishes as follows:

Adon is the Lord as Overlord or *Ruler*.

Adonim is the Lord as *Owner*.

Adonai is the Lord as *Blessor*.

Adon is the Lord as Ruler *in* the earth.

Adonai is the Lord in His relation *to* the earth; and as carrying out His purposes of blessing in the earth. With this limitation it is almost equivalent to *Jehovah*. Indeed, it was from an early date so used, by associating the vowel points of the word *Jehovah* with *Adon*, thus converting *Adon* into *Adonai*. (Appendix 4, viii.).

The first occurrence of *Adonai* in the Scriptures is extremely suggestive. It is found in the response of Abraham to the Lord's assurance.

"Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. And Abram said, Lord GOD, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless?" (Gen. xv. 1, 2).

When therefore the Prophet expanded the title "Behold your God!" by the added words "Behold, the Lord God will come", he was but following a legitimate train of thought. "The Lord God" was indeed the God of Israel, for He was the God of Abraham, to whom promises had been made that could not be broken, and it is the glory of Isaiah's prophecy to shed a beam of heavenly light across the dark interval of man's failure, rebellion and doom.

Isaiah's vision of the coming of the Lord God is twofold. He comes to rule with strength, and He comes to lead, as a Shepherd. At His first coming John the Baptist pointed Him out as the Lamb of God, but, even then, he saw that, associated with this lamb-like character, was another characteristic, that of inflexible righteousness, for, while John records The Baptist's words, "Behold the Lamb of God" (John i. 29), Matthew

records his declaration: “Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire” (Matt. iii. 12). Peter moreover designates the Lord as a Shepherd when he speaks of His second coming, saying: “Feed the flock of God which is among you and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory” (I Pet. v. 2-4).

The coming of Christ as the Redeemer, the mediation of Christ between His two advents, and the second coming of Christ to rule and reign, are all associated with the one title of Shepherd, and may be set out as follows:--

“THE GOOD SHEPHERD” (John x. 11). The First Advent. THE CROSS.
“THE GREAT SHEPHERD” (Heb. xiii. 20). The Present Session. THE CROOK.
“THE CHIEF SHEPHERD” (I Pet. v. 4). The Second Advent. THE CROWN.

In prophetic vision Jacob saw “The Shepherd” (Gen. xlix. 24); Israel’s God is addressed by the title “O Shepherd of Israel” (Psa. lxxx. 1); David, the type of his Greater Son, was Israel’s beloved Shepherd King, and Ezekiel prophesies of a reunited Israel by saying, “They all shall have one Shepherd” (Ezek. xxxvii. 24).

Let us consider a little more carefully the actual wording of this prophecy which sums up the “comfort” of God’s people, Israel:

“Behold, the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and His arm shall rule for Him: behold, His reward is with Him, and his work before Him. He shall feed His flock like a Shepherd: He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young” (Isa. xl. 10, 11).

When we speak of the “Second Coming” we may feel obliged at one time to emphasize the teaching of the opening chapter of the Acts and say “This same Jesus”, or at another we may quote the Lord’s own words and say, “The Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father” (Matt. xvi. 27), but we must never, never, forget that “This same Jesus”, this “Son of man”, is “Lord”, yea, Israel’s “God” (Isa. xl. 10), and that “the blessed hope” of the church of the mystery looks for the glory of “Our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ” (Titus ii. 11-13). He comes with strength, He comes to rule, He comes to reward.

The metaphors of strength are varied; the one that supplies us with the “strong hand” of Isa. xl. is derived from the figure of “binding”, and so by an easy transition to that of the exercise of strength which “repairs” and “recovers” (Psa. cxlvii. 13; Ezra i. 6; Judges ix. 24; Isa. xxxv. 3). The word *chazaq* is used more than thirty times in Neh. iii. to describe the “repairing” of the wall of Jerusalem. In the Prophet’s mind this “strong hand”, with which the Lord will come, is primarily associated with the “restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets”, and guarantees the glorious oneness of this true and blessed unity among the peoples of the earth.

He Whose strength repairs, recovers and unites, is also the great Ruler, “His arm shall rule for Him”. The “arm” of the Lord is an ever-recurring figure in the O.T.

The Hebrew word *zeroa* is derived from the verb *zarah*, “to scatter”, and is associated, by sound, with *zara*, “to sow”, as may be seen in the play on the word “Jezreel” in Hosea, where first it means “to scatter” (Hosea i. 4) and secondly “to sow” (Hosea ii. 23), fulfilling the twofold prophecy, “He that scattered Israel will gather him I will sow” (Jer. xxxi. 10 and 27). Moreover, He that gathers “scattered” Israel, gathers and keeps “as a Shepherd doth His flock” (Jer. xxxi. 10). No Hebrew could see the word “Arm” and forget its association with “scattering” in judgment and “sowing” in blessing and restitution.

Israel’s deliverance from Egyptian bondage is particularly connected with the “stretched out arm of the Lord” (Exod. vi. 6; Deut. iv. 34; v. 15). To this the Psalmist returns again and again.

“Thou hast with Thine arm redeemed Thy people” (Psa. lxxvii. 15).

“O sing unto the Lord a new song; for He hath done marvelous things: His right hand, and His holy arm, hath gotten Him the victory” (Psa. xcvi. 1).

“He brought out Israel from among them with a strong hand, and with a stretched out arm” (Psa. cxxxvi. 11, 12).

Coming to Isaiah’s prophecy itself, we find several important references. Looking back to the overthrow of Egypt, Isaiah cries:

“Awake, awake, put on Thy strength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in the ancient days therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return I, even I, am He that *comforteth* you: who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of the son of man which shall be made as *grass*” (Isa. li. 9-12).

The reader will need no elaboration of this prophecy in order to perceive its connection with Isa. xl. When Israel shall be in their extremity and “no man” appears as their saviour, then, says the prophet:

“Therefore His arm brought salvation” (Isa. lix. 16; lxiii. 5).

“The Lord hath made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God” (Isa. lii. 10).

This, however, is in designed contrast with Isa. liii. which, referring to the Lord’s first advent, asks: “Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?” (Isa. liii. 1).

The prophet’s words bring vividly to light the blessed fact that “The Arm of the Lord” is a title of Christ. He is both the Wisdom of God and the Power of God, a twofold pledge indeed that the purpose of the ages shall reach its goal.

When, in the passage which we are studying, the prophet speaks of the Arm of the Lord he does not refer to “salvation” but “rule”. This word “rule” is the translation of the Hebrew *mashal*, “to make like”, and gives us the word “similitude” and “proverb”. Gesenius says:

“Learned men have made many attempts to reconcile the significations of *making like* and *ruling* however, I have no doubt, but that from the signification *making like*, is derived that of *judging, forming an opinion*, to think, to suppose, to think fit.”

In the O.T. the symbol of righteousness is the plummet and the balance, and *mashal*, with its root idea of equality, is a splendid conception out of which grew the flower and fruit of righteous rule and equity. “In righteousness shall He judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth” (Isa. xi. 4). But at the coming of the Lord there is not only “rule”, there is “recompense”: “Behold, His reward is with Him, and His work before Him” (Isa. xl. 10).

The opinion of commentators as to the “reward” here is divided, some maintaining that it is Christ’s own recompense, and others that it relates to His recognition of the acceptable service of His children. Possibly there is no need to attempt a decision, for “He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied”. He endured for “the joy that was set before Him”. His glorious exaltation in that day is in direct sequence to His humiliation and death and, inasmuch as the redeemed of all ranks and callings are to share His glory, so the faithful servants of all ranks and callings may “enter into the joy of their Lord” and, in *His* crowning day also find their own. “*With Me in My throne*”, “*Reign with Him*” are words that do not permit of a separation between the triumph of the Leader and the awards of His followers. This passage, Isa. xl. 10, was very evidently in the mind of the Apostle when he wrote, “Behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to render to every one as His work shall be” (Rev. xxii. 12). By a recognized figure of speech the word translated “work” in Isa. xl. 10 is often rendered “reward” (Psa. cix. 20; Isa. xlix. 4, Margin); “recompense” (Isa. xl. 10, lxii. 11, margin); and “hire” (Ezek. xxix. 20, margin).

As we have already seen, the section ends on a tender note. The Lord God is the Lord of Hosts, His arm is an arm of shattering might and, in the opening of the next section, the mind is staggered at the description of His omnipotence. “The hollow of His hand” measures the waters, His “span” metes out the heavens. Yet this selfsame, mighty, arm “gathers the lambs” that He might carry them in His bosom. Israel have wandered alone and in misery for centuries, they knew not their Shepherd’s voice. One day, and that soon, they shall acknowledge Him, and, with that acknowledgment, their sorrows shall be turned into joy, the wilderness shall blossom as the rose, and peace shall flow like a river.

“*Comfort ye, comfort ye My people, saith your God*” (Isa. xl. 1).

ISAIAH.

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

The Structure of the section and introductory notes. pp. 178, 179

The reader may remember that the three great divisions of Isa. xl.-lxvi. are:

- a* | xl.-xlviii. COMFORT AND CONTROVERSY.
- b* | xlix.-lx. LIGHT AND PEACE.
- c* | lxi.-lxvi. THE ACCEPTABLE YEAR.

We have seen that Israel's comfort is intimately associated with the "Good tidings" that were preached to Zion. These good tidings are in view throughout this second great portion of Isaiah, whose prophecy is occupied with the *provision* made in Christ, the *promise* that restoration shall come to pass, and the ultimate *performance* of the word of the Lord. Further, inasmuch as this blessed restoration deals, not simply with the land and its desolation, but with the people and their sin, we must not expect the unfolding of the purpose to go forward with the directness that characterizes the response of the mechanical universe (*See also* Volume XXX, page 138).

It is not without interest that we discover that the word *basar*, "To bring good tidings", occurs seven times in Isaiah, all in the second half of the prophecy. The passages are, Isa. xl. 9; xli. 27; lii. 7 and lxi. 1, where the A.V. translates "to bring" or "to preach good tidings", and Isa. lx. 6, where the response to this blessed message is found in the words, "They *shall show forth* the praises of the Lord", an aspect of "preaching" that is often forgotten.

In the attempt to comprehend its significance as expressed in its structure, the section before us, like most of the passages already examined, taxes the powers of the mind to the utmost. We can however perceive that the challenging reference to the utter failure of the flesh, under the figure of "grass that withers", so prominent in Isa. xl. 1-11, meets us afresh in this second section, where the challenge is addressed by the Creator to the dumb idols and graven images in which Israel had so often put their trust.

Intermingled with this theme is that of service; "Israel, thou art My servant", "Behold My Servant". This relationship, coupled with the fact that "No man can serve two masters", is, in itself, a protest and a provision against the folly of idolatry, for "bowing down" to graven images is associated with "serving them" (Exod. xx. 5). Contrast with this the glory of such blessed service as is seen in the opening of Isa. xlii., where the Messiah Himself is spoken of as "My Servant".

Before we can deal with the teaching of this section, either as a whole or in its parts, it will be necessary to discover the underlying structure, so that we may concentrate our attention upon those features which carry forward the burden of the prophecy. By the

very nature of the subject, the following structure is presented in its barest outlines; to follow out the subdivisions in one presentation would, because of their complexity, defeat our object. With this necessary reservation in mind, we believe that the outline will not only be of interest, but of service, as we endeavour to follow the mind of the Lord in the outworking of His gracious purposes.

Isaiah xl. 12 - xlii. 17.

- A | xl. 2 - xli. 7. The incomparable nature of the Creator,
and the consequent folly of idolatry.
- A | xli. 8 - xlii. 17. The two “Servants”, Israel and Messiah,
and the consequent folly of idolatry.

This folly of idolatry is demonstrated, first by the utter inability of molten images either to act or foretell, and secondly in the contemplation of the true nature of service.

The two parts of Isa. xl. 2 - xli. 7 can now be considered separately, and the structure of the first part is as follows:

**Isaiah xl. 2 - xli. 7.
The Incomparable nature of the Creator,**

- A | xl. 12-14. “WHO?” The Creator’s might and wisdom. |
THINGS VISIBLE: Measured, meted, comprehended, weighed.
THINGS INVISIBLE: Directed, counseled, taught, shewed.
- B | xl. 15-17. “THE ISLES”. The comparative insignificance of the world. |
The nations—a drop in a bucket and less than nothing.
- C | xl. 18 - xli. 1. The utter folly of idolatry,
and the incomparable nature of God. |
 - a | To whom will ye liken God?
 - b | The graven image.
 - c | Have ye not known heard?
 - d | Inhabitants as grasshoppers.
 - a | To whom will ye liken Me?
 - b | Creation.
 - c | Hast thou not known heard?
 - d | Power to the faint.
- A | xli. 2-4. “WHO?” Jehovah’s might and wisdom. |
THINGS VISIBLE: Raised, called, ruled.
THINGS INVISIBLE: “I am He”: “First and Last”.
- B | xli. 5. “THE ISLES”. |
Fear and false trust.
- C | xli. 6, 7. The utter folly of idolatry. |
The carpenter and goldsmith.
Ready for soldiering.
Fastened with nails.

In this article we do not purpose giving the structure of the second part of this section, namely, xli.8 - xlii. 17. To do so would defeat our object, which is to provide helps to the understanding of the Word. The reader should go over the outline, point by point, in order that he may make it his own.

In our next article we hope to consider some of the outstanding lines of teaching found in this passage and gather up their comfort and inspiration. Meanwhile there is no need for any of us to wait before entering into the truth of the blessed message of the closing verses of Isa. xl., for at the present time we all stand much in need of the promise, *“They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength”*.

ISAIAH.
#23. Isaiah xl. 12 - xlii. 17.
The Folly and Tragedy of Idolatry.
pp. 191 - 194

Unless the reader’s memory is above the average, we suggest that it would be a help to keep by him for reference the structure of the passage before us, which will be found in Volume XXX, page 43.

A feature that calls for attention and which most strikes the mind when this chapter of Isaiah is read, is the apparently abrupt transition from the tender Shepherd of verse 11 to the omnipotent Creator of verse 12. But such a transition is by no means unique, as Isa. i. shows:

“I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering. The Lord
God hath given Me the tongue of the learned I gave My back to the smiters”
(Isa. i. 3-6).

We have but to call to mind the testimony of John’s Gospel to perceive that there is a doctrinal basis for this apparent meeting of extremes. In the chapter which tells us that Christ is “The Lamb of God” we read, “All things were made by Him”, or, if we turn to the tenth chapter, where Christ is revealed as “The good Shepherd”, we shall also find the claim, “I and My Father as One”.

If the hand of the gentle Shepherd that guides His sheep and carries His lambs is the hand in whose hollow the waters of the deep can be contained, then, even though all flesh is but grass, the purpose of God in Israel’s restoration must be attained. Further, the restoration of Israel is spoken of in terms of a “new creation” (Isa. lxxv. 17, 18). He Whose power and wisdom called the visible creation into being in the past is fully able to bring about a new creation in the future.

The utter distrust of “all flesh” that is uppermost in the mind of the Prophet in the opening section is again brought forward in this new section, as an argument against

Israel's great failure to trust God alone. From the days when the Lord said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me", Israel showed a terrible tendency to idolatry, or its equivalent, a trust in Egypt, or a trust in something visible and tangible.

Isaiah does not refer to the attributes of the Creator in the form of a statement, but in the guise of a question; "Who who with whom?" and then leads on to the great challenge "To whom, then, will ye liken God?"

Before we consider these references to idolatry, let us observe the way in which the subject-matter is distributed. Isaiah divides his references to the greatness of God into three.

- (1) POWER.—"Who hath measured . . . meted . . . comprehended . . . weighed?"
- (2) WISDOM.—"Who hath directed . . . taught . . . counseled . . . shewed?"
- (3) COMPARISON.—The Nations. |
A drop in a bucket.
The small dust of the balance.
Nothing; less than nothing; a vanity.
The Earth. |
The isles taken up as a very little thing.
Lebanon not sufficient to burn.
The beasts not sufficient for an offering.

We have already seen that in the mind of Isaiah the "Shepherd" and the "Creator" were one.

With this section of Isaiah, we may profitably couple the words of Agur, the son of Jakeh:

"Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in His fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is His name, and WHAT HIS SON'S NAME, if thou canst tell?" (Prov. xxx. 4).

This passage speaks of Christ, and John's Gospel and Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians provide the answer to the question raised:

"No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven" (John iii. 13).

"Now He that ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also the ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things" (Eph. iv. 9, 10).

When Isaiah saw the Lord high and lifted up, He saw the glory of the Lord Jesus (Isa. vi.; John xii. 41). When Isaiah set forth the Shepherd-Creator, He also spoke of the incomparable power of the self-same Saviour. From incomparable power, he passes to equally incomparable wisdom, and again speaks of Christ:

"For whom hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct Him? But we have the mind of Christ" (I Cor. ii. 16).

“Christ is the *power* of God, and the *wisdom* of God” (I Cor. i. 24). These are two essentials to success: wisdom to know how to do a thing, and power to carry it out. That the purpose of the ages is assured is clear, for with such power and with such wisdom as is set forth in Isa. xl. failure is impossible.

Twice the prophet sounds out the challenging question, “To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare with Him?” He challenges man, who alone of all creatures was made “in the likeness of God” (Gen. v. 1), as though He would say that in resorting to image worship, man not only degraded the name of God, but himself.

In this matter God has revealed Himself as being exceedingly jealous. Five times over do the Scriptures declare that the Lord our God is “a jealous God” (Exod. xx. 5; xxxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 24; v. 9; vi. 15). In every case the context deals with the worship of graven images or the making of the likeness of anything in heaven or earth, that could take the place of God Himself in the heart.

When Israel dethroned the Lord, they dethroned themselves.

“They have moved Me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked Me to anger with their vanities; and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation” (Deut. xxxii. 21).

Image worship not only degrades the name of God and the name of Israel, but aims a direct blow at the unique position of man in the purpose of creation, and what is of still greater moment, thrusts at the prerogative of Christ Himself “Who is the IMAGE of the invisible God”.

It will be a help if we can visualize the argument of the passage in Isa. xl. which deals with this question of the likeness of God:

- A | 18. FIRST QUESTION. “To whom will ye liken God?”
- B | 19, 20. FIRST ANSWER (Negative). The utter futility of idolatry.
- C | 21. SECOND QUESTION.
“Have ye not known? Have ye not heard?”
- D | 22-24. SECOND ANSWER. The majesty of the Creator.
- A | 25. FIRST QUESTION REPEATED. “To whom will ye liken God?”
- B | 26, 27. FIRST ANSWER (Positive). Omnipotence of the Creator.
- C | 28. SECOND QUESTION REPEATED.
“Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard?”
- D | 28-31. SECOND ANSWER. The gracious power of the Creator.

There is something of an anti-climax in the sudden insertion of B (Isa. xl. 19, 20), the First Answer. We have heard of Him in the hollow of Whose hand the waters may be measured, and Whose span meted out the heavens. Before this mighty One the nations, for all their number and prowess in arms or civilization, are as a drop of a bucket. Lebanon itself with its great cedars would not suffice to burn, nor the beasts thereof suffice for a burnt offering. Into this ascending scale, which carries the mind on and up until the contemplation of “the greatness of His might” causes the understanding to reel;

into this panegyric of Deity, the prophet, without preparation, suddenly inserts the bald statement concerning the fashioning of a graven image.

“The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains. He that is so impoverished that he hath no oblation chooseth a tree that will not rot; he seeketh unto him a cunning workman to prepare a graven image, that shall not be moved.”

In like manner this rhetorical figure of “Anti-climax” is found in the chapter that follows.

“And every one said to his brother, Be of good courage. So the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer him that smote the anvil, saying, It is ready for the sodering: and he fastened it with nails, that it should not be moved” (Isa. xli. 6, 7).

Surrounded with so many evidences of the Creator’s power and wisdom, it seems almost impossible to believe that the human mind should descend so low. It seems almost equally impossible that man, made in the image of God, should even think of so debasing himself as to fabricate a graven image to serve as the object of his worship. Listen to the pitiful irony of the prophet:

“Silver chains that shall not be moved!”
“Fastened with nails, that it should not be moved!”
“It is ready for the sodering!”

But idolatry is something more than the foolish worship of images held together with “soder” and fastened with “nails” and “chains”. Its root lies deeper, for at bottom it is a false faith. This is seen in Isa. xli. 6, 7:

“*Be of good courage. so the carpenter encouraged he fastened it with nails.*”

Used in a context like this the words “Be of good courage” indicate the root cause of idolatry. They are words used by God Himself, and which demand implicit trust in Himself.

“For I the Lord thy God *will hold* thy right hand, saying unto thee, Fear not: I will help thee” (Isa. xli. 13).

Here the words “will hold” are a translation of the same Hebrew verb that is translated “Be of good courage”, “encouraged” and “fastened”, in Isa. xli. 6, 7. It is the word used in the great epitome of prophetic truth, Isa. xxxv., where the Lord says:

“Say to them that are of a fearful heart, *Be strong*, fear not: behold, your God will come” (Isa. xxxv. 4).

In the passage we are considering (Isa. xl. 12 - xlii. 17) the vanity of image worship is not merely contrasted with the power and might of the Creator as seen in His works, but also with the help that He alone can give to His believing people. It is tragic to read, “*So the carpenter encouraged*”, only a few verses after those magnificent lines:

“Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of His understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might He increaseth strength. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall: but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint” (Isa. xl. 28-31).

“To whom then will ye liken God?”

message to His disciples, “I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God” (John xx. 17).

John’s Gospel presents us with the Apostle (“Sent”) and High Priest (“I ascend”), the Author (“Grace and truth came into being by Jesus Christ”) and the Finisher (“I have finished the work”). The actual word “apostle” does not appear in the A.V. of the Gospel, but *apostolos* is found in the original.

“The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither *he that is sent* (the apostle) greater than He that sent him” (John xiii. 16).

Here, moreover, is a strange thing. One would expect that in “He that sent him” the kindred verb would be *apostello*, simply and easily rounding off the subject, but it is *pempo*, which occurs 33 times in John, while *apostello* occurs 28 times. *Apostello* means “to send away”, “dispatch”, “dismiss”, and *pempo*, while including these meanings, adds the idea of “accompaniment” and “escort”.

In John xx. 21 there is therefore a gracious reason for the change of verb:

“As My Father hath sent Me (*apostello*, sent Me as on a mission, with some element of ‘dispatch’ and ‘dismissal’, or at least ‘distance’, adhering to the word), even so send I you (*pempo*, but this time, ‘escorted’, ‘accompanied’, for He had said ‘I will not leave you comfortless’).”

Eternal, or *aionion* life, is bound up with this “Sent One” for it is written not only at the opening (John iii. 16, 17), but also at the close of the Gospel.

“And this is life eternal (*aionion*), that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom thou hast sent” (*apostello*) (John xvii. 3).

We might also note that whereas *apostello* occurs seven times in the great prayer of John xvii., *pempo* is never used. When God so loved the world and “gave” His only begotten Son, He “sent” Him to execute a commission; He came as the great “Apostle”, even as He returned as the great High Priest.

(2) “HIS SON.”—In this Gospel the Lord is referred to as the “Son”, with the following additions to the title:--

“The only begotten Son” (John i. 18; iii. 16).

“The Son of God” (John i. 34, 49).

“The Son of Joseph” (John i. 45).

“The Son of man” (John i. 51; iii. 13, 14).

“The Son of the living God” (John vi. 69).

The references given are not complete, as some of the titles recur with frequency, but by far the greatest number are to “the Son”, without additional title, as: “The Father loveth the Son” (John iii. 35); “He that believeth on the Son” (John iii. 36). This title occurs fifteen times in the Gospel.

Whichever title is used, it is the same glorious Person, and the same most blessed relationship both as regards the Father that sent Him, and the children, who were partakers of flesh and blood, among whom He came. The simple title, “the Son” seems to be used on purpose to focus the heart’s attention on this one mediatorial relationship, “The Word Who became flesh”, Who, in the body of His flesh, through death, made a sacrifice for sin, and thus became the Saviour of all who trust in Him.

(3) INSTEAD OF “PERISH”, VERSE 17 USES “CONDEMNED”, AND, INSTEAD OF “ETERNAL LIFE”, VERSE 17 USES THE WORD “SAVED”.—The Greek word which is translated “condemn” is *krino*, and occurs nineteen times in the Gospel. Out of the number of occurrences however it is only translated “condemn” thrice, namely in John iii. 17, 18. In the majority of passages it is translated “judge”, and the primary meaning of the word is “to separate”, “distinguish”, “discern”. Of itself, *krino* does not imply condemnation, for it is used in Matt. xix. 28 in the clause “*judging* the twelve tribes of Israel”, and its primitive meaning is discerned in the rendering found in Rom. xiv. 5 where it is translated “esteemeth”.

Such however is the nature and extent of sin that it is enough to know that an unsaved man will stand before the Lord as his Judge, and that such judgment must issue in condemnation,

“This is the judgment, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil” (John iii. 19).

The way in which John speaks of light in this passage is very like Paul’s use of the same figure in Eph. v. 11-14. John says that light “reproves” and “makes manifest” “deeds” (John iii. 20, 21), and Paul says:

“Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works (*ergon* same word as ‘deeds’) of darkness, but rather *reprove* them all things that are *reproved* are made manifest by the light, for whatsoever *doth make manifest* is light” (Eph. v. 11-13).

Here, at the conclusion of the testimony at Jerusalem, the charge uttered in the prologue is found true.

“The light shineth (*phaino*, root of the word translated ‘manifest’) in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not” (John i. 5).

To receive the gift of eternal life, according to this extension of the subject, is to be “saved”. Salvation includes both life and deliverance from condemnation, the subjects of which will not perish, but, as another passage has it, have “passed from death unto life” (John v. 24).

We must next turn our attention to the testimony in Judæa and Samaria that followed this witness in Jerusalem. Meanwhile, all who are redeemed, whatever their calling, sphere and destiny, can rejoice as they contemplate the love, the gift, and the deliverance revealed in John iii. 16.

#24. The Testimony in Jerusalem, Judaea and Samaria (ii. 13-iv. 42).

JUDAEA.

The Bride and the Bridegroom (iii. 22 - iv. 2).

With special reference to the dispensational position of John's Gospel.

pp. 61 - 65

This section is a short one bounded at either end with a reference to the entry of the Lord into Judaea, and His leaving it for Galilee (John iii. 22 and iv. 3). The teaching of the intervening verses is distributed under references to baptism, either the baptism of the Lord (John iii. 22; iv. 1, 2), the baptism of John (John iii. 23, 24), or controversy arising out of these ordinances (John iii. 25, 36; iv. 1).

In the course of the testimony of John the Baptist, and in illustration of his declaration "He must increase, but I must decrease" (John iii. 30) he uses the figures of the Bride, the Bridegroom and the Friend of the Bridegroom.

"He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this is my joy therefore is fulfilled" (John iii. 29).

While *numphe*, "bride", occurs in Matthew and Luke, where it is translated "daughter-in-law", John is the only N.T. writer who uses the word of that company of believers known as "The Bride": he does so once in the Gospel (John iii. 29), and three times in the Revelation (Rev. xxi. 2, 9; xxii. 17).

The title "the friend of the bridegroom" refers to the *Shoshebin*, a word very common in Hebrew writings and comments, and the office is well illustrated by the "best man" of the modern wedding.

In the Gospel, no attempt is made to elaborate the doctrine of the "Bride", but in the Apocalypse John devotes considerable space to it and supplies a wealth of detail in his description of that company, whose sphere is the heavenly, or new, Jerusalem.

Turning for a moment to the book of the Revelation, we observe that the marriage of the Lamb and the fall of Babylon are announced: that the association of these two events is by no means accidental or slight, the following features will reveal.

<i>The Harlot.</i> Rev. xvii., xviii.	<i>The Bride.</i> Rev. xix., xxi., xxii.
"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me saying unto me, Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters" (Rev. xvii. 1).	"And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither; I will show unto thee the bride, the Lamb's wife" (Rev. xxi. 9).

<p>“So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of the names of blasphemy And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth” (Rev. xvii. 3-5).</p>	<p>“And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel and the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass” (Rev. xxi. 10-21).</p>
<p>“And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth” (Rev. xvii. 18).</p>	<p>“And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband” (Rev. xxi. 2).</p>

The reader will note the many ways in which these two companies are brought into contrast by the record of these chapters in Revelation. Leaving that subject to the reader’s own research, we proceed to note one or two distinctive items in the descriptions of the bride, or those associated with her, to which reference will again be made after setting out the argument for the peculiar constitution of that company called “The Bride”.

- (1) The Bride, is the Lamb’s wife (Rev. xxi. 9).
- (2) Every several gate was of one pearl (Rev. xxi. 21).
- (3) He that overcometh shall inherit these things (Rev. xxi. 7 margin).
- (4) They which are written in the Lamb’s book of life (Rev. xxi. 27).

While “the bride” is most intimately associated with Israel, (Rev. xxi. 12), for the following scriptural reasons it must not be confused with Israel as a nation.

Those purposes of God which by way of distinction we refer to as “kingdom” purposes, relate not only to the earth, but also to a heavenly sphere. This is made clear by considering the teaching of Scripture concerning Abraham.

Gen. xii.-xv. reveals that to Abraham and to his seed was granted, unconditionally, the earthly sphere of blessing. To Abraham, however, was opened up the further possibility of rising higher and of becoming a partaker of the heavenly calling. This is shown in Heb. iii. 1; xi. 8-10, 13-16; xii. 22. During the early days of the N.T. Gentile believers were associated with Israel’s hope under the New Covenant (II Cor. iii.; Rom. xv. 12, 13). As Gal. iv. 26 shows, however, they were not partakers of the earthly, but of the heavenly, sphere of the kingdom.

Israel, *as a nation*, became “the wife”, when they entered into covenant relationship *at Sinai*.

“The covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord” (Jer. xxxi. 32).

By the great love and mercy of the Lord, Israel, though thus “put away”, shall yet be brought back again.

“They say, If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man’s, shall he return unto her again? shall not that land be greatly polluted? But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to Me, saith the Lord” (Jer. iii. 1).

“Surely as a wife treacherously departed from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with Me, O house of Israel, saith the Lord Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings” (Jer. iii. 20-22).

This blessed restoration is the theme of Isaiah’s prophecies:

“Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah: for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married” (Isa. lxii. 4).

The restoration of a divorced woman and the betrothal and marriage of “the chaste virgin” which Paul speaks of in II Cor. xi. 2, and which John speaks of as the “Bride”, must not be confused. Israel, as a nation, are the restored wife, but a remnant out of Israel, together with some believing Gentiles, constitute the new company, “the bride, the Lamb’s wife”. During the Acts, Gentile believers were, equally with Jewish believers, Abraham’s seed and heirs, and to this company belongs Jerusalem which is above (Gal. iii. 29; iv. 26).

The distinction between these two companies is suggested in the two parables of Matt. xiii. 44-46. The treasure hid in a field, which, after discovery, was hidden again, represents the nation of Israel, God’s peculiar treasure.

“For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people (*segullah*) unto Himself” (Deut. xiv. 2).

“For the Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure (*segullah*)” (Psa. cxxxv. 4).

While “all Israel” was a treasure, the Lord noted with special approbation those “of Israel” who walked by faith, and these, such as Abraham, were granted the heavenly prospect, associated with the heavenly city, and are represented in the parable as the “one pearl”. The reader will remember that “one pearl” is noted in the description of the gates of the New Jerusalem. While the pearl is a part of the Lord’s treasure, it is signally different from other treasures in that it is organic, being produced by suffering and so typical of that remnant, according to the election of grace, that walked by faith, while the bulk of their fellows fell into idolatry and unbelief.

“All Israel” shall be saved (Rom. xi. 26); the erring wife shall be restored; but the marriage of the Lamb refers not to this restoration but to the new company that inherits the heavenly sphere of the kingdom. It is to this marriage of the Lamb that the parable of Matt. xxii. looks forward, where particular emphasis is put upon the invitation which was sent out to the “guests”. Not by any stretch of imagination can “guests” at a

marriage be made to refer to “the bride”, and they must therefore represent a yet further and separate company who are neither restored Israel nor the elect remnant.

As the “Lamb” the Lord Jesus is “the King’s Son”, and for Him a marriage has been made. The king’s servants went out and called those who had been bidden, but they would not come. A second invitation, corresponding with the renewal of the gospel in Acts ii. where “all things were ready”, was made, but this was met by excuses and abuse; “they made light of it”. The result of this hardness of heart was that these were destroyed and their city burned up (Matt. xxii. 7). This is plain allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D.70, and the words “ye would not” of Matt. xxiii. 37 and the destruction of the temple (Matt. xxiv. 2) confirm the interpretation.

After A.D.70 the hope of Israel and the New Covenant were suspended. Necessarily, with the suspension of that hope and that New Covenant, went the restoration of Israel as the wife, and the calling of the remnant as the bride, but one feature was perpetuated, namely, the calling of those who should be guests at the marriage. These were gathered out from the highways, “bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests” (Matt. xxii. 9, 10). Those who “had been bidden” (Matt. xxii. 3) and to whom a second invitation had been sent (Matt. xxii. 4) were Israel. Those who subsequently took the place forfeited by Israel are referred to by John: “He came unto His own, and His own received Him not, *but as many as received Him*” (John i. 11, 12). These are “the other sheep” not acknowledged by Israel (John x. 16).

John’s Gospel differs from the synoptic Gospels in many ways, and prominent among these is the dispensational position of those who believe its message. Such do not form part of the kingdom of Israel, neither do they constitute the Bride of the Lamb, but they do fit into Matt. xxii. 9, 10, and those who to-day respond to the gospel of John iii. 16 and order their lives according to the teaching of that gospel constitute that distinctive and blessed company who shall be the guests at the marriage of the Lamb, an honour high indeed for such as were gathered from highways and byways, both bad and good.

In harmony with this intention, the first miracle recorded as a sign in John’s Gospel is that of a marriage, where the “friend of the bridegroom” is introduced (John ii. 9) and where the Lord and His disciples were there as “guests”.

John’s Gospel is unique. It differs from Matthew in that it is not concerned with the kingdom, but rather with one phase of that purpose of the ages by which God fills the interval occasioned by Israel’s failure. Both the prison ministry of Paul and the Gospel according to John are written in view of the crisis of Acts xxviii. In John’s prologue the presentation of Christ as the Word is very close to the presentation of Christ as the Image of the invisible God in Paul’s prison ministry, but the callings are distinct and differ essentially. In John’s Gospel the believer is numbered among those of the Gentiles called after A.D.70 to be guests of the marriage feast, whereas in Paul’s prison ministry the Gentile believer called after Acts xxviii. 28 becomes a member of the body of Christ. In both Acts xxviii. and in the climax chapter of John xii., the crisis is indicated by the quotation of Isa. vi. 9, 10 (John xii. 40, 41; Acts xxviii. 26, 27). In John xii. 20, 21 it

is “Greeks” that seek the Lord; in Acts xxviii. 28 it is “Gentiles” that are the object of grace.

The correspondencies and the contrasts that form a valuable indication to the dispensational position of John’s Gospel may be seen in graphic form in the chart published in Volume XXVII, pages 126, 127, and now obtainable as a leaflet—see list of publications—which should be consulted by the interested reader.

#25. The Testimony in Jerusalem, Judæa and Samaria (ii. 13-iv. 42).

SAMARIA.

**The bearing of this “must needs go” upon
the dispensational position of John’s Gospel (iv. 3 - 42).**

pp. 96 - 100

The Lord’s ministry, as recorded by John, and the command which the Lord gave concerning the ministry of the twelve after Pentecost, follow the same course—Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria—and the section now before us deals with the Lord’s testimony in Samaria.

In order that the place of Samaria and the Samaritans in John’s Gospel may be appreciated, we give a brief account of this place and people, which will also throw light upon one or two statements in John iv.

At the disruption of the kingdom on the death of Solomon, the Ten Tribes, usually referred to as Israel, made their capital city, Samaria, which was built on a hill by Omri, King of Israel, in the portion of Ephraim, 42 miles north of Jerusalem:

“And he bought the hill Samaria of Shemer for two talents of silver, and built on the hill, and called the name of the city which he built, after the name of Shemer, owner of the hill, Samaria” (I Kings xvi. 24).

In II Kings xvii. 5, 6 we read that the King of Assyria went up to Samaria, and besieged it three years and that in the ninth year of Hoshea the King of Assyria took Samaria and carried Israel away captive. In the place of the deported Israelites the King of Assyria brought men from Babylon and other parts of his dominion “and placed them in the cities of Samaria” (II Kings xvii. 24). The people thus established were subjected to a devastation by wild beasts, because they feared not the Lord. A petition was made to the King of Assyria saying, “The nations which thou hast removed, and placed in the cities of Samaria, know not the manner of the God of the land: therefore He hath sent lions among them” (II Kings xvii. 26). The king replied: “Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence; and let them go and dwell there, and let him teach them the manner of the God of the land” (II Kings xvii. 27). This was done but, alas, the result of the attempted palliation is thus recorded: “They feared the Lord, and served their own gods” (II Kings xvii. 33).

After the return of the Jews from Babylon the Samaritans wished to join them in the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, saying: "Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esar-haddon King of Assur, which brought us up hither" (Ezra iv. 2). The offer was refused, and the repudiation continued even in the N.T. times, for we read "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." The Samaritans possess to this day a most ancient copy of the Pentateuch, written in characters resembling the Siloam Inscription and the Moabite Stone, characters earlier than those known as "Hebrew" to-day.

Maimonedes admits that the Samaritans rigidly practiced the law, and Dr. Wait in his "Repertorium Theologicum" has shown that the Samaritans had a clear notion of the coming of the Messiah. We shall presently revert to these items, but for the moment turn our attention to the passage in John that records the Saviour's dealings with the woman of Samaria. The section before us (John iv. 3-42) divides into three parts:

- A1 | 3-7. The COMING OF THE LORD TO SAMARIA. "To draw water."
- A2 | 7-27. The WOAN OF SAMARIA. "Messiah cometh."
- A3 | 28-42. The PEOPLE OF SAMARIA. "This is indeed the Christ."

The section A2 dealing with the Woman of Samaria falls naturally into seven parts, for the twenty-one verses of John iv. that relate to her consist mainly of the dialogue between her and the Lord.

John iv. 7 - 27.

- A | a | 7. THE LORD. Give Me to drink.
 - b | 8. THE DISCIPLES. Gone away to buy meat.
- B | c | 9. THE WOMAN. How? Jews and Samaritans.
 - d | 10. THE LORD. If thou knewest the Gift of God.
 - c | 11, 12. THE WOMAN. From whence? Well is deep.
 - d | 13, 14. THE LORD. A well everlasting life.
 - c | 15. THE WOMAN. Sir, give me this water.
 - d | 16. THE LORD. Go, call thy husband.
 - c | 17. THE WOMAN. I have no husband.
 - d | 17, 18. THE LORD. Thou hast well said.
 - c | 19, 20. THE WOMAN. Sir, I perceive Thou art a prophet.
 - d | 21-24. THE LORD. The worship of the Father.
 - c | 25. THE WOMAN. I know that Messiah cometh.
- A | a | 26. THE LORD. I that speak unto thee am He.
 - b | 27. THE DISCIPLES. Return.

When the Lord sent out His twelve apostles to preach the gospel of the Kingdom, He said:

"Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x. 5, 6).

In the passage in John which we are considering, however, we learn that our Lord Himself entered a city of the Samaritans and that many were saved, a firstfruits of those "other sheep" (John x. 16) for whose blessing this Gospel was written. "Go not" (Matt. x.) and "Must needs go" (John iv. 4) mark the two dispensational aspects of these two Gospels. Matthew's purpose would not have been served by revealing this ministry of the Lord, for he set forth the Saviour as the seed of David and of Abraham, Israel's King. John had another purpose in view. This same Christ, Who was Israel's King and Messiah, came to give life where death abounded, but He had limited His earthly ministry to Israel, because of the peculiar place they occupied in the purpose of the ages, yet that one life, death and resurrection is the basis of all callings, all salvation, all hope. Thus Paul revealed facts concerning that one sacrifice which, though surely accomplished, were as surely unknown at the time, even as John also revealed, by his inspired selection of the earthly ministry of Christ, a wider purpose of God than could be gathered from Matthew's narrative.

We must remember that dispensational changes take place when the time for their *announcement* arrives, not when the work upon which they rest was *accomplished*. Whether recorded by Matthew or by John, by Peter or by Paul, it is the *same* Christ and the *same* cross; the *same* resurrection and the *same* ascension, but the doctrines that are related to that one work of Christ vary considerably, and are made known only in their appointed seasons.

John the Baptist not only said "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand", but "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world". The former utterance was made known by Matthew, who did not include the latter, whereas John ignores the former and include the latter. It is therefore suggestive of the non-Jewish trend of the Gospel of John that he is inspired to record the ministry of the Lord in Samaria. Moreover, it is in entire accord with the confessed purpose of John in writing this record, which was:

"That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name" (John xx. 31).

This Woman of Samaria is led on to believe that Jesus is the Christ, and many of her own townspeople believed with her. Just as Nicodemus stumbled at the announcement of the new birth, saying, "How?" (John iii. 4) so, at first, the woman took the reference to "living water" physically, saying: "Sir, Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast Thou that living water?"

The testimony given to Nicodemus is prefaced by the words, "And needed not that any should testify of man: for He knew what was in man" (John ii. 25). It was this same, intimate, knowledge that convicted the woman of Samaria. When she admitted that she had no husband, the Lord revealed that He knew all about it, and that she had previously had five husbands; consequently, upon her return to the city, she said:--

"Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?" (John iv. 29).

“And many of the Samaritans of that city believed on Him for the saying of the woman, which testified, He told me all that ever I did And many more believed because of His own word; and said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world” (John iv. 39-42).

We have already drawn attention to the fact that, where Matthew will refer to the fulfillment of a prophecy, John adduces the evidence of individual testimony. We have seen this in the case of Nathaniel, who was convinced that Jesus was the Son of God and the King of Israel by the omniscient knowledge which the Lord manifested. It was by similar evidence that the Woman of Samaria and her fellow-townfolk were convinced. The man born blind and Thomas himself are further examples. Evidently the appeal is not to the Jew and his sacred Scriptures, but to the world at large. The introduction of such a controversial matter as the disputed place of worship, “Jerusalem or this mountain”, may have been the natural attempt of the woman to turn the conversation into less personal and intimate channels. On the other hand every Jew and every Samaritan must have felt that the matter was one of the first importance. The woman, realizing by the Lord’s intimate knowledge of her life that he must be a prophet (John iv. 19) seemed to feel that this was an opportunity too good to be missed, and said:

“Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship” (John iv. 20).

In selecting his incidents as a means of teaching the special line of doctrine inculcated in his Gospel, John seems to have been guided by two features,

- (1) Evidence, upon which faith can rest (as in the cases of Nathaniel, the woman of Samaria, or Thomas), that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.
- (2) Special aspects of truth (such as the New Birth), which the recounted incidents bring to light.

Here, in the story of the Samaritan woman, while supplying the evidence, “A man which told me all things that ever I did”, and most pointedly, evidence as to “eternal life” being “the gift of God”, he also brings into prominence the question of the true nature of worship.

Speaking after the manner of men, it is in the Lord’s dealings with Nicodemus, the teacher in Israel, that one would have expected a discourse on the nature of worship, and a lesson on the need of new birth to the poor sinful Samaritan woman; but it is not so.

This question of spiritual worship is too important to be dealt with at the close of an article and we must therefore devote our next study to the testimony of John iv. 20-24. We close the present article with the following observation:--

When the apostle spoke to the Jews, he quoted the law and the prophets. It was sufficient evidence of truth to show that such and such an event fulfilled the prophets. This is the line of argument adopted by Matthew, although some of his “proofs” need careful examination if those unaccustomed to Hebrew methods of handling the Scriptures

are to be convinced of their relevancy, as for example the “fulfillment” of the prophecy of Hosea in Matt. ii. 15, or of Jeremiah in Matt. ii. 18. When John wrote his Gospel it was not the Jew, with his Scriptures, that was before his mind, but “the world”, a world that knew not the Hebrew Scriptures. He opens his Gospel with a philosophic presentation of the Christ as “The Logos made flesh” (John i. 14), and while Philip told Nathaniel that they had found Him of Whom Moses and the Prophets wrote, the guileless Israelite is not convinced by an array of prophetic fulfillments, but by personal conviction brought about by the Lord’s absolute knowledge of his being and actions (John i. 50).

In chapter ii. the testimony of the Scripture and the force of its fulfillment does not operate in the minds of the apostles until after the resurrection:

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

The general trend of the teaching of the Gospel is to prove by evidence, that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God”, and then, because Christ is believed, the Scriptures which He endorsed would of necessity also be believed (John v. 46, 47). This is not of course a hard and fast rule; there are occasions when John does draw attention to the fulfillment of O.T. prophecy, but it remains true that the main basis of the Gospel is accredited testimony.

In his prison ministry, Paul does not quote O.T. Scripture in support of the mystery, because, being a mystery hid in God, it formed no part of O.T. revelation. In his Gospel, John does not appeal to O.T. Scripture to prove that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, because those to whom he addressed his message were not likely either to be in possession of the O.T. Scriptures or to be believers in them. His line of teaching is rather faith in Christ as the Giver of Life first, then the recognition that this Christ is the *Messiah* of O.T. prophecy, and consequently the acceptance of those O.T. Scriptures which spoke of Him.

Of the writers of the N.T. John alone uses the title “Messiah”. A superficial reading has led some to affirm that this is “proof” that John had the Jew in mind, but the reverse is the fact. Most evidently he had an untaught Gentile in view, for what Jew needed the following explanation?

“Which is, being interpreted, the Christ” (John i. 41).

“I know that Messiah cometh, *which is called Christ*” (John iv. 25).

The more we examine the Gospel, the stronger the conviction grows that John did not write “kingdom” truth, did not write to the circumcision, but to the world. One “argument” against this view is that John was an apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 7, 9), but if that would prevent John, in his old age, after the circumcision had been set aside, from writing a message to the world, it would also prevent Paul from writing the epistle to the Hebrews, which we do not believe or teach. Moreover, apart from John’s Gospel, there is no ministry that fulfils the call of the guests after A.D.70, but, with it,

every phase of God's gracious purpose in each sphere of blessing is provided for, for which we give Him thanks.

**#26. The Testimony in Jerusalem, Judaea and Samaria (ii. 13-iv. 42).
SAMARIA.
“The hour cometh.” Dispensational changes, true worship,
and the purpose of John's Gospel illuminated (iv. 3 - 42).
pp. 139 - 143**

As the subject is of such importance to all believers, we postponed until the present article examination of the Lord's teaching in John iv. concerning the nature of worship.

The commencement of the argument is upon a low plane; it deals with the conflicting claims of Mount Gerizim in Samaria, and Jerusalem in Judæa, but in the hand of the Lord the matter is soon raised to a higher realm and, by the addition of the words “and now is”, is made applicable to the period that followed the destruction of the temple in A.D.70.

The argument falls into two parts: (1) the woman's question, and (2) The Lord's answer.

“Our fathers worship in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship” (John ii. 20).

The words “the place where” reveal the heart of the question; it was a matter of “in” this mountain or “in” Jerusalem.

From the point of view of Phil. iii. 3, any localizing of the worship of God, or holding one “place” as more sacred than another, seems childish, but we must not wrongly divide the word of truth. In the older dispensation it was a matter of extreme importance to be sure of the “place” of acceptable worship.

“Unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His Name there, even unto His habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come” (Deut. xii. 5).

In Deut. xxvii. 4, the Samaritan Pentateuch reads “Gerizim”, where the Hebrew reads “Ebal”, and it is this falsification of the original that was at the bottom of most of the controversy between the Samaritans and the Jews in the matter of worship.

In Neh. xiii. 28 we read that the grandson of the high priest Eliashib was banished by Nehemiah because he was the son-in-law of Sanballat, and Josephus tells us that this man fled to Samaria, where his father-in-law made him high priest of the temple which he had built at Gerizim. There was also a revolt of other Jews who had married strange wives, consequently there would be a strong temptation to justify themselves by altering the

place of the words Ebal and Gerizim in the Law. Added to this was the strain of idolatry that had been brought by the men transferred from Babylon by the king of Assyria and the resulting mixture would justify the abhorrence of the Jew and the language of the Lord when He said, “ye worship ye know not what”. The Lord was about to reveal to the Samaritan woman that change of dispensation which would set aside Jerusalem itself as the “place” of worship, but, before doing so, He makes it clear that “salvation was of the Jews” and that worship at Jerusalem was of Divine appointment.

The Lord’s answer to the woman’s question occupies verses 21-24 of Chapter iv., and the structure is as follows:--

- A | John iv. 21.—DISPENSATIONAL CHANGE.—The hour cometh.
 B | 21.—WORSHIP OF THE FATHER.—
 Neither *in* this mountain. Nor *in* Jerusalem.
 C | 22.—SALVATION IS OF THE JEWS.—
 Ye worship ye know not what. We worship we know what.
 A | 23.—DISPENSATIONAL CHANGE.—The hour cometh and now is.
 B | 23.—WORSHIP OF THE FATHER.—
 True worshippers, worship *in* spirit and truth.
 C | 24.—GOD IS SPIRIT.—
 Worship must be in spirit and truth.

Let us examine this very important pronouncement on the nature of worship. First of all we observe that the Lord indicated that a time was coming when there would be no further need to debate whether Gerizim or Jerusalem was the “place” where men “ought” to worship.

“*The hour cometh.*”—In verse 23, this reference to the dispensational change is repeated, but with the added comment “and now is”. What are we to understand by these words? In John v. 25 and 28 we have the same expansion, only in this passage the order is reversed.

“The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God” (John v. 25).

“The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice” (John v. 28).

From verses 21, 22, 28 and 29 it is clear that actual physical resurrection is in view, and from verse 24 that a *spiritual* application of “life from the dead” is in view. Here the “hearing” is equivalent to “believing”. The “word” is equivalent to His “voice”; “coming out of the grave” is equivalent to “passing from death unto life”. So in John iv. “The hour cometh”. Even the “place” chosen by God, and the “ordinances” enjoined in the law, were, after all, “carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 10); and while, in the matter which the woman raised, the Samaritans were in error—“Ye worship ye know not what; we know,”—and so far as prophetic truth was concerned, the coming of Messiah and the hope attached—“Salvation is of the Jews,”—was its purport yet, just as, later, Paul was to sweep aside both circumcision and uncircumcision as superseded by the new creation (Gal. vi. 15), so now the Lord set aside

both Jerusalem and Gerizim, and that not only as a future effect of the change that was coming, but, by the added words, “and now is”, as a then present effect, so that while still continuing to worship in the temple, the true worshipper could, even then, anticipate the day that was fully coming later, when they that worship God will worship Him in spirit and in truth. The Lord does not say “God *will then* be spirit”, but that “God *is* Spirit”. God’s essence remains unchanged by His successive dispensational dealings with men. The imposition of carnal ordinances upon Israel was not because God had changed, but because of man’s inability to rise to spiritual heights.

“*God is Spirit.*”—It is a serious mistake to read “God is *a* spirit”, for that would only be true if God were one of the angelic order of beings. This sublime statement refers, not to His Personality, but His essence. He is Spirit. It follows therefore that, to be acceptable, worship, at its zenith, must be spiritual. “The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.”

What is the meaning of “true” worshippers?
What is the meaning of “in spirit and in truth”?
Why does the Lord introduce the “Father” here?

The word translated “true” in John iv. 23 is *alethinós*.

“The endings *inos* and *einós* denote that the quality, as a fundamental idea, exists in abundance” (*Kruger*).

“Accordingly, *alethinós* is related to *alethes* (true) as form to contents or substance; *alethos* denotes the reality of a thing; *alethinós* defines the relation of the conception to the thing to which it corresponds—genuine” (*Cremer*).

When the Saviour said, “Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven” (John vi. 32). He did not deny that manna fell in the wilderness; He affirmed, that He was the reality of which the manna was a type.

When Paul contrasted the earthly tabernacle with the “true” (Heb. viii. 2; ix. 24) he did not impugn the integrity of the O.T., but asserted that the tabernacle built by Moses was not the real holiest of all, which was nothing less than heaven itself. The “true” worshipper therefore was one who had risen above the mediation of type and symbol—Jerusalem and Gerizim—and drew near with a “true” heart. The word “truth” in the phrase “in spirit and in truth” is *aletheia*. This too sometimes has the same meaning as *alethinós*.

“Grace and truth” came by Jesus Christ in contrast with the “law” that was given by Moses (John i. 17). Yet the law was as true as the gospel, and he who rejects Moses rejects Christ (John v. 46, 47). The meaning of this passage is,

“The law which had a shadow of good things to come was given by Moses, but true, real, antitypical grace came by Jesus Christ.”

In the phrase “in spirit and in truth” the second “in” should be omitted. The preposition before the noun “in spirit” turns it into an adverb, as though it read

“spiritually”. The complete phrase, “in spirit and truth”, is cast in the form of a figure of speech called “hendiadys”, the “one-by-means-of-two” figure, for just as in the expression “grace and truth” considered above, one thing, not two, is intended, so here.

“God is spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him spiritually—yes in a truly spiritual manner, genuinely, without the intervention of types and shadows.”

It is not without a bearing upon the subject that we read in II Kings xvii. 26 that the Samaritans were troubled about the “manner” of the god of the land, as we saw when dealing with the inception of this people. The method adopted by the King of Assyria led to a worship of “they knew not what”, but the teaching given by the Lord leads to worship that is acceptable.

Moreover, we observed that the Lord introduced the name of “Father”. Though “God is spirit” and His worship *must* be spiritual, it is evident that sinful man can never approached such a God with such a worship. Consequently the Saviour speaks first of the “Father”, and the “fatherhood” of God is intimately associated with the “sonship” of Christ. Consequently, immediately following the statement concerning true spiritual worship, the woman speaks of the coming of Messiah, and the Lord makes the blessed revelation: “I that speak unto thee am He.”

This is the Lord’s seventh statement (see structure of John iv. 7-27 on page 97), and is the climax of this section. Both by the series of signs which he selected and in the intervening sections that link these signs together, John, again and again, leads up to the one supreme fact that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God”.

When setting out the structure (Volume XXII, page 6) of the great section which includes the eight signs (John ii. - xxi. 14) we drew attention to the way in which “work”, *ergon*, and “believe”, *pisteuo*, were a characteristic of each of the intervening passages that linked the eight signs together.

In John ii. 13 - iv. 42, the section we have now considered, the Lord introduced this subject of His “work” when His disciples returned to find Him in conversation with the Samaritan.

“In the mean while His disciples prayed Him, saying, Master, eat. But He said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not of. Therefore said the disciples one to another, Hath any man brought Him ought to eat? Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work” (John iv. 31-34).

To this and accompanying works, the Lord makes constant appeal throughout the Gospel, and the eight signs are so many “works” intended to lead to faith in Himself. While this is the only occasion in this section where “work” is associated with the Lord, as all know, there are a number of references to “believing”. The word *pisteuo*, “believing”, is used fifteen times in this connection. The significance of the fact that the Lord abode “two days” at Sychar (John iv. 40) becomes more evident when we consider the next sign (John iv. 43-54), but for the moment let us not miss the significance of the closing words of this section.

“And many more believed because of His own word; and said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world” (John iv. 41, 42).

Here is the object of John’s Gospel realized. That men should be attracted to the Lord by the evidence of His works (in this case His supernatural knowledge), and by personal contact become convinced that He is the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

There is a marked parallel in the experience of this woman and that of the man born blind.

SHE said of Christ at the beginning . . . “A Jew” (John iv. 9).

HE said of Christ at the beginning . . . “A man that is called Jesus” (John ix. 11).

SHE said, after the Lord had spoken . . . “That thou art a prophet” (John iv. 19).

HE said, after questioning . . . “He is a prophet” (John ix. 17).

SHE finally received the revelation . . . “I am He” (John iv. 26).

HE finally received the revelation . . . “It is He that talketh with thee” (John ix. 37).

This parallel is indicative of John’s method. Sinful and blind though they be, He would lead men and women first to consider Him, the Man that is called Jesus; then to realize that His title of “The Word” indicates that He is “The Prophet” and finally to acknowledge Him as the Christ, the Son of God, so finding life and light in believing in His name.

#27. The Second Sign: (iv. 43 - 54).

The Nobleman’s Son. Belief of the Word Spoken.

pp. 180, 181

We are assured by John that the Lord did “many signs” which are not written in this Gospel, but that he made a selection of eight of them with a definite object. This we must keep in mind as we approach the second sign recorded by John.

Writing to the Corinthians, the apostle Paul said, “The Jews require a sign” (I Cor. i. 22).

The first occurrence of the word “sign” is found in Matt. xii. 38, where the Scribes and Pharisees said, “Master, we would see a sign from Thee”.

In John’s Gospel, on the occasion of his cleansing of the temple, the Saviour is challenged with the inquiry, “What sign showest Thou unto us, seeing Thou doest these things?” (John ii. 18). Right in the heart of the second sign come the words, “Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe” (John iv. 48). After the confession of

Thomas, the Lord said, “Thomas, because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed” (John xx. 29).

Now it is noteworthy that no sign was wrought in Samaria, yet the woman and many of the townspeople believed. It is this fact that gives point to the words that introduce the second sign: “Jesus testified, that a prophet hath no honour in His own country” (John iv. 44). The Samaritans had believed His Word; the Galileans “received Him, having seen all the things that He did at Jerusalem at the feast: for they also went to the feast” (John iv. 45). This refers to the statement made in ii. 23:

“Now when He was in Jerusalem at the Passover, in the feast day, many believed in His name, when they saw the miracles (Gk. ‘signs’) which He did.”

Note must be taken of these features in the analysis of John iv. 46-54 which is as follows:

The Second Sign (John iv. 46 - 54).

- A | 46, 47. | a | Cana of Galilee. Where water was made wine.
 - b | Jesus was come out of Judæa into Galilee.
- B | 47-49. The Plea and The Expostulation. |
 - c | Come down, at point of death.
 - d | Except ye see signs and wonders.
 - c | Come down ere my child die.
- B | 50-53. The Answer and The Effect. |
 - e1 | THY SON LIVETH.
 - f1 | The man believed.
 - e2 | THY SON LIVETH.
 - f2 | The man inquired.
 - e3 | THY SON LIVETH.
 - f3 | The man and his whole house believed.
- A | 54. | a | This is the second miracle.
 - b | When He was come out of Judæa into Galilee.

“*Now after two days.*”—It will be remembered that these eight signs are arranged in the form of a simple introversion, the second corresponding with the seventh.

In both of these corresponding signs there is mention of “Two days” (John iv. 43, and xi. 6). In both the word “sick” (*asthenei*) is used (John iv. 46; xi. 2). In both “death” occurs (John iv. 47; xi. 14). In both there is reference to His rejection. In John iv. 44 “no honour”; in xi. 8 a reminder that in Judæa the Jews had sought to stone Him. The prophet Hosea, speaking of Israel’s long period of rejection, when they will be “Lo-ammi”, “Not my people”, says,

“After two days will He revive us: in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight” (Hosea vi. 2).

Possibly there is an allusion here to this prophetic period, and the fact that in these two signs, and in these only death and resurrection, or death and revival, are found, help to confirm the thought that the link is intended.

Moreover, the two signs have a lesson to teach by their points of difference.

The nobleman's son was "at the point of death", and the prayer was, "Come down ere my child die", whereas Lazarus had been dead four days before the miracle was wrought. Like Paul in I Thess. iv., John speaks of two companies of the redeemed:

- (1) Those who are living at the second coming, who will be changed.
- (2) Those who have died, who will be raised, as well as changed.

The two companies form the subject of the Lord's revelation in John xi.:

"I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth (*Gk.* 'is alive') and believeth in Me shall never die" (John xi. 25, 26).

Attempt has been made to identify this sign of the healing of the Nobleman's son, with that of the healing of the Centurion's servant of Matt. viii. 5-13, but, as the Companion Bible note reads,

"The two miracles differ as to time, place, person, pleading, plea, disease, the Lord's answer, and the man's faith, as may be easily seen by comparing the two as to these details."

Commenting upon the difference, Chrysostom says that "the weak faith of the nobleman is strengthened, while the humility of the centurion is honoured".

When the returning nobleman was met by his servants, and heard their glad cry, "Thy son liveth", his interest was quickened. He inquired of them the hour when he began to amend, and upon learning that it was "Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him" (John iv. 52), he was struck by the fact that it was at that self-same hour that the words of Christ were uttered, and this most evident witness to the saving power of the Saviour's word not only intensified the nobleman's faith, but led to the saving of his whole house.

Here therefore is the second sign which John selected out of many to lead to the conviction that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and so to the bestowal of life through His name.

#28. The Third Sign: (v. 1 - 15).
The Impotent Man.
The beginning of conflict; the Sabbath controversy.
pp. 216 - 221

The record of this sign commences with a reference to a feast of the Jews at Jerusalem. Commentators, ancient and modern, have suggested almost every Jewish feast as the one concerned. Irenæus understood it to refer to the second *Passover* of our Lord's ministry. The third would therefore be the one mentioned in John vi. 4, and the fourth in John xi. 55. This is the view of *Luther* and *Lightfoot*. *Chrysostom* thought that it would be the feast of *Pentecost*, *Kepler* that it was the feast of *Purim*; and others the feast of *Tabernacles*, and the feast of *Dedication*. The omission of the article before the word *heorte*, "feast", makes it unlikely that it was the Passover, and the fact that the feast of the Dedication was "winter" (John x. 22) makes it very unlikely, seeing that a multitude of sick folk were waiting to plunge into the water.

Where John wishes the reader to know what particular feast is in mind, he says so. Thus John ii. 13 connects the money-changers and the sheep with the observance of the feast of the Passover. In John vii. 2 the feast of Tabernacles is specified and, once again, the utterance of the Lord "in the last day, that great day of the feast" (John vii. 37) demands the knowledge that it was the feast of Tabernacles, to make it intelligible.

We can therefore rest assured that no lesson is to be drawn from any particular feast (John v.), except, perhaps, the fact that the reference to this feast as simply "a feast of the Jews" indicates the hollowness and barrenness of much that then pertained to the Jew's religion.

The occasion of this third sign was that a pool of water near the sheep market or sheep gate, known in the Aramaic tongue as *Bethesda*, and having five porches, was endowed, at periods, with healing powers, which rightly or wrongly were attributed to the interposition of an angel who troubled the waters.

It is suggestive that the corresponding sign—that of the healing of the blind man at the pool of Siloam recorded in chapter ix.—deals with a pool, the name of which is interpreted for the reader and, moreover, the healing took place on a sabbath day, as does the parallel healing to John v.

Bethesda means, "The house of mercy", and, like *Siloam*, which we are told means "Sent", is intentionally introduced by the writer. This word *kolumbethra*, which means "swimming pool", occurs five times in the N.T., and in no other passage than John ix., the corresponding sixth sign. Why is attention drawn to the fact that the pool was surrounded by "five porches"? If there were gates or steps they are not mentioned, but only the porches, which we must therefore consider have special significance. Is it possible that John saw in the five porches a reference to the Pentateuch, the five books of

the law, which suggested the failure of the law to save? “for the law was given by Moses, but true grace came by Jesus Christ”. Moses is most certainly introduced into these two signs (John v. 45, 46; ix. 28, 29), as also the fact that the Saviour was Lord even of the sabbath day, for both signs were wrought on a sabbath.

The sick who waited for the troubling of the water were “impotent” folk, and blind, halt, and withered. It is the “impotent” (*astheneo*) man that is singled out for blessing. *Astheneia*, the word translated “infirmity” in John v. 5, indicates both physical infirmity and infirmity of the flesh (Rom. vi. 19), as well as the infirmity of the law, because of the flesh (Rom. viii. 2). *Asthenes* is used of obsolete law, where it is referred to as the “weak” and beggarly elements (Gal. iv. 9). Moreover, the man had been impotent for thirty-eight years, the period that covered the wandering of the children of Israel.

“*Waiting.*”—From this word in verse 3 to the end of verse 4, the passage is omitted in many critical texts, though retained in the Syriac, but there is no justification for the omission, neither is there any reason to attempt to “explain” the reference to angelic ministry. If, as has been suggested, John merely introduced a popular but mistaken superstition here, what is to prevent the application of the suggestion to other recorded instances of angelic ministry in the N.T.? It is also unnecessary to attempt an “explanation” on natural lines. The pool might, or might not, have been an intermittent spring; it might, or might not, have been connected with the upper springs of the water of Gihon. The truth is that no one knows the site of the pool. The identification of the sheep gate with St. Stephen’s gate is inaccurate, for *Robinson* says no well existed in that quarter until the time of Agrippa. Against the “natural” interpretation of the troubling of the water, we must place the testimony of the record:

- (1) Only *one* sufferer could be healed.
- (2) The *first* who stepped down was healed.
- (3) The action of the curative power was *instantaneous*.
- (4) The cure was not confined to any *specific* disease.

If the pool had consisted of some sort of medicinal water, its powers would not be exhausted in the cure of the one sufferer, nor would it necessarily matter in what order the sufferers stepped into the water. Moreover medicinal waters do not cure instantaneously, nor every kind of disease or infirmity.

Before proceeding further we must discover the structure of the third sign.

The Third Sign (John v. 1 - 15).

- A1 | 1-4. GENERAL EXPECTATION. “*Made whole.*” |
 - a1 | A feast of the Jews.
 - b1 | Jerusalem: Jesus went up.
 - b1 | Jerusalem: A pool.
 - a1 | Hebrew tongue: Five Porches.
 - a2 | Impotent folk.
 - b2 | Waiting for troubling of water.
 - b2 | Angel at times troubled the water.
 - a2 | First to step in: Healed.
- A2 | 5-7. PARTICULAR CASE. “*Made whole.*” |
 - c1 | A certain man was there.
 - d1 | Impotent 38 years.
 - c1 | Jesus saw him lie.
 - d1 | Long time in that case.
 - e | *Question:* “Wilt thou be made whole?”
 - e | *Answer:* “Sir, I have no man.”
 - c2 | When water is troubled.
 - d2 | To put me in.
 - c2 | While I am coming.
 - d2 | Another steppeth before me.
- A3 | 8-11. THE SIGN ITSELF. “*Made whole.*” |
 - f | Take up thy bed and walk.
 - g | The man was made whole.
 - h | Took up his bed and walked.
 - i | On same day was the sabbath.
 - i | It is the sabbath day.
 - h | Not lawful to carry thy bed.
 - g | He that made me whole.
 - f | Take up thy bed and walk.
- A4 | 12-15. THE SEQUEL. “*Made whole.*” |
 - j | They asked him.
 - k | What man is that.
 - l | Take up thy bed and walk.
 - m | Jesus had conveyed Himself away.
Jesus finds him in the temple.
 - m | Behold thou art made whole.
Go and sin no more.
 - j | He told the Jews.
 - k | That it was Jesus.
 - l | Which had made him whole.

Among the items of extreme interest that yet await examination in this third sign is the question of verse six, “Wilt thou be made whole?”

Thelo, “I will”, occurs four times in this section and its expansion, which occupies chapter v.:

“Wilt thou be made whole?” (v. 6).

“The Son quickeneth whom He *will*” (v. 21).

“Ye were *willing* for a season to rejoice in His light” (v. 35).

“Ye *will* not come to Me, that ye might have life” (v. 40).

The faith of God’s elect, the faith as taught in the Scriptures, must embrace *all* that has been written on the subject. To follow one’s own leanings, and pick and choose texts and passages, is the surest way to produce another heresy (for the word heretic in the Greek, means, literally, “a chooser”), but it does not lead to the wholesome doctrine that is taught in the Scriptures. In John v. the Calvinist would be attracted to the pronouncement, “The Son quickeneth whom He will”. The Arminian to the words, “Wilt thou be made whole?” The *Berean* should be attracted by both passages, and his creed must embrace both. Those who deny freedom of will to man, seldom, if ever, quote or expound the pathetic words of Matt. xxiii. 37, “How often *would* I and ye *would* not” where the word translated “would” is *thelo*.

Predestination does not stand alone; in Rom. viii. 29 it is stated to be *according to foreknowledge*. Election does not stand alone, but is *according to the foreknowledge* of God the Father (I Pet. i. 2). For daring to believe and to teach these scriptural facts when writing the series on Romans, both we, and many of our readers in this country and abroad, were submitted to a series of anonymous letters wherein the writer, shielded by his anonymity, did not refrain from abusive language. It is in the doctrinal links that bind into a whole the eight signs of John, that this inter-relation of will, evidence, conviction, faith, choice, election, being drawn, being given the will, meet us. Among the last words of the N.T. canon are these: “Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely” (Rev. xxii. 17), and they contain the last occurrence in the N.T. of *thelo*. As these various aspects of a great truth appear, will be the right time and place to deal with them.

On occasion of the first sign, the turning of the water into wine, no opposition was manifested, “His disciples believed on Him” (John ii. 11). After the second sign, not only did the nobleman believe, but his whole house (John iv. 53), and again there is no indication of opposition. But on the occasion of the third sign opposition is manifested.

A characteristic of John’s Gospel that can be summed up in a few words, is this:

REVELATION
|
RECEPTION ----- REJECTION.

From the prologue, where, after the revelation is given, we read of some one who received Him not and of others who did receive Him, this twofold attitude is apparent throughout the Gospel.

In self-justification, however, opposition needs a reason, or an excuse. In this third sign the excuse was to hand. The man had been healed and had carried his bed *on the sabbath day*.

“And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: *and on the same day was the sabbath*” (John v. 9).

There are thirteen occurrences of the word “sabbath” in John’s Gospel, nine being found in chapters v.-ix. and the remainder in those chapters which deal with the crucifixion and the resurrection (John xix., xx.). It is evident that John has placed the third and the sixth sign in correspondence, for, among many other parallel features, these are the two which were wrought on the sabbath day.

“And it was the sabbath day when Jesus made clay, and opened his eyes” (John ix. 14).

The way in which John adds this comment in v. 9 and ix. 14, makes us mentally supply the ellipsis, “How shocking!”

These passages that deal with the sabbath group themselves sufficiently to enable us to perceive the underlying intention behind them.

Sabbaton in John v. - ix.

- A | v. 9. The same day was the SABBATH.
- B | v. 10, 16, 18. The SABBATH broken. “Sought to slay Him.”
- C | vii. 22, 23. Moses and the SABBATH. “The principle involved.
- A | ix. 14. It was the SABBATH day.
- B | ix. 16. He keepeth not the SABBATH day.

If there are thirteen references to the sabbath in John’s Gospel, there are also thirteen to Moses. If those to the sabbath are distributed under the grouping nine and four, (nine as above, and four at the close of the Gospel), so is the name Moses, distributed under a grouping of nine and four. Four times John spells the name *Mouses*, and nine times *Moses*. The latter spelling is more in line with the Hebrew, whereas the former is derived from the Egyptian.

“Hereupon it was that Thermathis imposed this name *Mouses* upon him, from what had happened, when he was put into the river; for the Egyptians call water by the name *Mo*, and such as are saved out of it by the same *Uses*” (*Josephus Ant. ii. ix. 6*).

There is no discovered assignable reason why one spelling or the other should have been used by the writers of the N.T., and we will not waste time in empty speculation.

The conflict in John is due to the misunderstanding of the law as interpreted by the legalists and ritualists of the day, and the gracious interpretation put upon it by the Lord. Thus, Moses lifted up the serpent, a blessed anticipation of John iii. 16. Moses gave the Manna, a blessed type of the True Bread that came down from heaven (John vi.). To avoid breaking the law of Moses, circumcision was performed even on the sabbath day

(John vi. 22, 23), and healing a man, and the carrying of his bed by the healed man, were in full harmony with the gracious intention of the sabbath.

Space will not here permit of an examination of this vexed question of the sabbath, but when we have reached John ix. we must devote a complete article to it. For the moment let it suffice that we perceive that the attitude of our Lord to the traditional sabbath day observance awoke the first murderous opposition recorded by John.

The fourfold division of the structure of this sign, (given on page 218) throws into prominence the words "be made whole". This word *hugies*, "whole", that gives us "hygiene", occurs seven times in John's Gospel, viz., John v. 4, 6, 9, 11, 15; vii. 23. It will be observed that every reference has to do with this third sign. John v. 14 associates the impotent man's condition with sin; "Sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee".

The first sign made up a deficiency, and ministered to a people's joy. The second ministered life, "Thy son liveth", and is the thrice-repeated key to the structure. The third sign ministered health, and by the fact that it was given on the sabbath indicated that a greater than Moses had come. Each sign reflects some one phase of our Lord's many-sided fullness, and each contributed its quota of evidence to the fact that this was indeed the Christ, the Son of God, and that life results from faith in His name.

The Pearl of Parables.

#1. The Parable of the Father (Luke xv. 11-32).

Volume XXXII, p. 205

The parable of the Prodigal Son has been called the pearl of parables. While it may be unwise to attempt comparisons between passages in Holy Writ, there is, nevertheless, in this parable, great appeal to the heart and much to move the feelings as one follows the progress of the prodigal both upon his disastrous outward journey, and during his return to love and restoration.

It is not by accident that this parable is recorded by Luke, for it is consonant with his practice of choosing always the evangelical aspect of his subject. Where Matthew's narrative is of the birth at Bethlehem of the "King", Luke delights to tell the good tidings of the birth of a "Saviour". Matthew of course pursues his definite purpose, for he proclaims the King and the kingdom, but Luke, the right-hand man of the apostle Paul, has a different object in view. It is he alone who traces the genealogy of Christ to God through Adam and, again, it is he alone who records the parable of "The Good Samaritan", a parable that could have no place in the Gospel of the Publican who went down to his house "justified" rather than the Pharisee; a blessed anticipation of the doctrine of Romans and of the confession of Phil. iii. 1-9.

Perhaps the affection in which this parable has ever been held is because it is *the* parable of the FATHER, a word that is used twelve times in the narrative. It was the mission of Christ to reveal the Father:

"No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (John i. 18).

He declared Him in His life, for the Son of God is the "express image of His Person". His declaration to the enquiring disciples was: "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father"; He declared Him in His gospel, in His discourses and in His parables, and here, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, we may learn something of the nature and character of Him to Whom we cry, "Abba, Father".

#2. The Two Sons (Luke xv. 11). pp. 7, 8

“A certain man had two sons” (Luke xv. 11). With similar words, a parable is introduced in Matt. xxi. There, the two sons are called upon by their father to work in his vineyard, and the point of the parable is the nature of their response. The first said, “I will not, but afterward, he repented and went”; the second said, “I go sir: and went not”. Not a word of censure is given to the first son’s initial refusal to go to the work, attention on the contrary, being focused upon the fact that ultimately he repented and went. So also in the parable of the prodigal son. The father utters no word of censure upon the ingratitude or stupidity of his erring son, but rejoices in his return and welcomes him home with open arms.

A superficial judgment would say that this is putting a premium upon sin. It is the elder brother who recalls his younger brother’s sins and asserts his own rectitude:

“Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends. But as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf” (Luke xv. 29, 30).

Those “many years of service”, that constant observance of the father’s commandments, find an echo in Phil. iii. where the Apostle says, “Touching the righteousness of the law—blameless”. But instead of holding fast to this, he now counts it but dung, as compared with the finding of his all in Christ.

At the close of the parable of the lost sheep with which Luke xv. opens, we read:--

“I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance” (Luke xv. 7).

Here again it would be easy to slip into the error of thinking that true righteousness is discounted and that a premium is put upon sin. That, however, is not the case. It is the *kind* of righteousness of the law and of the flesh; a righteousness that never acknowledges its abject need of grace and of the Saviour’s love. The theme is presented once more in Luke, in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. The Pharisee was most certainly “not as other men are”, otherwise he could not have belonged to “the straitest sect of the Jews’ religion”; he was not an extortioner, unjust, nor an adulterer, all of which can be taken at its full value. He was most certainly not “as this Publican”. Yet we know the conclusion. We know the Lord’s solemn verdict.

“I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for everyone that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted” (Luke xviii. 14).

The exaltation of self-righteousness is so odious in the sight of God that it cannot be tolerated. The humble penitence of “the sinner” or of the “prodigal son” is the only spirit that finds acceptance before the throne of God.

If it were possible for human nature to produce perfect righteousness it would be a lovely thing and would far outweigh even the grace of penitence. But perfection is seen only in the person of Christ. All men have sinned, and even their acts of “righteousness” often make them hard, cold, and self-exalted. Even the Apostle makes a distinction in Rom. v. between a “just man” and a “good man”, a distinction still, alas, possible, while human nature is as it is.

#3. “Give me Make me” (Luke xv. 12, 19). pp. 31, 32

A recent broadcast talk called attention to the two petitions of the parable of the prodigal son, the first, “Give me”, the second “Make me”. These embody a thought that goes to the very heart of the parable. Let us ponder it.

The younger son, said, “Father give me the portion of goods that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living”. The younger son did not ask for more than his share. He was not envious of his elder brother, with possibly a “double portion”; he simply asked for his own. Most certainly the Father did no evil in granting the request. In the beginning God made man a free moral agent. As such, if he chose to say “Give me” that which is my own, he was free to do so. What Adam did with his freedom of choice and his ability to say “I will not”, like the son in the other parable is, alas, not only past history, but a present factor in life.

The parable employs a peculiar word for “goods”. It is *ousia*, part of the verb “to be”, and occurs in but one more passage in the N.T., namely in the next verse of the parable, where it is translated “substance”. *Ousia*, while it means “goods”, most certainly leads the mind to think of “being” or “essence”. Its very choice makes us realize that typically the prodigal son is “man” who squanders not “things” merely, but “himself”.

Acceding to the request the Father divided to his sons “his living”, and while the elder said that his brother had devoured his “living”, the narrative says he wasted his “substance” (*ousia*). Man, his life, his means, and his mode of living, were given to him, and the Father waits, waits for the next request, “Make me” (Luke xv. 19). Here was repentance; here was humility; here was the lesson of the ages learned; here was something which, for all his cold self-righteousness, the elder brother could not apprehend.

“We are his workmanship” (*poiema*, “making”) said the Apostle to the Ephesians, where salvation by grace; salvation not of works; salvation that leads to “all lowliness of mind”, is the parallel experience.

“GIVE ME.”—Here we have a picture of man assuming responsibility, attempting to shape his own destiny and making utter failure of the effort.

“MAKE ME.”—Here is repentance or “a change of mind” indeed. Man at last turns to God, in Whom alone can he hope to find the full realization of the purpose of his own creation.

#4. “He wasted his substance with riotous living” (Luke xv. 13). pp. 42, 43

The Lord, to Whom all things belong, abhors *waste*. He Who fed 5,000 by miraculously multiplying a few loaves and fishes, and Who could, and did, feed them again in a similar manner, nevertheless commanded that the fragments be gathered up that nothing be wasted.

Sin is not only a crime, a transgression, an offence, it is a dismal waste. In the Hebrew Scriptures the meaning of the basic word for “sin” is not disobedience, or transgression, or villainy, but “to miss”, as an archer misses his mark. Man has sadly failed. He has missed the purpose of his being; he has “wasted” his essence, his being, his substance. In usage the word *asotos*, “riotous”, indicates profligacy and excess, but etymologically it means one who is outside the pale of salvation, *a* being the negative and *sozo*, “to save”.

Man, like the prodigal, has taken himself into a far country, beyond the preserving and restraining power of grace, and his end is beggary.

If, ignoring chapter divisions, we pass straight on into Luke xvi., we shall read of another *Waster*. This time it is a “steward”, not a “son”, and this time it is the Master’s goods that are wasted, not his own.

The figure of the elder brother is now changed to that of a steward. The self-righteous among the Jews had condemned their fallen brethren because they had wasted their substance in riotous living. But the Lord suddenly charges them with much more dishonourable act of wasting that which was not theirs but which had been entrusted to them. The Apostle Paul does the same thing in Rom. ii. He knew his Jewish readers would have agreed that the Gentiles were “without excuse” (Rom. i. 20), but they must have been astonished as he brought against them the charge:--

“Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things” (Rom. ii. 1).

The prodigal wasted his own substance, but the self-righteous Pharisees, who looked upon themselves as leaders and guides, had through unfaithfulness and self-seeking wasted the goods entrusted to them.

When one reflects on the possibilities that lay in man as first created in the image of God, and then turns and considers him to-day, surely he has indeed gone into a far country and there *wasted* his substance.

#5. “He came to himself” (Luke xv. 13-16). pp. 65 - 67

By a series of descending steps, this parable brings the prodigal at last “to himself”, and with the discovery of all that these words imply, the change commencing with the blessed words “I will arise” begins. He had taken his journey into a “far country”, he had wasted his substance in “riotous” living, and when he had “spent all” a mighty famine reduced him to destitution—he began to be “in want”. Here we have distance, dissipation, destitution. But this is not all. To this list must be added degradation, for the prodigal descended so low as to feed “swine”.

“*The far country.*”—When the Scriptures would speak of Gentiles, of sinners, or of Israel in disgrace, it speaks of them as being “far off”. In contrast, the position of the elder son is marked, “Son thou art ever with me”. The younger son well represented the condition of the “publicans and sinners” the presence of whom was the immediate cause of the utterance of the three parables of Luke xv. as verses 1 and 2 indicate.

“*He spent all.*”—“Wherefore do you spend money for that which is not bread?” asked the prophet (Isa. lv. 2). This reveals one aspect of the prodigal’s failure. The woman who “had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse” (Mark v. 26) reveals another aspect of utter failure, for salvation cannot be bought, it is the gift of God. Whether we spend all as the prodigal and come to want, or whether we spend all like the sick woman and yet grow worse, it is evident that all such spending is vain.

The prodigal hastened his end by spending his portion in “riotous living”. The word translated “riotous” is *asotos*, a compound of *a*, a negative, and a derivative of *so*, “save”. From this root come the words *soteria*, “salvation”, and such compounds as *sophron*, “sober” or a “saved” mind, in other words “sane”. The prodigal, like many another, thought he would see “life”, but what he really saw was a glimpse of corruption and death. He had not only wasted his substance, but he had spent it all on that which was “without salvation”, in other words, he was bankrupt. It is no accident that Luke uses

here the same word as Paul in Romans, for the word translated “want” and “come short” is the same (Rom. iii. 23).

And now external circumstances combine against him, adding degradation to destitution; he descends lower, for he “joined himself” to a citizen of this far off country, and what this implies can be discerned when we know that Luke employs the same word here as he does in Acts x. 28, where Peter refers to the fact that it was unlawful for a man that is a Jew to “keep company” with one of another nation. The depths of degradation however are reached when he was put to feed “swine” and would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat. Destitute and degraded he now realizes that he is in a desperate case, for in addition to all this misery come the added words, “no man gave unto him”.

The doctrinal lesson is of course that no man could be of any use to such as he, for “no man can by any means redeem his brother”. When however the prodigal “came to himself” this failure of both self and man proved to be the foreseen opportunity for grace, “and He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor; therefore His arm brought salvation unto Him” (Isa. lix. 16). Coming to himself the prodigal discovered that he was indeed, “wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked” (Rev. iii. 17). The home he had left, the blessings he had so lightly esteemed, now appear in their true light. He thinks longingly of the comforts that even the hired servants of his father are enjoying, while he was perishing, and so repentance begins. While repentance is usually accompanied by sorrow and remorse, the word thus translated here does not mean sorrow, but rather “to think again”. The word is *matanoia*, *meta* meaning “after” and *noia* being derived from *nous* “the mind”. That “repentance” is to be understood at this point a comparison with the other parables of the chapter will reveal.

The Parables of Luke xv.

- A1 | 3-6. The parable of the “lost sheep”.
- B1 | 7. “One sinner that repenteth”.
- A2 | 8, 9. The parable of the “lost coin”.
- B2 | 10. “One sinner that repenteth”.
- A3 | 11-32. The parable of the “lost son”.
- B3 | 17, 18. “He came to himself”, “I will arise”.

With repentance the prodigal turns his back on destitution and degradation, he turns his face to home, to a father’s love, to rejoicing and restoration. Even so must Israel emulate this prodigal before the restitution so long foretold can be enjoyed.

#6. “No more worthy” (Luke xv. 17-19).
p. 92

When the prodigal son started on his journey with his wallet well lined with money, the world seemed a splendid place and he himself felt a fine fellow. But when, after the grim experience in independence, he “came to himself”, a reversal in his estimate of values had taken place. The far country no longer seemed so enchanting, and even the servants in the father’s house were now seen in an enviable light.

“When he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father’s have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger. I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants” (Luke xv. 17-19).

“I perish.”—The prodigal had reached the point where he would agree with the Scriptures concerning the fate of the man outside Christ. John iii. 16 makes it clear that whosoever does not believe in the Lord shall “perish”. This word has already occurred in the two preceding parables of this chapter, the “lost” sheep of verse 6 and the “lost” piece of money of verse 9, and it recurs in verses 24 and 32, where the father speaks of his son who was “lost, and is found”.

“I have sinned.”—It is one thing to agree that “all have sinned”; it is another to “come to oneself” and be led to confess as an individual “I have sinned”. Moreover, the prodigal began to realize the “sinfulness of sin”; that he had “sinned against heaven” as well as in the sight of his father.

“I am no more worthy.”—These words were bitter in the utterance, but sweet in the ears of the angels of heaven who have joy over one sinner that repenteth more than over many elder brothers who remain in their unruffled, unexplored, self-righteousness.

“I will arise and go to my Father.”—Here is repentance (*matanoia*) “A change of mind”, both regarding self and regarding “the Father”. Of his own will he had left the Father, of his own will he returned. The word “arise” is *anistemi*, which in its next occurrence (Luke xvi. 31) is used of the rising from the dead. Although still in the far country, still sad and sore and disillusioned, the beginning of the new life that will be spent in the presence of the Father—with robe, ring, and joy—has already begun. We are nearer to immortality when we say, “I perish”, than when we say (as the rich fool in the same Gospel), “Take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry” (Luke xii. 19).

#7. The Father's Compassion (Luke xv. 20).
pp. 127, 128

If the Son of God came to reveal the Father, and if this parable is a part of that revelation, what a light it throws upon the Father's heart!

"And when he was yet a great way off."—The seeking sinner need but make the slightest movement toward God, to find God going out to him. Had the Father chosen to stand upon his dignity and say, "My son took it upon himself to leave home; let him come back; let him knock at the door; let him taste a little salutary discipline; let him wait my pleasure", he would but have acted as many a human father has acted to such a son. But here it was the Father that "ran", not the returning prodigal. Because of remorse and shame, it was the son's footsteps that lagged; the Father's steps were quickened by love. Even when he was a great way off "his Father saw him". Is it too much to say that the Father had been watching daily in the hope of that precious sight?

"He had compassion", or, as the words literally, "His bowels yearned" over him.—Not one word of reproof or rebuke. No censure, no condemnation, but unutterable love and inexpressible joy over the returning prodigal.

By the witness of the self-same Scriptures we know that a sacrifice was needed to justify the forgiveness of the sinner. That cannot be introduced into this parable, but it is given its place in perfect fullness in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, where it can be introduced without incongruity. The Father needs no sacrifice to make Him love this erring son; rather it is His love that *provides* the sacrifice.

"He kissed him."—This is reconciliation and acceptance. As the poor prodigal retraced his steps he had been repeating to himself the confession, "I will say unto him". Even as his father kissed him the words are heard, but he was not allowed to complete his confession. Before he could reach the words, "Make me as one of thy hired servants", the father broke in upon him and said,

"Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet; and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry."

If such be the reception of one seen "afar off", what excuse will a man have in that day who remains unsaved, unaccepted, unforgiven? He is not compelled to crawl abjectly to the throne of God, as well he might; he has but to turn his heart toward the Father to find the Father Himself seeking him.

#8. The Prodigal's acceptance (Luke xv. 22).
p. 168

What a welcome awaited the returning prodigal! What an exhibition of "grace abounding"!

"Bring forth the best robe and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand; and shoes on his feet" (verse 22).

The Father commands, the servants obey. The robe, ring and shoes are both provided and "put on" the son, without that son saying a word, or raising a finger. Like the believer to-day, he stood "accepted in the Beloved".

We have not far to seek to discover the purport of the "robe". "All our righteousness", said the prophet, "are as filthy rags", a picture of the tattered and travel-stained clothing of the returning prodigal, which, in their turn, depicted his own conscious unworthiness. The same prophet, speaking of Israel's restoration, said, "He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness".

In the New Testament, "To put on" is used of the "Armour of light", of "Incorruption", and "Immortality", of "The new man", and of "Christ".

The prodigal is clothed with a righteousness not his own.

"When I stand before the throne,
Dressed in beauty not my own,
When I see Thee as Thou art,
Love Thee with unsinning heart.
Then Lord shall I fully know,
Not till then, how much I owe."

It is noteworthy that the word used to denote the "best" robe, is the Greek word *protos*, "first". It was the "chief in rank", it was parallel with the "adoption" that is the glory of our own blessed calling.

"The ring" was a symbol of distinction (James ii. 2). "The shoes" were an indication that he was a free man, for according to Alford, slaves often went barefoot.

How this unreserved acceptance and full and free reinstatement foreshadows something of our position by wondrous grace!

"In the body of His flesh through death, to present you *holy and unblameable and unproveable* in His sight" (Col. i. 22).

#9. The Real Lost Son (Luke xv. 25-30).
pp. 185, 186

Stier has well said that the elder brother is really the *lost son*. He is Pharisaical in his self-righteousness; he is entirely lacking in either filial or brotherly affection; he has neither charity nor humility. We cannot imagine him saying, "I am no more worthy to be called thy son".

We read that when he was told the reason for the feast that was in progress, "he was angry and would not go in". In brutal and coarse language he repelled his father's entreaty, saying, "*Lo these many years do I serve thee*" (No reference is made to the home life and its love and comforts, the stress being put on serving, *douleuo*, which comes from the root "to bind", "to be in bondage and serve as a slave"), *neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment* (Another Pharisee once wrote, "Touching the righteousness of the law—blameless" and, after all, not to transgress a commandment, is but negative obedience. In all this there appears to have been a complete absence of obedience to the second great commandment, the commandment of love), "*and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends*" (Here, the elder brother speaks of a "kid", something very much less in value than the "fatted calf" slain for the prodigal, and thus expresses his estimate of the father's love and care all his life). "*But as soon as thy son was come*" (Not "this, my brother"—here the Pharisee betrays himself), "*which hath devoured thy living with harlots*" (Is this just? The prodigal asked and received no more than that portion of goods that fell to him. He wasted it in riotous living, but inasmuch as the elder brother was confessedly ignorant of the facts of his younger brother's life, the adverse additions which he made were clear evidence of his own uncharitable heart).

From some angles it may be dangerous to attempt to distinguish between one sin and another. Yet the Scriptures speak of a sin which is not unto death, and a sin which is unto death (I John v. 16), and the epistle to the Hebrews says that willful sin after we have received the full knowledge of the truth has no more sacrifice provided for it (Heb. x. 26).

The "sin" of the prodigal was a crime against himself more than against his fellow-men. He "wasted his substance", but he is not charged with lying, thieving or murder. For all his boast, the elder brother was deeper in guilt, for uncharitableness, spitefulness, malice and blind self-righteousness are blacker and deeper-dyed than anything attributed to the repentant prodigal.

Yet, how blessed to hear the prodigal's confession, "I have sinned against heaven". He never thought to minimize his guilt. He never dreamed of comparing himself favourably with his brother. We find the two attributes of mind forcibly brought out in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. Later we may turn to that parable for another series of short talks together. Meanwhile let us thank God for this parable of prodigal love, and the loveliness of true repentance, remembering its setting; that it was

when “drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him” that this “Pearl of Parables” was drawn forth from the Saviour’s heart.

The Pulpit of the Opened Book.

#5. Inspiration and the Holy Ghost.

pp. 8 - 10

In the Greek, the term “inspiration of God” used by Paul in II Tim. iii. 16 is *theopneustos*, and it is evident that there is a vital connection between “inspiration” and the Spirit (*pneuma*). On occasion, therefore, we are prepared to find that a specific statement is made in the Scriptures ascribing the authorship of the Book to the Holy Spirit. Let us note these passages.

(1) PSALM XCV. 7.—This passage is quoted in Heb. iii., but instead of settling the vexed question as to whether Moses, who wrote Psa. xc., should be recognized as the author of the anonymous Psalms that follow, Paul says, “Wherefore, as *the Holy Ghost* saith, To day if ye will hear His voice” (Heb. iii. 7). This statement is too explicit to be passed over in silence. Everything associated with the integrity of Scripture is involved in it. The critics have assured us that Moses never led the children of Israel through the wilderness; that the story written in the book of Numbers is not factual history; Moses never lifted up a serpent in the wilderness, etc., etc., yet Paul declares that the Psalm which says, “Forty years long was I grieved with this generation I swear in My wrath, that they should not enter into My rest”, was the language of “The Holy Ghost”. Here there can be no compromise, no middle ground; we *must* be either for or against. Either Paul’s words are sober truth and the critics blasphemers, or his words are hysterical nonsense and the critics our deliverers. For our part we believe the Apostle’s declaration that the Psalm quoted was the language of the Holy Ghost.

(2) THE TABERNACLE.—Heb. ix. is devoted to the typical tabernacle of the wilderness, and the anti-typical fulfillment of its ordinances, sacrifices and types in the heavenly priesthood of Christ and the true tabernacle, which God pitched and not man, namely, “heaven itself”. Once again the issues are clearly defined. Paul does not speak vaguely of the tabernacle; he describes its two great portions, he specifies the sacred furniture, both within the veil and in the holy place, and in Heb. viii. 5, says of the earthly priesthood of Israel:

“Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount” (Heb. viii. 5).

Having committed himself to the belief that Moses did actually erect the tabernacle and that the record in Exodus is true, he further commits himself to the utter extreme of saying in Heb. ix. concerning this tabernacle and its services:--

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

Again the issues are evident. Either Paul speaks the truth, or he does not. If he does, then Moses actually did erect the tabernacle in the wilderness, and the critics are found to be liars.

(3) THE NEW COVENANT.—Paul brings to a climax the doctrinal teaching of his epistle to the Hebrews in chapter x., where he reaches the subject of the offering made for sin by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, “once for all”. He follows this in verse 15 with the words, “Whereof *the Holy Ghost* also is a witness to us”, and proceeds to quote from Jer. xxxi.

Here therefore, in the short range of one epistle, the Holy Ghost is attested as the Author of Psa. xcvi. He is said to have “signified” certain lines of truth in the tabernacle and its ministry, and to bear witness to the truth of the New Covenant given by God in Jeremiah.

In the first chapter of the Acts we have another instance. Peter stood up and said:

“Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which *the Holy Ghost* by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus” (Acts i. 16).

Here a Psalm of David is the passage in question, where, writing out of his own bitter experience, he said, “Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me” (Psa. xli. 9), but the Holy Ghost, Who inspired the *record*, looked down the centuries to a greater betrayal than that of Ahithophel. If, moreover, Ahithophel subsequently “hanged himself”, as did Judas, we should not be surprised, so full, so complete, is the inspiration of Scripture (II Sam. xvii. 23).

Like guardians at the two extremities of the Acts stand the references to the Holy Ghost. Peter’s statement in Acts i. 16, to which we have just referred, and Paul’s in Acts xxviii. 25, where it is recorded:

“And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake *the Holy Ghost* by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers” (Acts xxviii. 25).

and Paul goes on to quote, in full, Isa. vi. 9 and 10.

Again, writing to the Corinthians, the Apostle said:--

“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which *the Holy Ghost* teacheth” (I Cor. ii. 13).

We can have a book evidently inspired by “man’s wisdom”, or we can have a book the “words” of which are taught by the “Holy Ghost”, and it is the testimony of the Chapel of the Opened Book that the Scriptures are the Word of God, “true from the beginning”.

The association thus established between the Holy Ghost and the Scriptures makes useful an examination of John xiv.-xvi. This we do not here enlarge upon, but, in lieu, give the headings that formed the basis of one of the addresses given during the series.

The Holy Ghost, as the Spirit of truth, guided the Apostles into “all truth” (John xvi. 13); He recalled to their memory whatsoever the Saviour had taught them (John xiv. 26); He made clear the meaning of sayings not previously understood (John xiv. 26); He endowed the Apostles with a vision of the future (John xvi. 13); He led the Apostles on in the recognition of the glory of the Person of the Redeemer (John xvi. 14); and He confirmed the witness given by the Apostles (John xv. 26); He enabled them to bear their testimony (John xv. 26, 27); He is named, three times over, “the Spirit of truth” (John xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13); A power unseen by the world (John xiv. 17) and Who would abide with them for ever (John xiv. 16).

In symbol, this overshadowing, inspiring, power of the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles when the Saviour “breathed” on them, as recounted in John xx. 21, 22; and His full advocacy could be relied upon in the hour of trial (Matt. x. 19, 20). Moreover, this mighty, gracious, indwelling, illuminating power, is called “The promise of the Father” (Luke xxiv. 49) without which the apostolic testimony at Jerusalem could neither have begin nor succeeded.

#6. The Preservation of the Inspired Documents. **pp. 32 - 35**

In Psalm xii. there are two statements that we must notice about the words of the Lord. The first assures us of their “purity”, the second of their “preservation” (Psa. xii. 6, 7). And so it is that next to the miracle of their production, must stand the marvel of their preservation. When we come to consider that the Bible we read today is substantially the self-same Book that was read nearly two thousand years ago, and when we further call to mind the persecuting opposition and antagonism of both Church and State to the Book and its readers, the Providence that has preserved it intact to this day is beyond question one of history’s greatest miracles. The history and preservation of the O.T. falls into four periods:

- | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|
| (1) From Moses to Ezra . . . | Approximate | 1000 to 500B.C. |
| (2) From Ezra to fall of Jerusalem . . . | | to A.D.70. |
| (3) The Talmud Period . . . | | to A.D.500. |
| (4) The Period of the Massorets . . . | | to A.D.1000. |

To follow in these pages the story of the preservation of the text throughout this length of time would involve too many explanations and illustrations to permit of its being undertaken, especially so far as the Talmudic and Massoretic periods are concerned. There is, however, enough in the Book itself from the days of Moses to the days of Ezra to show the care that was taken to preserve the Scriptures that were entrusted to the

people of Israel. To see how this operated during the great period from Moses to Ezra, justifies the expectation that He Who watched over His Word, and provided for its preservation at the beginning, did so because He purposed that it should remain intact until the end.

When Moses had reached the age of one hundred and twenty years, and knew that he would not pass over Jordan with Israel, he appointed Joshua as his successor, and then made arrangements for the safeguarding of the five books of the law, written by himself at the command of the Lord.

“And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel” (Deut. xxxi. 9).

The priests were instructed that at the end of every seven years, when all Israel gathered before God, “this law” should be read “before all Israel in their hearing” (Deut. xxxi. 11). Here were the two initial enactments that went far to preserve the sacred writings. First, they were entrusted to the priests, and secondly they were publicly read every seven years. We learn moreover that the book was deposited in Israel’s most sacred depository, the Ark.

“And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God” (Deut. xxxi. 24-26).

Earlier in Deuteronomy a further safeguard is recorded, in that it was incumbent upon any king that should reign over Israel, to carry out the following injunction:

“And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his live” (Deut. xvii. 18, 19).

Turning now to the book of Joshua, we follow Israel across the Jordan and to the overthrow of Jericho. After the victory at Ai we read the Joshua built an altar, and there he wrote a copy of the law of Moses in the presence of the children of Israel, and afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings, “there was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel” (Joshua viii. 30-35).

Here, then, is the record that the command given by Moses was carried out by his successor.

At the close of the book of Joshua, we come to the first recorded addition to the five books of Moses.

“And Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God and took a great stone and set it up by the sanctuary of the Lord. And Joshua said this stone shall be a witness” (Joshua xxiv. 26, 27).

Here Joshua probably added the account of Moses' death, which closes the book of Deuteronomy.

The next reference is found in the first book of Samuel, after Saul had been chosen king.

“Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it (literally ‘continued the writing’) in the book, and laid it up before the Lord” (I Sam. x. 25).

Coming to the days of David, we have abundant testimony in the Psalms that the law of the Lord was believed and honoured by this man who was after God's own heart, and, accordingly, in I Kings ii. 1-4, we find him impressing their value upon his son and successor, Solomon.

In the reign of Jehoshaphat, the king sent the Levites “and they taught in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them” (II Chron. xvii. 8, 9).

After the dark days of Athaliah, Joash was made king, and we read “Then they brought out the king's son, and put upon him the crown, and gave him the testimony, and made him king” (II Chron. xxiii. 11). Not the crown only, but both “crown” and “testimony” were necessary to “make him king”. So the story proceeds to tell how Amaziah spared the children of his father's murderers according to what was “written in the law in the book of Moses” (II Chron. xxv. 4).

Hezekiah kept the Passover in the second month, as it was written, which reveals that Numb. ix. 6-14 was in his possession.

Josiah is the next link in the royal chain, and in his reign we learn that Hilkiyah the high priest “found the book of the law in the house of the Lord” (II Kings xxii. 8).

After the carrying away into captivity, we find Daniel referring to that which had been “written in the law of Moses the servant of God” (Dan. ix. 11), and Nehemiah in his prayer concerning the desolation of Jerusalem refers to the statutes and judgments He gave by Moses (Neh. i. 7-9). When the people returned under Nehemiah and Ezra, and the walls of the city had been repaired, a most solemn assembly met in the street that was before the watergate, while Ezra “read in the book in the law of God distinctly” (Neh. viii. 1-8).

There is a suggestion in II Chron. xxix. 30, that the Psalms had by this time taken their place in the sacred canon, for the singers praised the Lord “with the words of David, and of Asaph the seer”. In Neh. x. we have the names of those who formed “the great Synagogue”, which lasted from Nehemiah to Simon the Just, a period of 110 years. Among other things, its main purpose was “to collect and preserve the canonical scriptures”. Its work being accomplished it became known as the Sanhedrin and continued into N.T. times. According to the Talmud, Neh. viii. 8 means, “They read in the book of the law” (i.e. the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch), “distinctly”, which would

involve translating and interpreting it in the Chaldee paraphrase. "Gave the sense" is more correctly translated "divided the sentences", the first attempt to break the books up into chapters and verses. "Caused them to understand the reading", i.e., gave the traditional pronunciation of the words, which were then without the vowel points.

This brings us to the close of the O.T. After the solemn gathering recorded in Neh. viii. there were but three more books to be written before the prophetic gift ceased in Israel: These were the prophecies of Haggai, Zephaniah and Malachi. The date of the last-named is about 370B.C., and so about 30 years after the restoration under Ezra. Malachi is called by the Rabbis, "The Seal of the Prophets", and from his day the Jew has given his life rather than add to or take away one book or portion of the sacred scriptures entrusted to him.

Owing to the nature of the meetings addressed, we cannot enter into highly technical arguments, as, for example, the witness of the Samaritan Pentateuch, or the extreme value of the Septuagint translation. Such studies belong to the class-room rather than the pulpit, and are incorporated in the Correspondence Courses of Study now in preparation. We trust, however, that enough has been advanced to show the provision made by the Lord for the sacred custody of His Holy Word, and it is a fact to be remembered, that while Israel have been charged with breaking practically every commandment of their law, never has the charge been made against them of tampering with the sacred Scriptures entrusted to them. "Moses", in whom they "trusted", might indeed condemn them (John v. 46) and the Messiah, of Whom Moses wrote, might be rejected by them; they may have overlaid the law with their traditions and so have smothered its teaching, but with a zeal that bordered upon fanaticism, this same people preserved intact the O.T. scriptures and passed them on to the N.T. church.

It will doubtless be realized that during the first six months in which the main theme of our London witness has been the inspiration of the Scriptures, we have looked at many aspects of this doctrine which it has not been possible to touch upon in these six short papers. Nevertheless we believe our readers and supporters will have been pleased or encouraged to share with us a little of the matter of the oral ministry thus given.

#7. “Foundation Day”, 26th May, 1945.
A summary of two addresses given by the Principal.
pp. 73 - 75

“Something new” will always catch the ear, but a good preacher can invest the most orthodox of subjects with all the interest of the heterodox if he knows his business. This standard we shall most certainly aim at when we have the joy and privilege of training others to take their place among the ranks of those who have been found “apt to teach” (II Tim. ii. 2, 24); it is fitting, therefore, that the speaker to-day should live up to this searching test. With four such themes as the basic tenets of the *Berean Forward Movement* to be dealt with in two short meetings, there will be little or no room for anything more than a statement of the truths involved; nevertheless, even though most, if not all, assembled on this occasion believe and know quite intimately these precious doctrines, they must be re-stated this day as though they were being propounded for the first time, or defended against opposition.

Without subscribing to any existing creed, it is very evident to all who know *The Berean Expositor* and those concerned with its production, that we have most definite views concerning the doctrines contained in the Scriptures, and these doctrines have been maintained, by the grace of God, since *The Berean Expositor* was first published in 1909, and it is hoped that they will continue to be maintained until faith is exchanged for sight.

On a number of occasions Paul makes it manifest that he had a great aversion to labouring “in vain”, and enjoined upon Timothy to have “a form of sound words” which he had heard of the Apostle. When, therefore, the *Berean Forward Movement* was instituted it became necessary to state and include in a Deed of Trust the basic doctrines of such Movement, so that the work inaugurated should continue, and the labour already expended should be fruitful.

The simplest basis was sought, and it was felt that this must include statements concerning *The Word* and *The Lord*. Consequently the Inspiration of all Scripture, and the Deity of Christ were set down as fundamental. It was then realized that the great *work* of Christ must be included, and so His One Sacrifice for sin was added. These it was felt would prove sufficient, and not impose shackles upon those who follow. It was however realized that there were many Protestant and other Societies that would endorse these three doctrines, but who would not subscribe to the central feature of our Witness, namely, the subject of Dispensational Truth; therefore it was considered essential that the Principle of “Right Division” should be included.

Our doctrinal basis therefore is fourfold:--

- (1) Full inspiration of the Scriptures.
- (2) Right division of the Scriptures.
- (3) The Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.
- (4) All sufficiency of His one Sacrifice.

These basic tenets were included in the Deed of Trust, but as is well known, Deeds of Trust do not implement themselves. Unless Trustees are faithful, and unless the company of believers constituting the Movement are made aware of them, it is possible for such tenets, in the course of time, to become a dead letter. They may be “safe” in the Black box in which they are kept, but they may also be “dead and buried” therein.

With this in mind it was deemed desirable that:

- (a) From time to time the foregoing basic doctrines be brought prominently before those constituting the Movement, at what is to be known as “Foundation Day” Meetings, to be held on the last Saturday in May each year. These to take the place of the old Annual Meetings.
- (b) Whoever should speak at these Meetings, their subject must be one or more of the four basic doctrines or their interrelationship.
- (c) At the first of these gatherings it was considered fitting that the Principal should be the sole speaker, and deal with all four basic doctrines, two in the afternoon, and two in the evening.

For the afternoon, the Inspiration and Right Division of Scripture was the theme, and in the evening The Deity of Christ and His One Sacrifice were dealt with.

It was pointed out that the Inspiration and Right Division of the Scripture were really inseparable. Both are maintained in one epistle, namely in II Tim. iii. 16 and II Tim. ii. 15, and *all* Scripture cannot be accepted as true unless Right Division is applied. This will be demonstrated presently. First, however, let us present the case for the Inspiration of Scripture.

Three passages provide all that we need at the moment, II Tim. iii. 16; II Pet. i. 19-21; and John xvii. 8, 14, 17. They are as follows:

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

“Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation (or, of its own unfolding); for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (II Pet. i. 19-21).

“I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me” (John xvii. 8).

“I have given them Thy word” (John xvii. 14).

“Thy word is truth” (John xvii. 17).

It is noteworthy that both Paul and Peter wrote the above words in view of imminent martyrdom, even as John xvii. is uttered in view of the approaching death on the cross. This adds to the solemnity of the utterances, and the obligation under which such passages place all believers.

“Right Division” is a basic principle of interpretation. The meaning of the term is best understood by consulting Prov. iii. 6, where the Septuagint reads “He shall rightly divide thy paths”. Full acceptance of inspiration is jeopardized where right division is not observed. For example, Exod. xii. 14, 15 declares that “that soul shall be cut off from Israel” who fails to observe the law concerning unleavened bread, and the

commandment to keep the Sabbath day holy, which was enforced even by the death penalty (Numb. xv. 32-36), cannot be correctly understood in the light of such passages as Rom. xiv. 5, 6, or Col. ii. 16 unless the distinction between dispensations is observed.

Our Lord's recognition of the principle of right division is clearly seen in Luke iv. 16-21, where He stopped short in the quotation of Isa. lxi. 1, 2 because of the two time periods found in that passage. The two commands "Go not" of Matt. x. 5 and "Go ye" of Matt. xxviii. 19 only makes sense if right division is observed. Mark xvi. 17 declares that "these signs *shall* (not may) follow them that believe", and apart from right division it is difficult to see how believers *to-day* can have any assurance of their salvation. The scientific student as he observes the strata of the earth, the composition of the chalk cliffs, the coal deposits, the fossils embedded in the rocks, is stumbled by the teaching that creation took place in six days some six thousand years ago; indeed, Hugh Miller was driven to suicide by conflicting loyalties, yet the observation of right division allows the Scriptures to be implicitly believed and accepted.

Other matters like the use of the Lord's prayer, the special word translated "daily" in that prayer, and the specific meaning of the "temptation" for which deliverance is sought, are discoverable when Kingdom is distinguished from Church and the prayer seen in the light of the book of the Revelation.

In the evening the subjects were The Deity of Christ and the meaning of the Atonement.

Deity of Christ, and the meaning of the Atonement.
pp. 75 - 78

Before attempting to speak on these momentous themes, a word or two concerning "God" is called for. What do we know of "God" as He is *in Himself*? The answer must be "Nothing". Every title He has assumed has been for our sakes. Every manifestation has been a condescension, every name a limitation. God absolutely and unconditioned is unknown and unknowable by finite beings. When we read "God is spirit" we have a statement of fact which we can believe, but what do we know of life that is pure spirit? What are its modes? How can a "Person" be everywhere at once? What can we know of that order of being that is invisible, inaudible, intangible, infinite? If God reveals Himself under the title "I AM"—just what do we understand? Is there not the tendency on our part to reply, "I am what"? The name Jehovah which is adopted by God as His name for the age, is used repeatedly of Christ in the New Testament. He, too, at times claims the title "I AM", as for example in John viii. 58, 59, and answers to the unspoken cry of our nature when confronted with the title, by filling it out in such claims as "I AM the bread of life", "I AM the light of the world", etc. In other words, Christ is God stepping down from the unconditioned into the realm of manifestation.

The Universe falls into two categories: (1) The Creator; (2) The Creature. Christ must be one or the other. Scripture affirms that Christ is the Creator (John i.; Col. i.; Heb. i.). The Universe falls into two categories: (1) All that is God; (2) All that is not

God. Christ must be one or the other. Scripture affirms that He is God (John i.; Heb. i.; Rom. ix.). In Chapters i. and vi. of the first epistle to Timothy, God is said to be “invisible”, and that the mystery of godliness is that “God manifest in the flesh” (I Tim. iii. 16).

It is taught in Matt. xi. 27 that the Father is knowable, for it is the office of the Son to reveal Him, but the Son is inscrutable, “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father”, and the words “and He to whomsoever the Father will reveal Him” do not follow. Even Matt. xvi. 16, 17 does not reveal the nature of the Son.

The Old Testament is intensely monotheistic, not only in affirming that God is One, but by such repeated statements as characterize such a passage as Isa. xlv.

“I am the Lord, and there is none else, *there is no God beside Me*” (verse 5).

“For thus saith the Lord that created heavens. God Himself *I am the Lord; and there is none else*” (verse 18).

“There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour: *there is none beside Me*” (verse 21).

“Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and *there is none else*” (verse 22).

To any one that believes the Scriptures to be the inspired Word of God the above statements must be taken implicitly, without alteration or reserve—and they must be taken together with all that the context teaches. The near context says:

“I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of My mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto Me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear” (Isa. xlv. 23).

If there is anything that is plain in this passage it is this, that to the One God, the Creator, the Saviour, to Him Who is God alone, with none beside Him, “every knee shall bow”. Paul as a Jew and as a Pharisee knew this, and held it tenaciously. As an Apostle he knew it and taught it, writing in Romans:

“For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to God” (Rom. xiv. 11).

Does he throw this blessed revelation to the winds then when he wrote to the Philippians, or does he recognize in “Jesus”, God manifest in the flesh?

“That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil. ii. 10, 11).

The Father is God, but so also must the Son be to justify this application of such a passage as that of Isa. xlv. The confusion of the titles “Father” and “Son” with the Being of the Absolute and Unconditioned God is the fruitful source of all the objections made to the Deity of Christ. Humanly devised creeds have taken the place of Scripture

statements, transcendental philosophy mistaken for Scripture truth, to the confusion of the believer and the mutilation of truth.

Just as we saw that the inspiration of Scripture is linked with the principle of right division, so we see that the Deity of Christ is linked with His sacrifice for sin. The three passages which we have already referred to in answer to the question “Does Scripture give the title ‘God’ or ‘Creator’ to Christ?” indicate the link that there is between His Person and His Sacrificial Work.

John i. -	“God” . . .	“Made all things” . . . “Made flesh . . . the Lamb of God.”
Heb. i. -	“God” . . .	“Earth and heavens . . . Thine hands” . . . “Flesh and blood” (Heb. ii. 14, 15).
Col. i. -	“Image of Invisible God” . . .	Created all things” . . . “The body of His flesh through death”.

Confining ourselves for the present to one great aspect of the Sacrifice for sin we look at the Atonement. The word so translated in the O.T. is the Hebrew *kopher*, and its primitive meaning is “to cover”. Such words as “A cloud”, “A hand”, “A spoon”, “A cave”, anything over-arching or hollow, are translations of this word or its derivatives. It means also “a village”, obviously a covering or a “roof over one’s head”, and survives in the N.T. name *Capernaum*, “the *village* of Naum”. While atonement means to “cover”, it does not mean “to cover up”, for it is written, “He that covereth his sins shall not prosper” (Prov. xxviii. 13) even though Psalm xxxii. 1 speaks of the blessedness of the man whose sins are “covered”. The fact that the law permitted the penalty to be commuted (Exod. xxi. 30, xxx. 12, Numb. xxxv. 31, 32) prepared the way for the glorious *commutation of the cross*.

Among the essentials for a scriptural atonement we must instance two particularly:

- (1) The shedding of blood. Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 22.
- (2) The Offering must be “perfect”. Lev. xxii. 19, 20.

This essential place of the shedding of blood is carried over into New Testament doctrine. It is the basis of Justification (Rom. iii. 23-26); Sanctification (Heb. ix. 13, 14); Forgiveness (Col. i. 14); Presentation (Col. i. 22); and Cleansing (I John i. 7, 9).

The passage of Scripture which was read at the meeting brings the Deity of Christ and His Sacrifice close together:

“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Titus ii. 13, 14).

From earliest days, Preachers, Teachers and Students have exercised themselves in the endeavour to frame some definition of the Atonement that will give it its Scriptural place

in the Divine purpose. With great diffidence the following was submitted to the Meeting as a beginning, with the hope that at subsequent Meetings the various features could be taken up individually and the definition clarified thereby:

The atonement is an expedient introduced into the Divine moral government, devised by infinite wisdom, to satisfy both the righteousness and the love of God in the forgiveness and salvation of the sinner who believes the gospel.

This atonement consists of the Substitutionary Sacrifice of Christ, bearing our sins in His Own body on the tree, and through the shedding of His precious blood a ransom has been found, satisfaction made, reconciliation accomplished, justification, sanctification, forgiveness, life and peace for ever assured.

The atonement thus made provides a ground upon which a holy God can meet a sinner in grace and mercy, without in the slightest degree compromising the throne of His holiness, or doing dishonour to His holy law.

It is of the very essence of this atonement that its benefits should be freely bestowed and freely received, without merit or legal works on the part of the sinner thus saved. It is by grace through faith alone.

At future "Foundation Day" Meetings, every one of these terms used in the attempted definition could be examined. What is Substitution? Sacrifice? Satisfaction? What is meant by the "necessity" of the atonement? What is meant by "A ground upon which a holy God can meet a sinner in grace and mercy"? What is meant by "An expedient introduced into the Divine moral government"? and so with every feature both of this, and of the other three basic doctrines of the Trust.

In conclusion we print a comment upon the first Foundation Day Meetings received from a friend who was present:

"On Saturday, 26th May, the first Foundation Day Meetings of the Chapel of the Opened Book were held, and proved to be of an auspicious character.

In reviewing the circumstances leading up to the establishment of this witness, the individual details are prosaic enough, but their cumulative effect reveals a sure guidance of the hand of God which is very heartening in a day when 'there is no open vision'. Their ultimate effect may even prove historical.

It is the more remarkable that it was the outcome, not of a single mind or purpose, but born of a latent desire on the part of many widely scattered people who, seeking for the truth, found it, and finding it desired to spread it to an ever widening circle of seekers, so that in a day when counsel is darkened and confusion tends to bewilder the minds of men, a beacon has been lit by which to steer in the aftermath of the storm that is past and the storms already appearing."

#8. A synopsis of a year's testimony. pp. 131 - 134

After the initial testimony, covering the first six months' witness at the Chapel of the Opened Book, summarized in the preceding articles of this series, our next step was to seek some acquaintance with the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the GOD Who gave them, and MAN to whom they were given.

We traversed much the same ground as has been covered under the headings "This God is our God" (Volumes XXII-XXV), and "Fruits of Fundamental Studies" (Volume XXVII and onward), the early articles on Genesis in "Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth" and "What is Man?" (Volume XIX). We do not therefore propose repeating the substance of these addresses here, as, although they were presented in very different form from the articles referred to, and many points given but passing attention were elaborated with fuller detail in the pulpit; in the main, the conclusions were very similar.

The addresses upon the Being and Attributes of God were prefaced by a reminder from Job xi. 7 where we read: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" We realized that no title of God, or all His titles put together, could fully reveal to man the nature and being of God, Who is Spirit, Who is Infinite, Who is Absolute and Unconditioned. We realized that God must stoop down out of the Absolute and Unconditioned, into the realm of the Relative and the Manifest, where He comes into touch with limited and conditioned man. We did recognize with much joy that, great as are the titles and names assumed by God in making Himself known under the Old Covenant, the goal of the ages, as well as the crowning glory of all His titles and manifestations, is to be sought for in the New Covenant name of "Father".

As our studies proceeded it became obvious that if we were to appreciate in any sense of reality the nature and being of God, we should have to follow this series of addresses with another, which sought a scriptural answer to the question, "What is man?" We found that man was made, "for a little", lower than the angels; that his very name "Adam" suggests his prime purpose in the scheme of the ages, allied as it is to the word translated "likeness" in the verse where "Adam" is first mentioned in the original (Gen. i. 26), and we found much to encourage us as we realized that the first Adam, who was of the earth, earthy, was a "shadow", a "figure", of Him that was to come.

The nature of the soul and the unscriptural dogma "The immortality of the soul" were naturally included in this series, but, as time went on, the demand grew more insistent for some Divinely appointed bridge, some living link, that could span the gap between the Creator and His creatures; between Man, the sinner, and a God, too pure to look upon iniquity. Consequently the third section of the new series of addresses dealt with the need for, and the provision of, "The One Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus".

The opening addresses of this new series dealt with the three-fold promise of a “Seed”.

- (1) The SEED of the woman who should bruise the serpent’s head.
- (2) The SEED of Abraham, limiting the channel of this promise to Israel, and revealing both the place that Israel must play in the outworking of the purpose of mercy, and also revealing the evangel that was “preached before unto Abraham”.
- (3) The SEED of David, with its emphasis upon crown and throne, and also in the light of New Testament references to the foreknown sufferings and resurrection that would precede His accession and reign.

This threefold promise finds a threefold fulfillment in the opening of the New Testament.

- (1) *“Time” was fulfilled.*—The testimony of prophecy was examined, the historical references of Luke ii. 1, 2; iii. 1, 2 scrutinized, the fact of Gal. iv. 4 realized, and the testimony of Mark i. 15 noted.
- (2) *“Place” was fulfilled.*—Both the birth-place of Bethlehem and the upbringing at Nazareth fulfilled the prophets.
- (3) *“Person” was fulfilled.*—Matthew and Luke give us two genealogies. One going back through Solomon to David and Abraham, the other going back through Nathan to David, Abraham and Adam. Matthew’s was seen to be the direct genealogy of Joseph the husband of Mary, Luke’s the line of Mary herself, her husband being the son-in-law, or legal son of his wife’s father. The appearance in both genealogies of Salathiel and Zorobabel (Matt. i. 12 and Luke iii. 27), suggesting a marriage between the Solomonic and Nathanic lines, was noted.

This threefold cord of evidence is supplemented by,

- (4) *The authority of His word as the “Sent One”.*—He spoke with authority and not as the Scribes, and eight times in John’s Gospel He declared that the doctrine and the words He spoke were not His but the Father’s that sent Him.
- (5) This authority is supplemented by the working of miracles, which were not only wonders and mighty works, but signs. The Lord appealed to these miracles, saying “believe Me for the very works’ sake” (John x. 38).
- (6) Yet in spite of the fact that the fullness of time had come, and that Time, Place and Person all adhered; in spite of words of authority and miracles without precedent, the shadow of rejection is seen in Matt. xi., and becomes more pronounced as “parable” and “mystery” are introduced in Matt. xiii.
- (7) This led us to the great prophecy of the second coming, Matt. xxiv., the very fact of there being a “second time” speaking of original rejection, as in the typical cases of Joseph and Moses (Acts vii. 13 and 35).

The crucifixion of the Saviour was viewed from the twofold aspects of Acts ii. 23: (1) “Delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God”, and (2) “Taken by wicked hands, crucified and slain”. “The last word” (Prov. xvi. 1-4, literal rendering) however is always with the Lord, and His last word is seen in operation when He raised the Lord from the dead.

In the Gospels the historic facts of the crucifixion and of the resurrection are given, but it is reserved for the succeeding speeches of the Acts and the doctrine of the epistles to show their true significance.

At the close of the Gospels we meet with the Commissions, the Lord appointing His representatives, and giving them their orders, before His departure. These commissions are found in each Gospel.

(1) “All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even till the consummation of the age” (Matt. xxviii. 18-20).

This commission belongs especially to the kingdom, and is addressed to all nations. The words “gospel” and “preach” are not employed. However, with the setting aside of Israel at Acts xxviii. this proclamation awaits the time of the end, and the presence of the Lord is assured to those who make the proclamation “all the days until the *sunteleia* of the age”.

(2) “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following” (Mark xvi. 15-20).

This commission we are assured was fulfilled. The miraculous signs did follow. They persist throughout the Acts of the Apostles to the last chapter, being found in full operation in the churches of Corinth and Rome, while reference to them is found in Galatians, and Hebrews.

(3) “Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of My Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high” (Luke xxiv. 47-49).

This commission is repeated in Acts i., and is partly fulfilled in the Acts of the Apostles. It is Pentecostal in character and scope.

(4) “When the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning” (John xv. 26, 27).

Matthias fulfilled the condition here specified, and was numbered with the Apostles (Acts i. 22-26). Pentecost fulfilled the promise of the Comforter, but John’s Gospel has a place in the purpose of grace that occupies the period from the destruction of Israel’s city to the second coming, during which the highways and byways are searched, and the wedding of the King’s son furnished with guests.

One other commission awaits investigation, that given to Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, but he was not called until, once again, rejection cast its shadow over the scene and the failure of Israel to repent, even after the second invitation, was evident.

The future ministry of The Chapel of the Opened Book will be largely occupied with considering the distinctions that must be observed between the various commissions, but will give particular attention to the commission and calling of the apostle Paul because of the close relationship between the present dispensation and that last of all the commissions, and the only one given by the *ascended* Christ, after all His earthly ministry had been fulfilled.

**#9. “Go ye and learn what that meaneth,
I will have mercy and not sacrifice” (Matt. ix. 13).
pp. 149 - 153**

Is there a danger in stressing the believer’s full acceptance in the sacrifice of Christ? Is there a danger in emphasizing that salvation is “not of works”? There is, if truth be not presented in all its fullness. We must, however, refrain from putting out our hand to stay the ark of God. We must not minimize by one iota either the completeness of redemption or the believer’s inability to provide the least contribution towards his acceptance. Moreover, if we see a believer taking an advantage of grace in that he assumes that one’s “manner of life” is of no importance, we must yet be watchful that, in stressing his responsibility, we neither reintroduce the fetters that redemption has for ever broken, nor preach the once-offered Sacrifice with any reservations.

It is evident from the objection raised in Rom. vi. 1 that the Apostle had so preached “grace without works” as to make it possible for the objection to be laid, “Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?” but we do not find in that chapter any attempt on the part of the Apostle to minimize the completeness of the offering of Christ. First, he meets the objection with a vigorous, “God forbid!” and then proceeds to show that every one that has accepted Christ as Sacrifice and Saviour, does so not only as if Christ had accomplished an objective work done on his behalf, but as if it is a work with which he must be identified, his language being, “How shall I that am dead to sin, live any longer therein?” (Rom. vi. 2). In the subsequent argument of the chapter, it is clearly stated that “His servants ye are to whom ye obey”, and that those who have been made “free from sin”, instead of receiving license to spend their blood-bought liberty in the pleasing of self, are free so that they may become “the servants of righteousness”. It is therefore untrue to assume that he who preaches the basic doctrine of the One Sacrifice for sin is not alive to the moral issues that must arise therefrom.

Our thoughts have been directed to this aspect of truth by having to deal with the problems relative to the Mosaic law of Sacrifice and Offering which certain passages in the Psalms and the Prophets create. It is easy to lift out and regard as sweeping statements such words as “Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not”, or “Incense is an abomination” and so conclude that the whole system of sacrifice was thereby set aside, and that nothing more was demanded of any man than that he “walk humbly” with His

God. But such an attitude of mind is, to say the least, illogical, for it not only sets aside the Mosaic law of Sacrifice, but also the bulk of the teaching of the N.T., completely emptying Paul's epistles of any meaning.

No one acquainted with the teaching of the Lord in the Gospels, or of Paul, Peter and John in their Epistles, could hesitate to admit that the Sacrifice of Christ was held to be fundamental to salvation, and that this One Offering did most truly endorse and fulfil all that had been foreshadowed in the ritual sacrifices of the Old Covenant. In view of the reiterated statement that Christ came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, it is not possible to believe that those self-same prophets did indeed set aside the supreme purpose for which "a body" had been "prepared" for Him.

This being so, it is highly probable that those who see any divergence between the Law and the Prophets in this matter of sacrifice for sin, have not only misunderstood the meaning of the prophet, but have equally misunderstood the law of sacrifice itself. If it be conceived that a sinner under the law could, as it were, obtain an indulgence for any sin and get off scot free by hiding behind a mere ceremonial, then Luther's burning indignation against the notorious licences of Tetzl should have been directed to the more fatal licence inculcated by Moses! Such a conclusion carries with it its own refutation, but though writer and reader be at one over the matter, the subject is of such importance that an examination of the passages found in the Psalms and in the Prophets that appear to militate against the law of sacrifice seems desirable, and to this we now apply ourselves.

When David was convicted of sin and realized that no sacrifice provided by the law could give him peace, he exclaimed:

"Thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise" (Psa. li. 16, 17).

Nevertheless, so far removed from David's thoughts was it that the Mosaic sacrifices were rendered null and void, that he goes on to say that when Israel are restored; when the walls of Jerusalem are rebuilt; "Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering and whole burnt offering; then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine altar" (Psa. li. 18, 19).

Again, a superficial reading of Psa. xl. 6, "Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire", might lead to the supposition that the law of sacrifice was set aside, but a reading of the context, and particularly the remote context of Heb. x., reveals that, instead of setting aside the law of sacrifice, this passage but demands its fuller and higher recognition. Commenting on this passage, Perowne says:

"We may perhaps paraphrase verses 5-8 as follows: My heart is full to overflowing with the thought of Thy goodness. How can I express, how can I acknowledge it? Once I should have thought sacrifices and offerings a proper and sufficient acknowledgment. Now, I feel how inadequate these are; for Thou hast taught me the truth; my deaf unwilling ears didst Thou open, that I might understand that a willing heart was the best

offering that I could render. Then, being taught of Thee, I said, Lo, I come, presenting myself before Thee, not with a dead and formal service, but with myself as a living sacrifice.”

The tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews establishes two great truths regarding the doctrine of sacrifice.

- (1) That the sacrifices offered under the law, together with its promises, were “shadows” of good things to come: and
- (2) That these “shadows” find their substance and fulfillment, not in the repentance of the sinner, but in “the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. x. 10).

Yet once more, Psa. l. 8 has been similarly misconstrued:

“I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt offerings, to have been continually before Me.”

In these words God was not repudiating the Mosaic system but, as Perowne comments:

“The reason for this act of judgment is given first negatively. It is not because the people neglected the externals of the law, or had forgotten to offer the sacrifices appointed by the law. They had brought them; but they had brought them as if the act were everything, and as if the meaning of the act, and the spirit in which it was done, were nothing. But God demands no service for its own sake (the cattle upon a thousand hills were His), but as an expression of an obedient will. A thankful heart is more than all burnt offerings.”

It is in the light of such passages that we must read:

“To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto Me” (Isa. i. 11-13).

These words were spoken to a people who could be likened to Sodom and Gomorrha, whose prayers were rejected because the hands that were spread out to God were “full of blood”. Such were enjoined to wash and make themselves clean; to put away the evil of their doings; to cease to do evil; to learn to do well. If the sacrificial system had been devised to make “the mere ceremonial act an easy means of blotting out the moral offence, iniquity would have been established by the law. The moral sense of the nation would have been enfeebled” (*Patrick Fairbairn, D.D.*).

Similarly, we must read another such passage in Jeremiah:

“I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices” (Jer. vii. 22).

A superficial reading of such a passage creates a contradiction; it sets the Prophets over against the Law. But, while it is true that when the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt nothing was indeed said of burnt offering and sacrifice, the system was introduced later

when Israel made it clear by their worship of the golden calf that they would never attain to righteousness by the keeping of the law of Sinai.

Earlier in Jer. vii. we have the ominous repetition “The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord” (Jer. vii. 4), reiteration that savours more of the idolatrous repetition of the worshippers of Diana at Ephesus than of worship of the true God. In this connection it is noteworthy that the structure of Acts xix. 21 - xxi. 39, given in Volume XXX, page 98, places the “uproar” at the temple of Diana in correspondence with the “tumult” at the temple of Jerusalem, reducing the temple at Jerusalem to the level of that of Ephesus, and showing the force of the Lord’s words when He said “Your” house is left unto you desolate.

It was to those who used mere ceremonial as a screen for iniquity that the prophets so spoke. It is in the light of such moral necessity that we must interpret the words of Hosea: “I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings” (Hosea vi. 6).

On two occasions the Saviour used these words to correct a ceremonial and mechanical use of the law of sacrifice:

“But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Matt. ix. 13).

“But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless” (Matt. xii. 7).

It is only by the context that we can gather what this text “means”. It is in contrast with the narrow self-righteousness that would rather elevate and enlarge the law that prohibited certain occasions of fellowship with Gentiles, than see a poor outcast gathered into the fold of salvation. It was quoted in direct opposition to that narrow scrupulosity that condemned the disciples for plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath and elevated the unfeeling tradition of the Elders above the spirit of mercy resident in the law.

We, too, must learn what this twice-quoted passage from Hosea “meaneth”. We must not read it, “I will have mercy, *and not sacrifice*”, as though sacrifice was repudiated. The words *kai ou*, “and not”, denote a “comparative negative”, as for example, “Rend your hearts, and not your garments”, or as the parallelism of Prov. viii. 10 makes clear: “Receive my instruction, *and not silver*; and knowledge *rather than* choice gold”, for the Lord did not say that the Pharisees *should not* tithe “mint and anise and cumin”; these He said should not be left undone, but to omit the weightier matters of the law, such as “judgment, mercy, and faith” was to empty the law of its true “meaning” (Matt. xxiii. 23).

With such correctives ministered by the Psalmist, the Prophets and the Saviour, we can and should realize that the Mosaic sacrificial system was a divinely given, typical foreshadowing of the one great Sacrifice offered by the Lord, which indeed was no mere ceremonial, but involved the identification of the believer both with his Substitute’s death to sin, and in newness of life to God. The sacrifices of the law never touched the conscience; they were but shadows, but on the other hand they gave no premium to sin,

and were only truly offered when the offerer was conscious of his guilt and felt a need both of a Deliverer and the moral necessity of repentance; a repentance that not only turned from the sin committed, but turn the heart toward the God Who had been so grievously offended.

A fitting conclusion would be a prayerful reading of Psalm li. in its entirety, observing the Psalmist's consciousness of sin, his inability to provide any sacrifice that could meet his dire need, the desire for cleansing within, the desire for restoration and usefulness, and the complete endorsement, after all has been said, of the very sacrificial system which at first appears to be refuted and obsolete.

The Self-Drawn Portrait of the Apostle Paul.

#7. Separate Features: Dread of Officious Interference. pp. 11, 12

“Here we see that dread of officious interference which led him to shrink from ‘building on another man’s foundation’, that delicacy which shows itself in his appeal to Philemon, whom he might have commanded, ‘yet for love’s sake rather beseeching him, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ’, and which is even more striking in some of his farewell greetings, as for instance when he bids the Romans ‘Salute Rufus, and his mother, who is also mine’.” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

Paul’s dread of officious interference is but the other side of the delicacy of his nature, and just as in the features of the face, it is scarcely possible to describe but one, and not both, eyes, so we have found it difficult to speak of one side of the Apostle’s nature without the other.

Shakespeare speaks of:

“Man, proud man,
Drest in a little, brief, authority,
Most ignorant of what he’s most assured.”

and more or less most of us have suffered at the hands of officialdom. Who among us thinks kindly of “red-tape”, or who could associate such a term with the Apostle Paul? The generosity which marked him we considered in our last article. It enable him to be made all things to all men, and rendered him alike intolerant of officiousness, red-tape and the narrow rut of smaller minds.

He was an apostle, not one whit behind the chiefest of the apostles, yet, so far was he removed from the “official” in his high office, that he laboured with his hands, and refused Corinthian gold. The Apostle “magnified his office” without magnifying himself. His sensitiveness and delicacy, and his lack of official interference comes out very prominently when he is dealing with the financial affairs of the churches. Writing to the Corinthians concerning the much-desired collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem, the Apostle said:

“I speak not by commandment, but by occasion of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sincerity of your love” (II Cor. viii. 8).

A perfectly free hand was given to the Corinthian church in choosing those who should go with the Apostle to Jerusalem:

“And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem. And if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with me” (I Cor. xvi. 3, 4).

Here we see the Apostle practicing what he preached, “providing things honest in the sight of all men” (Rom. xii. 17).

“Provide for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men” (II Cor. viii. 21).

Oftentimes a curious mentality is displayed by believers in connection with Christian financial matters. Some very much resent giving a receipt, others refuse an audit, but what to such appears most officious, would to the Apostle appear to be nothing but what is decent, and so it seems to us.

The Apostle not only refrained from officiousness in financial affairs, but even in matters of faith and practice, where one might have expected the full exercise of authority, even there we discern the true inward greatness of this man of God.

“Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy” (II Cor. i. 24).
“Who then is Paul and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man” (I Cor. iii. 5).

The salutations of Paul at the close of his epistles reveal much as to the Apostle’s character. He forgets none: He mentions all by name. He gives wherever possible some characteristic epithet; where he cannot praise he says nothing. Greetings are sent to Priscilla and Aquila, with a warm recollection of their love for him that puts the whole church in their debt (Rom. xvi. 3, 4). Epænetus is called “well beloved” and is “firstfruits of Achaia in Christ” (Rom. xvi. 5). So, too, “Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us”.

The Apostle is always more reserved in his references to sisters in Christ. No endearing term is used in this letter when he greets this sister in the Lord. This does not indicate that she was not as “well beloved” as Epænetus, but in the case of sisters the Apostle does not use such terms publicly. So we go down the list in this closing chapter. Persis is a woman’s name, and the Apostle has circumvented the difficulty by saying, “Salute *the* beloved Persis”, not “*my* beloved”, so rendering the epithet less personal.

In Col. iv. the Apostle mentions a number of those who had helped him in the ministry. Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus are named, with many an endearing remark. Special consideration is given to Marcus, sister’s son to Barnabas (Col. iv. 10), as though the Apostle would remove the memory of the dissension that arose over him in the early days of his ministry. Jesus, Justus, Epaphras and Luke (Col. iv. 11-14) all receive some commendation. This only makes the words, “and Demas”, stand out the more from the rest. It is evident that Paul’s delicacy of feeling, his sensitiveness to the slights made upon him by others, would, had it been possible, have prevented any omission of favourable remark in the case of Demas. Clearly the defection of Demas, which he sorrowfully records as a fact in II Tim. iv. 10, already manifested itself to the Apostle’s discerning eye. He could say nothing good of Demas, but he would say nothing ill—all he could say, and did say, was, “and Demas”. In this he followed the Lord, who endured

the presence of Judas without ever hinting to the rest of the disciples a word as to his true character.

Fervid patriotism, hot indignation, fearless independence, delicate sensitiveness, these are some of the elements that went to make up the personality of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

#8. Separate Features: Fear of evil appearance. pp. 43 - 45

“Here we see that scrupulous fear of evil appearance which ‘would not eat any man’s bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that he might not be chargeable to any of them’.” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

There were three orders in the Sanhedrin. The Priests, the Elders and the Scribes. Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin, and therefore could not have been a priest, and as he was a young man neither could he have been an elder. Most evidently he was a scribe, for he knew the scriptures, at least in the letter. By his own confession he was also a Pharisee.

The very expression “Scribes and Pharisees” calls up all that is petty and mean. Dean Farrar thus comments on the words, “He lived a Pharisee”:-

“We know well the kind of life which lies behind that expression. We know the minute and intense scrupulosity of Sabbath Observance wasting itself in all those *abhoth* and *toldoth*—those primary and derivative rules and prohibitions, and inferences from rules and prohibitions, and combinations of inferences from rules and prohibitions, and cases of casuistry and conscience arising out of the infinite possible variety of circumstances to which those combinations might apply.”

As a Pharisee Paul had therefore known the minutiae of thought and action involved in this system. But Paul, the Apostle, exulted in the liberty wherewith Christ had set him free, and, apart from grace abounding, such a swing of the pendulum might have led to licence and disregard for appearances. While this was not the case, the fact that Paul was under no bondage and that he would not tolerate the placing of fetters on the believer is evident from all his epistles. He who was once the scrupulous Pharisee, writes:

“One believeth that he may eat *all* things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind” (Rom. xiv. 2-5).

A man not so fully actuated by grace would have flaunted this new-found freedom in the face of his fellows. He would have sought to show his liberty by outraging convention; he would have imagined effrontery to be synonymous with principle, and that to ride roughshod over the scruples of others was evidence of superior strength. Such behaviour however does not result from a knowledge of the truth. The man who

reminds the whole household that he is Master is usually far from being so. The man most easy to be entreated is usually the strong man. The man who can bear with the scruples and foibles of others is usually one who himself is so far above such scruples that he can afford to stoop without fear of the charge of compromise. A good example of this is found in Acts xv., xvi. From Gal. ii. 3, as well as from Acts xv., we realize that the key to the conflict was the circumcision of the Gentile believer. Paul fought, and from his fight on this very point, came away from Jerusalem in triumph. In Acts xvi., the very next chapter, we read that he circumcised Timothy. This act might have been the evidence of compromise in a smaller man, who would have been afraid of being misunderstood and would have entrenched himself in apparent consistency. But Paul's attitude is neither that of base compromise nor unbending, blind, external, consistency: it was the attitude of a man concerned not with petty triumphs but with eternal truth. Whether resistance to the imposition of circumcision in Acts xv. be demand for the truth's sake, or yielding to it be demanded for the same truth's sake, as recorded in Acts xvi., Paul had grace enough to put truth before apparent consistency, and for truth's sake was prepared to appear to throw away the hard-won victory of the preceding chapter.

This apostle, in all his strength, neither censures nor ridicules the weaker brother. He protects him; he even allows the "other man's conscience" (I Cor. x. 26-29) to be the deciding factor. Paul's scrupulous fear of evil appearance, therefore, was not the result of the fear of man, nor of slavish adherence to mere appearance, but of willingness, for love's sake, to give up and to yield; to be constricted where he might have been at large, so that the name of Christ should not be blasphemed; so that the weak brother should not be stumbled; so that all things might be done to the glory of God.

How splendid it is to say, "I refuse to be turned aside from the faith before me; I do all to the glory of God". How much more difficult, yet how much more Christ-like it is, still to press on to the one mark, "the glory of God", and at the same time to be able to respect the scruples of the weak, and endure without irritation the bigotry of the narrow minded. Yet nothing less than this is before us, as it was before the Apostle.

"Whether therefore ye eat, or drink" (and one must remember the arguments of chapters viii.-x. on this vexed question) "or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God, give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved" (I Cor. x. 31-33).

The many references to the Apostle's refusal to receive support during his ministry, because circumstances suggested that it would be misinterpreted, are doubtless known to the reader. If not, they should all be discovered and read, for the sake of the illumination they throw on this particular feature of the Apostle's portrait, without which some of his actions would be inexplicable. May we all rise above the petty scruples that are prompted by fear, yet, for love's sake, observe many from which we could be free were we willing to disregard the weaker believer.

#9. Separate Features: Refined Courtesy.

pp. 67 - 69

“Here we see that refined courtesy which cannot bring itself to blame till it has first praised, and which makes him deem it needful almost to apologize for the freedom of giving advice to those who were not personally known to him.” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

We have all met the man who boasts that he is “John Blunt”, but we have usually found that he has a “sharp” tongue. To “call a spade a spade” might appear to be the essence of frankness. It may however be the essence of grace to remember that “pity” enters into the attitude of the heavenly Father to His children; a remembrance of natural frailty and a desire so to administer needful correction that it shall contribute to the upbuilding rather than the overthrowing of the believer.

One of the first reasons why we should never speak with untempered censure is that, in the very nature of the case, we can never know all the facts or all the circumstances. Perhaps the proverbs, “To know all is to forgive all”, errs too much on the side of leniency, but if we would serve our brethren a recognition of the principle involved must ever be ours. Again, what is so cheap as “advice”. On every hand there are those who will tell one what one “ought to do”, but in most cases, such unsought and freely-offered advice is of little value. Advice that is real and helpful must usually be sought, and must often be paid for. Now the Apostle, as the representative of Christ, might appear to be exempt from these limitations. Surely where censure is merited, Paul can give it without mitigation or preface! Surely, we might say that where Paul had the right to command, he would not apologize for advising! So we lesser folk might reason, but not so those most taught by grace. God Himself respects the image after which man was created. Sinful though man is, yet, so far as circumstances permit, he is a free moral agent. In the gospel of His grace, God Himself woos, pleads, invites. He Who is Lord of all says, “Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man open” and His ministers are more like Him when they “minister and are not ministered unto”.

Chapter after chapter in the first epistle to the Corinthians is devoted to rebuke and censure, for the Corinthians were divided, were partisan, were carnal, were immoral, were enslaved by unholy bonds, or boasting in unholy freedom, yet in spite of all this, the Apostle opens his epistle with the words, “I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ” (I Cor. i. 4). This is followed by a long series of rebukes. Again, in I Cor. xi. 2, we read, “Now I praise you, brethren”, but in verse 17 he follows on by saying, “Now in this that I declare unto you I praise you not”. And again, in verse 22, “What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not”.

In the same epistle the Apostle’s advice is sought on the question of marriage. Instead of laying down a law, he spends a long time in looking at the matter from various angles,

leaning to abstention from marriage “for the present necessity” (or distress) (I Cor. vii. 26), because of the then possibility of the Lord’s return. He prefaces his remarks with the words, “I speak this by permission, and not of commandment” (verse 6). And again, midway through his advice, he says, “now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment, as one that has obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful” (verse 25), and finally at the close he says, “But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the spirit of God” (verse 40).

By these concessions a lesser man than Paul would have so weakened his authority as to render his advice valueless. Paul’s magnanimity, however, was such that what he lost by right of command he more than gained by sympathy and affection. Where the Corinthians might have rebelled against hard and fast rules, they were persuaded that the Apostle had no designs upon them but sought their highest good.

After such a mighty revelation of truth as is contained in Rom. i.-xi., it is almost disconcerting to find the Apostle *beseeking* us to present our bodies as living sacrifices (Rom. xii. 1). Or, again, in Eph. iv., instead of demanding a worthy walk, the prisoner of the Lord *beseches* us to walk worthy. How clear a portrait we have of Paul in this respect when we read the letter he wrote to Philemon.

“Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient, yet for love’s sake I rather beseech thee, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ But without thy mind would I do nothing albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides. Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say” (Philemon 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21).

It looks as though the Apostle of the grace of God was a gracious person: that he who had received so much love and forbearance, showed love and forbearance: that in dealing with others, he who had known the burden of the law, avoided using terms of law, even when he had the right to command or to instruct. How few, O Paul, are thy successors!

#10. Separate Features: Self-denying Love. pp. 109, 110

“Here we see that self-denying love which ‘will eat no flesh while the world standeth lest he make his brother to offend’.” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

When, as dispensations change, gifts and graces pass away, Faith, Hope and Love remain. When the ages have reached their goal, faith and hope will find their fullest expression in love, which abides. Love is an all-pervading essence, too great, too manifold, too diverse, for the mind of man to grasp on this side of resurrection. In the Scriptures love is spoken of in terms of its outgoings rather than of its essence. One phase will be seen as faith, another as joy, yet another as righteousness. A man may have love for the Lord, for His Word, for His people, but, during this life, it may still be crippled, half fledged or baffled. The self-denying element of Christian love is that which is here brought before us. Paul expressed this quality in a remarkable way. He refrained from enjoying the highest liberties and fullest rights that the gospel of grace had brought him.

To you and to me, the question of whether we shall or shall not eat this or that is of little consequence. Years of bondage, ages of tradition, veneration of one’s elders, regard for the sanctity of Moses and his law, respect for the interpreters of that law, a fear of the damnation that followed the overstepping of its prohibitions (as expressed, for example, in the eating of certain prohibited foods), have never held us in check. To yield a point to the foolish scruples of a weak saint is easy. We do so with a good-humoured smile, and the matter is ended. Not so with Paul. As a Hebrew, as an Israelite, as a Pharisee, as a zealot for tradition, the question of clean and unclean meats was a vital one. It touched his nation’s peculiar sanctity. It involved his place in the covenant of the God of his fathers. Nothing but a miracle could have delivered Saul, the Hebrew, from the slavery of such scruples, and nothing but a miracle could have turned him into Paul the Champion of *Liberty*. Again and again, in Galatians, in Corinthians, in Colossians, Paul strikes the note of freedom. The observance of days; the question of meat offered to idols; the question as to whether such meat had been killed according to the rules of the Rabbis; from all such legal observances Paul stood gloriously free. And yet—and yet—he who was free; he who fought, as no one since has fought, for the perpetuation of that freedom to the Gentiles; he, the one whose boast it was that all things were now lawful, it is he that willingly circumscribes his blood-bought liberties. It is he who does not enter into all the opening avenues of freedom. He remembers that he had been set free by self-denying love, the love of Christ.

“Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother’s way. I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, *now walkest thou not according to love*. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died it is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak” (Rom. xiv. 13-15, 21).

Again in I Corinthians the Apostle writes:--

“All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not. Let no man seek his own, but every man another’s wealth. Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake, for the earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof but *if any man* say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not *for his sake* that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof. *Conscience, I say, not thine own*, but of the other not seeking mine own profit” (I Cor. x. 23-33).

How strange that the apostle of freedom should be the one to plead for self-imposed restrictions! He who knew that all things were lawful, voluntarily refrained from exercising his privileges. Yet it is not strange to those who have glimpsed the lodestar that ever drew the Apostle on. “The love of Christ constraineth me”, he said, and if love, then it must at times “deny itself” to justify itself. For love not only gives, but gives *itself*. It not only gives, but “spares not”.

Here, then, is another feature in the portrait of the man sent by the Lord to the Gentiles.

**#11. Separate Features:
Impatience of formalism, joined with forbearance.
pp. 159 - 161**

“Here we see that impatience of exclusive formalism with which he overwhelms the Judaizers of Galatia, joined with a forbearance so gentle for the innocent weakness of scrupulous conscience.” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

Impatience usually spells disaster, is a sign of weakness, and is scarcely Christian in its connections. Throughout his epistles the Apostle practices and preaches patience, yet it is no contradiction to speak of his impatience, as is done in the above quotation.

Can we not speak of the “impatience” of the God of all long-suffering, when He says in Isa. i. concerning Judah’s “exclusive formalism”:

“Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto Me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, *I cannot away with*; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts My soul hateth; they are a trouble unto Me; *I am weary to bear them*” (Isa. i. 13, 14).

This divine impatience is evident throughout the epistle to the Galatians. In the eyes of the Apostle, so intolerable are the inroads of the Judaizers that he is moved to indite the epistle in a manner altogether unusual for him. He omits to praise the Galatians for anything; he omits to thank God for them in any particular. So impatient is he to get at the root of the trouble, so intolerable does it appear that there should have been preached

“another gospel”, that he scarcely stops to say, Amen (verse 5) before plunging into the heart of the controversy.

“I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel” (Gal. i. 6).

For so doing, even an angel from heaven would merit his anathema. In his impatience with the exclusive formalism that would impose its empty ritual upon the Lord’s freemen Peter is withstood to the face and apostles are called “somewhats”.

“O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you” (Gal. iii. 1) he cries.

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

“After that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” (Gal. iv. 9).

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

“I would they were even cut off which trouble you” (Gal. v. 12).

Here is impatience that is to be envied.

“Such”, says Farrar, “was the epistle to the Galatians; nor can we without some knowledge of what Judaism then was, and what it was daily becoming, form any adequate conception of the daring courage, the splendid originality—let us rather say the inspired and inspiring faith—which enabled the apostle thus to throw off the yoke of immemorial traditions, and to defy the hatred of those among whom he had been trained as a Hebrew and a Pharisee.”

Side by side with this burning impatience is seen that gentles forbearance with which it is joined, and which saves it from harshness and selfishness.

“Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am, for I am as ye are: ye have not injured me at all. Ye know that through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?” (Gal. iv. 12-16).

The Apostle calls the Galatians his “little children”, and speaks of travailing in birth again until Christ be formed in them (Gal. iv. 19).

After another attack upon legalism (Gal. iv. 21 - v. 26) he again addresses them as brethren, and again reveals the other side of his character.

“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. Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ” (Gal. vi. 1, 2).

This alternation of the severe with the tender continues to the end of the epistle. The Apostle takes the pen from the amanuensis and with his own hand restates his charge

against those who “desire to make a fair show in the flesh” yet, while so utterly repudiating circumcision, he writes:

“For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God” (Gal. vi. 15, 16).

We can be sure that Paul’s fight was for “the truth of the gospel”. He was not a fault-finder; rather would he exercise that toleration which turns a blind eye upon matters of small account. When the blow fell, one realized that it was merited; the subject was serious; that fundamentals were at stake. He cared for no party; “neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision”; he travailed again in birth for the forming of Christ; he stood upon the same level as the outcast Gentile—“Be as I am, for I am as ye are”—that is, dead to the law, and alive unto God through Christ (Gal. ii. 19).

Who could be angry at impatience which exhibited such patent selflessness? Whether in gentleness, forbearance, or impatience this man sought only the believer’s highest and best.

#12. Separate Features: Tender Grief. **pp. 199, 200**

“Here we see that grief for the sins of others, which moved him to tears when he spoke of the enemies of the cross of Christ, ‘of whom I tell you even weeping’.”
(*Conybeare and Howson*).

The man who could stand as Paul stood before the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.; Gal. ii.) must have had the heart of a lion. In the man who could endure for Christ’s sake that list of troubles about which Paul so reluctantly speaks in II Cor. xi., there was enough material to have made a dozen heroes. The man who spoke as Paul spoke at Mars’ Hill; who was willing to preach the gospel at Rome; who, in spite of rejection and betrayal, stood unashamed at the end of his course; who could say, “None of these things move me”; that man, by the grace that was given him, was as firm as a rock and as true as steel. But while opposition and misrepresentation left him undismayed and unmoved, the many failings and follies of his family in the faith often brought tears to his eyes.

The fact that the Apostle drew near to the close of the early ministry that he had received and was about to enter into the ministry which was associated with bonds and afflictions (Acts xx. 23), by no means indicated that “tears” would be a new experience and learned only in prison, for, in summarizing the ministry that had occupied Acts ix.-xx., the Apostle could say:

“Serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations, which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews” (Acts xx. 19).

While Paul could remain unmoved at the prospect of prison, or even death, for Christ's sake, he was exceedingly moved by the tears of the saints who sought to dissuade him from his purpose. It is recorded:

“Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus” (Acts xxi. 13).

Paul also remembered the tears shed by others. He writes to Timothy:

“Greatly desiring to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy” (II Tim. i. 4).

In his counsel to the church at Rome he wrote:

“Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep” (Rom. xii. 15).

although, some time earlier, in a different context, he had said:

“The time is short: it remaineth that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not” (I Cor. vii. 29, 30).

While weeping was far more common in Eastern lands than in our own, and not considered a sign of weakness, to be hidden or repressed, there is nothing in the Apostle's mind or manifested in his character which is indicative of weak or maudlin sentimentality. He would have been as severe a critic of the lachrymose preacher as any to-day, but he could not refrain from tears, nor did he attempt to hide the fact, when he wrote to the Philippians warning them of the evil example of those who were minding “earthly things”. If not repudiated, such conduct would do for the Philippians what the mixed multitude did for Israel—cause them to lose the prize.

It is enough to make one weep to-day to see how many different ways the evil one has of cheating the believer of his reward, and perhaps the one most used, is the denial, falsely put forward as in the interests of grace, that there is a prize to be won or a reward to be lost, and that in spite of Phil. iii. 14 and Col. ii. 18; iii. 24.

We feel sure that the Apostle shed more tears over others than he ever shed for himself. Trials and troubles that come from the world are not unexpected; it is the “lying in wait of the *Jews*”, his own countrymen; the attacks of ignorant brethren; the slanders created by envy and spite, where love and appreciation should have been found; these, and the sins of the Lord's people, were the cause of the Apostle's weeping. In all this he followed the steps of his Lord. The chapter in John's Gospel that contains one of the mightiest of Christ's self-revelations also contains the most human of all:

“I am the resurrection, and the life” (John xi. 25).
“Jesus wept” (John xi. 35).

And so the tears of Paul blend with his lion-like courage, and help us to understand the grip that such a man had upon hearts that were attuned to the same grace that saved, moved, kept, and empowered himself.

#13. Separate Features: Freedom from jealousy. pp. 225, 226

“Here we see that noble freedom from jealousy with which he speaks of those who, out of rivalry to himself, preach Christ, even of envy and strife, supposing to add affliction to his bonds, What then? Notwithstanding, every way, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice” (*Conybeare and Howson*).

The cause of jealousy is the safeguarding of that which belongs to self. It is with perfect right that God can be jealous that the love and faithfulness of His people shall not be delivered from His Own glorious Person, but mortal man can seldom be moved to jealousy without sin. What was it that enabled the apostle to rise above this besetting sin? The answer is that he had within him something that had taken the place of self. In another part of the same chapter from which *Conybeare and Howson* quote in the above extract, he says:

“Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death. For to me to live is Christ” (Phil. i. 20, 21).

Christ had taken the place of self, so that Paul was enabled to look away from the cruel envy that could even preach Christ with the object of adding affliction to his bonds, to the simple and single fact that Christ was preached. There he could rest. He would go not a step further. Whether out of love or out of envy, one feature was common—Christ was preached, and therein, said Paul, he would rejoice. In such circumstances it was impossible to add afflictions to his bonds. No man can be hurt by an external thing of this character: it is only as he “feels” the attack, the envious word, the cruel look, that it can hurt. In physical things it is not easy to avoid feeling a blow, for one function of the sense of touch is to give protection. But, in spiritual things, the heart can be so taken up with the things of Christ as to be almost insensible to such evil intentions of the enemy. This is indeed a “noble freedom”. If, at the apparent triumph of his rivals, Paul had been moved by jealousy, all his boasted freedom, all the liberty of which he was the champion, would have been nothing worth. As it was, the stone walls of a Roman prison or the presence of a Roman guard in his own hired house, could not make the Lord’s free man a slave, but evil thoughts entertained within his breast, self-enthroned, instead of Christ, that would have made Paul a bondsman, even though he walked at liberty among the free of the earth.

“He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city” (Prov. xvi. 32).

While the Apostle manifested such disinterestedness when the matter concerned himself, when the Lord's people were the subject of attack or deception, he could be moved to great depths of feeling:

“Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly, and indeed bear with me. For I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present a chaste virgin to Christ” (II Cor. xi. 1, 2).

Throughout the O.T. the relationship of Israel with the Lord is as a wife to a husband. Idolatry is regarded as adultery, and over and over again God speaks of His jealousy because of Israel's unfaithfulness. Here, during the Acts period, the company which bride is associated with the heavenly city, and those who followed in the steps of the faith of Abraham, whether Jews or Gentiles, would share with Abraham that bridal city. It was with a jealous eye that the Apostle looked upon the preachers of “another” gospel. Such were doing the self-same work as the Serpent in Eden. These deceitful workers transformed themselves in order to have the appearance of the apostles of Christ, while in reality they were the agents of Satan who transformed himself into an angel of light.

Paul's godly jealousy, noting the fact that the deception was associated with false apostleship, led him on to be “a fool in his boasting”. He opens the chapter with a reference to his folly (II Cor. xi. 1). He supposes that he was not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles (II Cor. xi. 5). Over and over again in this passage he calls himself a fool and his boasting foolish (xi. 16, 17, 21, 23; xii. 11). What the Apostle would not have revealed, even under the severest pressure, he does reveal out of godly jealousy for the name of the Lord. He will boast of his sufferings, of his shipwreck, of his stripes, though repeatedly interjecting that in doing so he was acting as a fool, but the spring of his action was jealousy for the Lord; mere personal jealousy was not found in him. Not only is this manifest in Phil. i., but, in his association with such as Apollos, no word gives the remotest suggestion that Paul was jealous of the eloquence or the acceptance of Apollos at Corinth. Who then is Paul? said he, Who is Apollos? but ministers by whom ye believed. The glory, even as the grace, was the Lord's.

Where the believer can say, “For me to live is Christ”, there can be, and there will be, a complete absence of personal jealousy, and, side by side with this absence, there will be a real godly jealousy for the truth and the saints entrusted to one's care. Where selfish jealousy rules, godly jealousy will wane; where love of pre-eminence is found, there also will be a casting out of the saint, and slackness concerning the Lord's honour.

Once more, to borrow an expression, what “a myriad minded man” the apostle Paul was, and what an honour it is to be associated in any way with the truth for which he lived and died.

“Tempted in all points like as we are”
(Heb. iv. 15)

(This article and the three that follow are based upon one of the afternoon expositions given at the Chapel of the Opened Book.)

#1. pp. 78 - 81

“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 will 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 discover the scope of the argument that contains these pregnant words, we propose an examination 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 most of our readers already possess the structure of the epistle to the Hebrews, which is set out in full in Volume XX, page 128. For our present purpose we will lift out two corresponding members only, because in them are found every occurrence of the words “tempt” and “temptation” found in the epistle.

<p>B Heb. iii.-vi. ON TO PERFECTION. </p> <p style="text-align: center;">“The Profession” (<i>Homologia</i>) (iii. 1; iv. 14).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* * * *</p>	<p>Let us come boldly. Example of unbelief. Perfect <i>v.</i> babes. No renewal unto repentance. Senses exercised. Crucify afresh the Son.</p>
<p>B x. 19 - xii. 25. BACK TO PERDITION. </p> <p style="text-align: center;">“The Profession” (<i>Homologia/eo</i>) (x. 23; xi. 13).</p>	<p>Let us draw near. Example of faith. Sons <i>v.</i> firstborn. No place for repentance. Discipline exercised. Trod under foot the Son.</p>

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 to be 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 iii.

“Your fathers tempted ME” (Heb. iii. 9), said God. Now whatever questionable views we may entertain concerning the temptations 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 have 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” (xi. 17). Shall we say that God tempted Abraham to sin when he made the great demand concerning Isaac? God forbid! because Scripture positively declares that God never tempts man to sin (James i. 13) and also because 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 contexts 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 “ATtempt”. The other reference (Heb. xi. 37) 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).

The reader will recognize the influence of this LXX rendering in Heb. v. 13, 14, where the unskillful “babe” is contrasted with the “perfect”, 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 “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” refers 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.

This feature, however, we must consider in our next article. For the present let us rejoice that there is no trial that the believer can experience *in relation to his “profession” as a pilgrim and stranger*, that His Lord does not fully know, with which He does not fully sympathize, and for which there is not ample provision.

#2. pp. 110 - 113

Our examination of the usage of the words “tempt” and “temptation” in the epistle to the Hebrews left us with no 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 temptation” (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 here perfect work” (Jas. i. 4).

After speaking of a double-minded man, who is unstable in all his ways, and of the danger of pride, he uses a figure that takes our minds back to the Gospels; “For the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat, but it withereth” (James i. 11), a passage that recalls

the parable of Luke viii. 13: “They on the rock are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.” The withering of the burning heat of the sun (Matt. xiii. 6; Mark iv. 5, 6), is likened to “affliction or persecution for the word’s sake” (Mark iv. 17). This being the case, we are prepared to find, and do find, a reference to temptation similar to that found in Hebrews:

“Blessed is the man that endureth *temptation*; for when he is *tried* (or having become approved, *dokimos*), he shall 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, which also urges the believer to endure and to run with patience the race set before him, and which more than once speaks of reward for such conduct.

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).

That these two aspects of temptation are in mind in the epistle of James is evident, for he could not teach, “My brethren, count it all joy when ye shall fall into divers temptations, and are led away by your own lust, and enticed, bringing forth sin and ending in death” (James i. 2, 14, 15), yet such must be the implication of James i. 2 if there be no difference between that testing which comes from God, and is associated with going on unto perfection, and those temptations that spring from our own depravity.

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 the Chapel of the Opened Book 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.

It is possible that the reader’s mind may have turned back to Gen. iii. and questioned how far all that we have said would apply there. For the moment, our answer is that the words “tempt”, “temptation” and “tempter” are never once used of the Fall of Man, in either the Old Testament or New and, therefore, believing in the inspiration of all Scripture, we must abide by this fact and exclude the passage from our present considerations.

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).

Let us note: these tempted believers are, at the same time, “greatly rejoicing” in salvation; the temptations are “for a season” and “if need be”, and as a result they are “in heaviness”, or as the word is elsewhere translated, “grieved” (Eph. iv. 30); “sorrowful” (II Cor. vi. 10). It sounds a contradiction to say that a believer who thus rejoiced, and who was thus grieved, could at the same time be yielding to, or tempted to, actual sin. But we have no need to interpose on our conjectures, for Peter himself goes on to expand and explain his meaning. “That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ” (I Pet. i. 7). Here, “That” is “In order that”; “trial” is *to dokimion*, “the proof after testing”, and the result of the trial, “praise and honour and glory” at the appearing of the Lord. It is utterly impossible to import temptation to sin into I Pet. i. 6. It is the *trial of faith* that is in view. 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).

This passage is so eloquent in the distinction which it makes between temptation as a test and temptation to sin that we add no word of our own, except to say that the “trial” here, which is called “fiery” and is a partaking of Christ’s “sufferings” (not at all being led away by evil things), is the translation of the Greek word *peirasmos*.

The only other reference is that of II Pet. ii. 9,

“The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of *temptations*.”

The context of this statement speaks of the deliverance of “just Lot”, who escaped the overthrow of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, which overthrow was an ensample of the fate that awaits the ungodly.

It is clear by this examination that the epistles of the circumcision use the word “temptation” consistently, and always in the sense of trial; not in the sense of *enticement to sin*.

Before we can come to a scriptural conclusion, we shall have to consider the teaching of the apostle Paul in his other epistles, the Acts, the Gospels and the Book of The Revelation. What we have already seen, however, is truth, and must ever be in mind when we stress the words of Heb. iv. 15, “tempted *in all points* like as we are”.

#3. pp. 161 - 164

So far, our studies in the epistles to the Hebrews and by James and Peter reveal the fact that the character of “temptation” as there found is the testing and proving of the believer on his way to perfection, not temptation to sin, whether by Satan or self.

We now turn to the remaining epistles of Paul to see how far this presentation of the truth obtains there, and what other phases are brought forward. Adopting what we believe to be the chronological order of the epistles, we commence with Galatians. There are two references, one concerning Paul himself and the other spiritual believers.

“And my temptation (*peirasmos*) which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected”
(Gal. iv. 14).

In verse 13 the Apostle speaks of the “infirmity of the flesh” in connection with his preaching. A literal rendering of the verse suggests that the Apostle had preached the gospel while he was passing “through a period of sickness or infirmity”, and that in spite

of the fact that this “temptation” or “trial” (apparently ophthalmia, verse 15) had rendered him despicable and loathsome in appearance, the Galatians had received him as “an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus”. It is beyond belief that, had this “temptation” in the flesh had any connection with sin, the Galatian Christians would have so received him.

We pass on to the second and only other occurrence in the epistle:

“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).

Ignoring the chapter division and reading this first verse as a continuation of the subject of the previous chapter, we shall find that “meekness” is a “fruit of the spirit”, and the “spiritual” brethren of Gal. vi. 1 are exhorted to restore a fallen brother in the “spirit of meekness”. What this spirit involves is made evident by the words, “considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted”. It is evident that the “temptation” against which these brethren are here warned is one of pride and confidence, as they contrast themselves with the erring brother; not a test of faith, but a temptation to spiritual pride, which is sin. This, then, is the first passage we have met that uses the word in this sense. But is it the teaching of Scripture that our Saviour ever needed this warning against spiritual pride? Surely the words, “God forbid!” arise in most minds at such a thought.

We must next examine I Thessalonians. Paul was solicitous for the believers left at Thessalonica, and had sent Timothy to comfort them concerning the faith, his object being “that no man should *be moved* by these afflictions”, for he had himself warned them that “we are *appointed* thereunto”, and that “we should suffer *tribulation*”. It is in this context that we meet the only occurrences of *peirazo*.

“For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain” (I Thess. iii. 5).

There is no thought here of temptation to commit sin (to steal, to lie, to commit adultery); it is a temptation relating to The Faith.

Macknight expands the passage as follows:

“For this reason also, no longer bearing my anxiety on your account, I sent Timothy to know your faith, fearing lest, by the calumnies propagated concerning me, as having no real affection for you, the devil may have tempted you to think me an impostor, who, in preaching to you, had my own interest only in view, and so my labours in converting you have become fruitless.”

This idea, together with the reference to being “moved by afflictions” and the inevitableness of tribulation, show that it was the fear of their yielding under great external pressure, not to internal lust and desire, that had aroused the Apostle’s concern.

The next occurrences are found in the epistles to the Corinthians. They are five in number and we will cite them together.

“Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your inconsistency” (I Cor. vii. 5).

“Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents” (I Cor. x. 9).

“There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, Who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it” (I Cor. x. 13).

“Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith” (II Cor. xiii. 5).

It is not our immediate purpose to give a detailed exposition of every use of these passages. What we are primarily concerned with is the question that arises from the statement that Christ was tempted *in all points* like as we are. So far as I Cor. vii. 5 is concerned, no point arises. The passages cited in I Cor. x. deal with the provocation in the wilderness already examined in connection with Heb. iii. and iv. In I Cor. x. 9 the word “tempt”, in the opening phrase, “Neither let us tempt Christ”, is *ekpeirazo*, “To try out”, and is used in the N.T. always in a bad sense (only other occurrences Matt. iv. 7; Luke iv. 12, x. 25). By no method of interpretation can the call of the Apostle to the Corinthians in II Cor. xiii. 5 “to examine” themselves be made to refer to what we commonly understand by “temptation”, so we pass on to the remaining occurrence in Paul’s epistles, which is I Tim. vi. 9.

“They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lists, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is a root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

Timothy is urged to “flee these things”, and reminded that he had “professed a good profession”, and also of “Christ Jesus, Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession”.

While Timothy would be strengthened as he kept before him the constant and unswerving integrity of the Saviour, there is not a word that would suggest that he would find comfort in the thought that even his Lord, at times, was tempted by riches and the love of money! Truly, the Saviour was “pierced through with many sorrows”, but these were for sins “laid on Him”, not for any “love” of hurtful things within Him.

The word translated “to pierce through” is the Greek *peripeiro*, used by Josephus in his record of the Wars of the Jews in the sentence, “They were pierced through on all sides with Roman darts”. Here it will be seen that the “temptation” of verse 9 becomes the “probe” of verse 10, and sheds further light upon the primary meaning of all the words translated “tempt”.

Temptations to sin arise from within. Money, the external thing, is useful and innocuous; the “love” of it is resident, not in the money itself, but in the heart. In themselves riches are useful and of value, but he who “wills to be rich” falls into a temptation and snare—it is the “will”, not the riches; the “love”, not the money, that constitutes the snare.

It is contrary to the teaching of Scripture to affirm that when a Christian falls into such temptations he can count on the “sympathy” of the Saviour. In such circumstances he needs, not sympathy and succour, but forgiveness and restoration. To expect sympathy after being ensnared by hurtful lusts is to hold a very low estimate of the enormity of sin or of the attitude of the Saviour towards it. In the temptations that assail the believer in his journey through the wilderness that intervenes between initial conversion and the attainment of “perfection”, he will always receive sympathetic help, for it was temptation of this character that the Saviour shared and endured.

We now have the Gospels, the Acts, and the Revelation to examine, and then every occurrence of “temptation” will have been surveyed. In the light of all that we have learned on the subject it will then be our responsibility to entertain sound conceptions of this most important subject; important because it affects both the doctrine of the Saviour’s unfallen and sinless humanity, and the nature of the temptations that come from God.

#4. pp. 201 - 204

We have examined the teaching of all the Epistles on the subject of temptation, and to complete the survey there now remain the Gospels, the Acts and the Revelation. For our present purpose there will be no point in giving separate consideration to the three accounts of the temptation of Christ in the wilderness, or of the three records of “The Lord’s prayer”. The Gospel according to Matthew will provide a full account, and we need only to consider in the other Gospels any statement regarding temptation that may be peculiar to any one of those Gospels.

Taking the occurrences in order of their appearance, we come first to the temptation of the Saviour as recorded in Matthew:

“Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil . . . and when the tempter came to Him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But He answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (Matt. iv. 4).

The heavens had just opened and the voice had been heard saying, “This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased”, and the first temptation is based upon the declaration.

Every experience through which the Saviour passed was for our sakes, for He needed not the testing, the suffering, the agony or the cross, for anything of, or for, Himself alone.

Adam had failed in a garden of plenty; Christ prevailed in a wilderness of want. Moreover, the Lord was in special relationship with Israel. This ancient people had been

tested in the wilderness in connection with “bread”, and had succumbed. They had murmured about the provision made for them; they had expressed their doubt as to whether God could provide “flesh to eat” (Numb. xi. 4); they “tempted” God; they failed.

The quotation with which our Lord had withstood the tempter was a passage from Deut. viii.:

“And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years (the Saviour had fasted ‘forty days’) in the wilderness (LXX *eremos*, as in Matt. iv. 1), to humble thee, and to prove (LXX *peirazo*, ‘tempt’, ‘try’) thee, to know what was in thine heart He suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna that He might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live” (Deut. viii. 2, 3).

As on a later occasion, so here, the Saviour could say: “The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing *in Me*” (John xiv. 30). The trials of Israel in the wilderness were to reveal what was *in their heart*; the temptation of the Son of God showed that there was no desire in His heart that ran counter to the will of Him that sent Him. He was indeed the beloved Son, in Whom the Father was well pleased.

As indicated in the preceding article, the rejoinder to the second temptation emphasizes the word *ekpeirazo*, “to try out” (Matt. iv. 7), pages 164-168. The Son of God could neither be tempted by the devil, nor would He tempt the One that sent Him.

This brief comment on so weighty a theme is obviously too meager to be regarded as an attempt to explain the full significance of this initial trial of our Lord, but we cannot attempt more here. At the moment all that we are doing is reviewing the occurrences of the words “tempt” and “temptation”, and endeavouring to discover their significance.

The next reference is found in the Sermon on the Mount, in the prayer which the Lord taught His disciples: “And lead us not into temptation” (Matt. vi. 13). What does this petition mean? The words are uttered over and over again by those who use “the Lord’s prayer” in public and private, yet it is not uncharitable to affirm that very few could give an intelligent reason for the prayer.

In this same prayer is another petition, which, on the surface, seems simple enough. “Give us this day our daily bread” (Matt. vi. 11). Yet scholars have written reams of explanations of the prayer, for it is a strange fact that the word translated “daily”—“the torment of theologians and grammarians”—is a word unknown elsewhere in the Scriptures. It is *epiousios*. For some reason yet to be sought the Saviour was under the necessity of coining a word to express His meaning, consequently, such a simply, every-day, idea as “daily” cannot be the translation of this strange word. The word is most evidently composed of the preposition *epi*, “upon”, and *eimi*. Now *eimi* is usually to be understood as representing the verb “to be”, but it has a secondary meaning, “to go or to come”. It means here, in *epiousios*, “to come upon”, and is a most obvious allusion to the Manna which came upon Israel in the wilderness.

What is there in this prayer that demands such strange petitions as these two, the one regarding “bread that cometh down”, and the other regarding “temptation”? We answer, if the prayer is related, not to the church but to the setting up of the kingdom, a solution of the problem may be found, for it involves consideration of the state of affairs that will usher in the Day of the Lord which precedes the setting up of the kingdom.

In the book of the Revelation the church at Philadelphia is given this promise:

“Because thou hast kept the word of My patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of *temptation* (*peirasmos*), which shall come upon all the world, to try (*peirazo*) them that dwell upon the earth” (Rev. iii. 10).

Those therefore who wait for the setting up of the kingdom upon earth; who live in that day of fierce trial; could, with this promise before them, appropriately pray, “Lead us not into temptation”. During this same period, some of the people of Israel are to be nourished by God in the wilderness “for a time, and times, and half a time” (a cryptic reference to the three and half years of the tribulation mentioned elsewhere in the Revelation) “from the face of the serpent” (Rev. xii. 14). In that period and in those circumstances this company could pray with meaning, “Give us this day the bread that cometh down upon us”.

Further exposition of these themes is not called for in this series; it is sufficient if we have “placed” the occurrence of temptation as it is found in Matt. vi. 11. Certainly it does not mean “temptation to sin”.

While we read at the end of the threefold temptation in the wilderness that “the devil leaveth Him” (Matt. iv. 11), we gather from His words in Luke xxii. 28 that His whole life on earth could be considered as one long “temptation”, “Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations”. There can be no doubt as to the character of these, for “reward” is immediately connected with this “continuance”: “And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me” (Luke xxii. 29). There are, scattered throughout the Gospels, a number of passages which speak of men approaching the Lord and “tempting” Him, as did the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who, “tempting, desired Him that He would show them a sign from heaven” (Matt. xvi. 1). With this passage can be read Matt. xix. 3; xxii. 18 and 35, and the parallels in the other Gospels.

There remain the references to temptation that relate to the agony in the garden:

“Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak” (Matt. xxvi. 41).

“Weakness” there may be, and temptation is strong, but that presents a different aspect from “temptation” by, and to, evil.

Three more occurrences complete the references in the N.T. “Thou hast *tried* them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars” (Rev. ii. 2). “Temptation” cannot be substituted here. “The devil shall cast some of you into prison

that ye may be *tried*' (Rev. ii. 10). The sequel, "faithful unto death" and the "crown of life", provides sufficient evidence to establish the meaning of this reference. Rev. iii. 10 we have already considered when dealing with the hour of temptation which is coming upon the world "to try" the earth-dwellers.

The word *peira*, which lies at the root of the words translated "tempt", "temptation", "try" and "prove", means a point, or an edge, or, as we would call it, a "probe". It is a well-known phenomenon in language for "b" and "v" to be interchangeable, consequently we are not surprised to learn that the verb "to prove" comes from *probare*, "to test as to its goodness", which in turn comes from the word *probus*, "good". So we find such words as "probable", "probation", "probity", all coming from the same root, and having the basic meaning of "testing for goodness".

The word "probe" means either an instrument, or the act of searching, exploring and trying. In the great majority of the passages where "tempt" and "temptation" occur in the N.T., the meaning is just this "probing to discover whether goodness is present", and only in a few passages can the popular idea of "tempting to commit sin by solicitations and an appeal to evil desires within" be discovered.

We return therefore to the original verse that caused this examination, and rejoice to know that in all the "probing" and "testing" that must be undergone on the way to glory, we have both the sympathy and the succour of Him Who was tempted in all points like his brethren, "sin excepted". Where temptation issues in sin, not sympathy, succour and infirmity, but forgiveness and restoration are needed, and forthcoming, but in such experiences the Son of God can have had no part. He needed not forgiveness, he was never deflected, he needed not to be restored.

In conclusion we would draw the reader's attention to the equivalent words used in the O.T. First, those in the A.V.

- (1) *Nasah* . . . To Try, Prove; Example Gen. xxii. 1
- (2) *Massah* . . . A Trying; Ex. Psalm xciv. 8.
- (3) *Bachan* . . . To Try, Test; Ex. Mal. iii. 15.

In addition to these, *peira* (Gk.) and derivatives translate various Hebrew words, which are not translated "tempt" or "temptation in the A.V. These we give to make the evidence complete.

- (4) *Inyan* . . . Travail, Business. Eccles. v. 3.
- (5) *Gadad* . . . A Troop. Gen. xlix. 19.
- (6) *Tseba* . . . Host, "Appointed time". Job vii. 1.
- (7) *Lahah* . . . A Madman. Prov. xxvi. 18.

Tromm lists a few various readings, none of which make any difference to the results already obtained. They are too complicated to set out here, and indeed the reader who is so far advanced as to be able to follow any such attempt would already be independent of our help, these articles not being written for such.

May we count it all joy that we are counted worthy of being tested, and flee all solicitations to the "old man" within us. Realizing that the one form of temptation but

“probes to discover the good” that has been implanted by the new nature, we can recognize that the other but seeks to accomplish our downfall by stimulating the desires of the old nature. In the former the Saviour has shared; *from* the latter the Saviour was separated, but *for* them He suffered on the tree.

Let us prove all things; let us search and see; let us hold fast the form of sound words.

Thoroughly Furnished (II Tim. iii. 17).

(Being introductory lectures given at the Christian Workers' Training Class).

#1. An examination of the words "Thoroughly furnished". pp. 211 - 216

The goal of all Christian training is expressed by the words of the Apostle to Timothy, "That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (II Tim. iii. 17). Light upon the meaning of these words will be provided by the context, but before seeking this, let us endeavour to understand, as fully as we can, the words "Thoroughly furnished".

Modern English has dropped the word "thoroughly" and uses in its place the word "thoroughly", but the conception "through" is not lost, as may be seen in the word "thorough-fare". The furnishing provided by the Scriptures goes right through; it commences with the "child" (II Tim. iii. 15), it remains with the "man of God" (II Tim. iii. 17), it is "thorough". It is interesting to note the different translations of *exartizo*, "thoroughly furnished", that have been made since the A.V. *Rotherham* translates the word "well prepared"; *J. N. D.* renders it "fully fitted"; *Weymouth*, "perfectly equipped"; *Cunnington*, "completely fitted out"; and *Young's Literal Translation*, "completed". The Greek verb *exartizo* occurs but once more in the N.T., namely in Acts xxi. 5, where it refers to the "completion" or "accomplishing" of a period of time. Josephus uses the word in his "Antiquities" (Book iii. 2. 2), where he employs it in connection with military equipment, saying that his people, in the days of Moses, were "in mighty disorder, and in want of all necessaries", and yet were to make war with men who were "*thoroughly well prepared for it*". It is evident that to be "thoroughly furnished" includes both matter and method, "all necessaries", and is the very opposite of "mighty disorder". Evidently, a parrot-like quotation of mere Scripture texts would not satisfy the desire of the Apostle, for there seems to be indicated here the completeness provided by "all Scripture" (II Tim. iii. 16), "all necessaries", and "right division" (II Tim. ii. 15), the antithesis of "mighty disorder".

Exartizo is a compound of *ek*, "out of", and *artizo*, "to make fit". In composition *ek* often loses its primitive significance, "out of", and takes on the meaning of excess or superiority, even as it does in such English compounds as "out-do", "out-bid", "out-vie", "out-rival", etc., and is as near to the English "out-fit" as one language can be to another. Furnished right through, fitted right out, such is the equipment aimed at, and possible to those who follow the teaching of the Apostle here. The idea of "fitting", "mending", and "adjusting" can be seen in *katartizo*, "mending their nets" (Matt. iv. 21); and *katartismos*, "perfecting", or "adjusting", the saints to the requirements of the new dispensation (Eph. iv. 12). The root word *aro* does not occur in the Greek N.T., but *Liddell and Scott* say of it, that it is "one of the most prolific of Greek roots", from which is derived words meaning "to join", "to fit", "to fashion", "to arrange", and "to harmonize". Every one of these significations is implied in the words "thoroughly

furnished”, which gives a fuller idea than may at first have been formed of what this goal of Christian training involves.

Before a Christian worker can make progress in his training he must have some sense of vocation; he must feel that, in his degree, the words of the great Apostle are also true of himself, “Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is me, if I preach not the gospel!” (I Cor. ix. 16). This sense of vocation however will not be confined to the mind of the teacher alone; there will be evidences of his call sufficient to cause the concurrence of Christian brethren. These two elements can be seen together in the record of Paul’s great commission, as found in Acts xiii. Paul turns Timothy’s attention back to this great moment in his life, when he directed him to his “doctrine, manner of life”, and to those experiences through which he passed “at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra” (II Tim. iii. 10, 11; Acts xiii., xiv.).

Paul was “separated” by the Holy Ghost in a way that is not to be expected in the present dispensation. “The Holy Ghost said, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them” (Acts xiii. 2). This command was obeyed by the brethren gathered at the church at Antioch, for they “laid their hands on them” and sent them on their way. There will therefore not only be the preacher’s own personal conviction, but it will be accompanied by some evidences of fitness for the great undertaking. Ordinarily, if he feels a call to be a teacher, he will be “apt to teach”.

This “separation” by the Holy Ghost in Acts xiii. is the climax rather than the beginning, of the Divine choice. All unknown to Paul, yet most certainly guiding each step in his career, the hand of the Lord had been outstretched: the city of his birth, his racial prejudices, his Roman citizenship, his schooling at the feet of Gamaliel, were all subsequent to the fact that Paul had been “separated” as a preacher from before his very birth (Gal. i. 15, 16). Another reference to his call and separation is made in Rom. i. 1 where he wrote, “Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God”. Unless there is some parallel with this consciousness of a Divine call, the discipline and rigour of Christian training will generally prove too severe, but, where the call is real, no pains will be too great to enable the believer to stand approved unto God, a workman who needs not to be ashamed of the execution of his task.

If we pass from the “separation” of Paul in Acts xiii. to the actual ministry that follows, it will be observed that, when speaking to the people of Israel, he bases all his doctrine and exhortation upon the Scriptures. The exodus from Egypt, the period under the Judges, the reigns of Saul and of David are traversed in the opening of his address. Here was a mind stored with the facts of God’s word, ready to be marshaled and applied as the Lord gave opportunity. But we should miss the essential point if we concluded that we must always and in all circumstances introduce large portions of Scripture into our public address, for we have only to turn to Acts xvii. to discover that, to a people who knew nothing of the exodus, of Judges, of Saul, or of David, Paul omitted all reference to the Scriptures, met them on their own ground and led them step by step to the same goal that was before him in Acts xiii. That goal was Christ.

To the Jew he became a Jew, and led up through Biblical history to David, and from David to Christ, “Of this man’s seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a SAVIOUR, JESUS” (Acts xiii. 23).

To the Greek he became a Greek, and by reference to their “superstition”, their “unknown God”, the testimony of their philosophers and poets, led on, equally with his address to the Jews, to the inevitable Christ:

“He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man Whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead” (Acts xvii. 31).

Paul’s conception of the gospel was the preaching of “Christ” (Rom. i. 1-4; I Cor. i. 23; Gal. i. 16; Phil. i. 18). That his equipment for the work had already been going on before his conversion is made evident by the fact, that he only needed the saving revelation on the road to Damascus, to vitalize all he had previously acquired, for we read that, after only a few days’ respite, “straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that He is the Son of God” (Acts ix. 20), “and confounded the Jews proving that this is the very Christ” (Acts ix. 22), the church in Judæa learning with wonder, “that he which persecuted them in times past now preacheth that faith which once he destroyed” (Gal. i. 23).

As a survey of all his references to them will show, Paul’s acquaintance with the O.T. Scriptures was very wide and very thorough. Furthermore, he spoke both “Greek” and “Hebrew” (Acts xxi. 37-40), which enabled him to quote sometimes the Greek Septuagint, and sometimes the O.T. as it is in the original, a great asset in his equipment. This must not be misrepresented as indicating that no one can exercise the vocation of preacher or teacher to-day without a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, but it does indicate the extreme value of all such aids as the Concordance and Lexicon to enable the man of God to verify his references and so build upon a sound foundation.

We have already referred to the fact that a thorough furnishing of the man of God includes, not only the supply of all necessary material, but the intelligent use of that material. We shall therefore not be fully equipped if our “manner” spoils our “matter”. A good housekeeper not only provides wholesome food, but sees to it that it is not spoiled in the cooking.

“As his manner was, Paul went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. Opening and alleging” (Acts xxvii. 2, 3).

Dialegomai, “reasoning”, indicates an argument in which two or more speakers take part, or in which one speaker argues out the “pros and cons” of his subject. A good example of this method is exhibited in Rom. vi. and vii. where (four times) the Apostle interposes a possible objection, and (four times) gives a reasonable refutation and positive reply. The word translated “opening” is *dianoigo*, and is used of opening the scriptures, opening the heart, and opening the understanding (Acts xvi. 14; Luke xxiv. 32 and 45). “Alleging” is *paratithemi*, “to place beside”. Its first occurrence in the N.T. is

associated with parables, where it is translated “to put forth” (Matt. xiii. 24), a mode of teaching in which one thing is placed beside (*para*) another, thus, “The field *is* the world” (Matt. xiii. 38). The Apostle’s method therefore was twofold. First, he opened up the Scriptures. This would involve, not only quotation, but any needed explanation to make plain the inspired sense to the hearer. Then he compared scripture with scripture, and scripture with historic fact, or with feeling, and so produced a convincing argument. There was one further element that Paul added to his manner of preaching which vivified his reasoning and alleging: he “testified” or “bore witness” to the truth he expounded. With this word he summed up his early ministry, “testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ” (Acts xx. 21). From this time he looked forward to entering upon his second great ministry, “to testify the gospel of the grace of God” (Acts xx. 24), and with this expounding and testifying he brought his ministry to Israel to a close (Acts xxviii. 23).

Paul’s message was the testimony of a lover of the Scriptures, not the mere deliverance of a doctrinaire. The alphabet he used may have been learned at the feet of Gamaliel, but the gospel he preached he learned at the foot of the cross. His learning and logic was made a living thing by reason of his personal testimony. He was both preacher and teacher. He brought good tidings of great joy; he announced the message given him with no uncertain sound, and he taught, and “showed”, as the word translated “doctrine” indicates, the unfolding of the mind and will of God. He knew by bitter experience the bondage of legalism; he knew what pride of race and religion could never give. He knew the conflict that the believer experiences, for he confessed that when he would do good evil was present with him; and so he emphasizes the need for sympathy with our hearers in all their pilgrim experiences.

Turning from the example of Paul to some who served with him in the gospel, we learn another important lesson in Christian equipment. In Acts xviii. 24-28 we read of a man named Apollos, who was both “mighty” in the scriptures and an “eloquent” man. We might be pardoned for believing that such a man was “thoroughly furnished”. Yet Aquila and Priscilla evidently thought otherwise, for they took him home, and there “expounded to him the way of God more perfectly”. These faithful servants of Christ enabled Apollos to sort out his already abundant material; to arrange, to classify, to differentiate, to complete (for he knew only “the baptism of John”). In other words, he was led to see the need for “rightly dividing the Word of truth”, and as a consequence he “helped them much which had believed through grace”, besides “mightily” convincing the Jews (Acts xviii. 27, 28).

In conclusion, it must not be forgotten that the thorough furnishing of the Christian worker will not be attained unless he adds to all that has been brought forward such qualities as “lowliness of mind”. While at one time the Apostle would “magnify” his office, at another he would recognize that he was indeed “less than the least of all saints”.

The Apostle was consistent. His preaching and his practicing went hand in hand. “Thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life”. Thus he not only taught the church

to support the weak, but he could say, “These hands have ministered I have shewed you” (Acts xx. 34, 35).

While the Apostle had no confidence in the flesh, he had great confidence in His Lord. He was not to be made ashamed or intimidated by persecution, opposition or desertion; he “knew” Whom he had believed.

The word *exartizo* which we have been considering is used for the “fitting out of a ship”. Now the world has a proverb which says, “There is no back door to a ship”, the obvious meaning being that the equipment of a ship for a voyage must be thorough, comprising within itself provision for all possible contingencies, and it is the glory of the Scriptures that are given by inspiration of God, that such an equipment for the man of God is their special province.

So far we have pondered the fact and the meaning of the equipment; in our next study we must examine this complete equipment in relation to its context.

Time and Place.

or

The Scriptural association of chronology and topography with doctrine and purpose.

#1. A definition and a vocabulary. pp. 189, 190

No experience is so fundamental to the human consciousness as the necessary relation of time, space and event. The human mind is so constructed that “an event” that took place at no time and in no place is inconceivable. Philosophy may entertain the idea that Absolute Being is unrelated to time and space, and the Scriptural title I AM suggests an eternal present, but the pursuit of this theme is forbidden by Scripture, for we read:

“He hath set the *olam* (age) in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end” (Eccles. iii. 11).

If this is man’s limitation regarding the “work” of God, how much more must he be limited when the subject is the Person of God Himself.

The various attempts to define the fundamental conceptions of time and space have filled volumes. Time has been defined as “the measure of movement”, and this is certainly true, if not the whole truth. We cannot speak of a speed of “20 miles”; we must say “20 miles per minute, per hour, per day, etc.”. Time, therefore, in this definition, is indissolubly linked with space, which is implied by “movement”, for one can only move from one place to another. However, while recognizing this aspect of our subject, we have no intention of pursuing it. Our theme is by no means a philosophical inquiry.

Time and place, being two of the fundamental conceptions of human thought, must necessarily find their place in a book that purports to speak to the understanding, and we are sure that an acquaintance with the time “when” and the place “where” its events took place, will be a contribution to our understanding of its glorious doctrines. We shall also be obliged to take cognizance of Scriptural chronology, for the O.T. is vitally associated with a chronology that links Adam with Christ. We shall seek to demonstrate the accuracy of that chronology, and deal with some of the problems it raises. We make no pretence, however, to any special qualifications in this science, and shall be content to use the studies of others in so far as they are in harmony with the Scriptures. Where authorities differ and Scriptural harmony is not attainable, we shall be content to leave the matter.

The place where any event took place is also constantly noted in the Scriptures, and this will involve a knowledge of Ancient and Modern Geography. Like chronology, this, too, is a subject for the specialist, and where authorities differ, we must be content to wait. We believe, for example, most surely that a garden was planted in Eden, even

though we may be bewildered by the variety of suggestions made by scholars as to the exact place on the map that should be assigned to it.

Before we begin our study of time and place and their relation to doctrine, let us first acquaint ourselves with the different words used by the inspired writers in connection with time. We will take the Hebrew first.

- Zeman* . . . Translated in the A.V. “season”, “time” and as a verb, “to prepare”.
- Zaman* . . . Translated in the A.V. “time”, “appointed time”, “season”; and as a verb, “consider”, “think”, “purpose”, “devise”, “imagine”, “plot”.
- It is evident that the underlying meaning of this word is “time, with special reference to its fitness”; hence an “appointed time” or “season”.
- Yom* . . . Translated in the A.V. 116 times “day” and 65 times “time”, together with a great variety of other words, ranging from “weather” to “yearly”. “Day” may be accepted as the fundamental meaning of the word, with the understanding that it is not always limited to a period of twenty-four hours.
- Moed* . . . Translated in the A.V. “congregation” 149 times, and then “appointed time”, “appointed season”, “time”, “feast”, and allied ideas. This word is derived from *yaad*, “to appoint, as a place or time”, and so “to meet with others at an appointed place”.
- Iddan* . . . Translated in the A.V. “time” 13 times. The word is derived from *adah*, “to go or to pass”. From this comes *ad*, variously translated “for ever”, “perpetually”, etc. Its basic meaning may be seen in the adverb *ad*, “till”, “yet”, etc. From *adah* is also derived:
- Eth* . . . Translated in the A.V. “time” 257 times, “season”, etc.
- Olam* . . . Translated in the A.V. “ever” and many other words. The primary meaning of the word is “age”, and carries with it the idea of something hidden, from *alam*, “secret”—the length of the age being something beyond human knowledge.
- Rosh* . . . Translated in the A.V. “head” 349 times, and when used of time, “beginning” and “first”.
- Dor* . . . Translated in the A.V. mostly by “generation”.
- Teledoth* . . . Translated in the A.V. “generation”, “family”, “origin”, “family history”.

These are the most important words used in the O.T. to denote the conception of “time”. In the N.T. the most important corresponding Greek words are as follows:

Genea, “generation”; *hemera*, “day”; *kairos*, “season”; *chronos*, “time”; *hora*, “hour”; *aion*, “age”; and *arche*, “beginning”.

With this introduction and list of words we must be satisfied for the present. In our next article we hope to take up the question of Time and Place in relation to Scriptural doctrine.

The SECOND EPISTLE to TIMOTHY.

#11. Crown and Prize (ii. 1 - 13). pp. 14 - 17

The reader may remember that, appearing in the structure (Volume XXXI, page 130) as three corresponding pairs, there are three great topics that run through this epistle:

FORSAKEN.—i. 8-18 and iv. 9-18;
CROWN.—ii. 1-13 and iii. 10 - iv. 8;
APPROVED, or DISAPPROVED.—ii. 14-26 and iii. 1-9.

We have seen that, although forsaken by most of those who should have stood by him, the Apostle is nevertheless not ashamed, because the Lord was his Keeper. Moreover, we have seen that though the outlook was indeed black, there were mitigating elements, not the least being the “refreshing” ministry of Onesiphorus. On the whole, however, this great opening section is painted in somber colours. Timothy is told that, if he is to endure the pressure of those persecuting days he will need all the grace that is at his disposal. Consequently the second great section of the epistle, while using figures that emphasize labour, suffering and endurance, introduces the encouragement of reward and crown.

Most of our readers are acquainted with the relationship of the four basic prison epistles, but it may be useful to set out the relationship of Philippians with II Timothy, so that we may the better appreciate the place that Prize and Crown occupy in the doctrine of the mystery.

PHILIPPIANS.	Try the things that differ (i. 10 margin).
The Prize.	Strive (i. 27). Press toward mark (iii. 14). Not already perfect (<i>teleioo</i>) (iii. 12). Prize (iii. 14). Depart (i. 23). Offered (ii. 17).
II TIMOTHY.	Rightly divide the Word (ii. 15).
The Crown.	Strive (ii. 5). Course finished (iv. 7). Finished (<i>teleo</i>) (iv. 7). Crown (iv. 8). Depart (iv. 6). Offered (iv. 6).

There can be no reasonable doubt that these epistles form a pair, just as surely as do Ephesians and Colossians. Apart from other distinguishing features, the words “Depart” and “Offered” are enough evidence of the fact, for these words do not occur in any other of Paul’s epistles.

The correspondence of the two epistles places together the two outstanding thoughts of the Prize and the Crown. There are some who see a difficulty here. They say that in Phil. iii. 14, the Apostle has a Prize in view, whereas in II Tim. iv. 8, it is a Crown, and that these different words must refer to different things. But is this so? We can deal with the objection in two ways, either of which will show that the conclusion drawn is false. Let us suppose that an athlete enters for a competition. It is announced that the winner of "The 500 yards" will receive a prize. He runs the race and comes in first, and on the appointed day goes forward to the dais, where a lady has honoured the Sports Club by consenting to give the Prizes. One after another of the successful competitors have gone forward, received their Prize, bowed and retired, amid the cheers of their fellows. Our "500 yards" winner now goes forward, and the lady, with a gracious smile, hands him a silver cup. To the amazement of all present he refuses the cup on the ground that he expected a "Prize". The thing is too ridiculous to continue—no one in his senses could ever entertain such an objection. If instead of a silver cup the lady had presented him with a purse of money, a live pig, a ticket for a cruise, it would still have constituted the Prize. Without being formal logicians each of us acts in such circumstances as though they had actually reasoned the matter out thus:--

GENUS (Prize).

SPECIES.

Silver Cup. Live Pig. Purse of money. Ticket for cruise.

just as is done in countless other cases, such as when we speak of a flower.

GENUS (A Flower).

SPECIES.

Rose. Lily. Buttercup. Orchid. Hawthorn.

There are some, however, who look with suspicion upon "Logic", forgetting that without reason and rule language itself would be but a collection of words.

We are, however, happy in being able to turn from any appearance of "reasoning" to the Scriptures themselves. We feel sure that, given his belief in the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, the most strenuous opponent would agree with the following line of investigation and proof. Paul uses the words "Prize" and "Crown" in Phil. iii. and II Tim. iv., and uses them in contexts that both state and imply the figurative background of a race or athletic effort. If this same Paul, in a similar context, brings together Prize and Crown in such a manner as to leave no doubt that the Crown is the Prize in view, then we have settled beyond controversy two things, namely:

- (1) In Paul's estimation, Prize and Crown are related as Genus and Species, and,
- (2) A Prize, in Paul's usage, is something that may be won by effort or lost by negligence, and therefore must not be confused with a gift in grace, which is categorically declared to be "not of works".

The student of the Scriptures knows quite well that Paul has done all that we here claim. Here is the passage:--

“Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the PRIZE? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible CROWN: but we an incorruptible” (I Cor. ix. 24, 25).

Note the following features:

- (1) The words “receiveth” in the clause “but one receiveth the prize”, and “obtain”, in the clause “to obtain a corruptible crown”, are both translations of the one Greek word “*lambano*”. They “receive” a prize; they “receive” a crown.
- (2) The word “race” is the Greek word *stadion*, a word meaning originally “a furlong” but used in the Apostle’s day, and even to the present day, for the place where athletic sports are held. Owing to the influence of the Latin the modern spelling of the word is *stadium*. It is utterly unscriptural, nay, it is anti-scriptural, to import into the epistles of Paul the conception that any believer “runs”, as in a race, for either salvation, life, forgiveness, membership of the body, acceptance, or any of the wonderful blessings that constitute the high calling of the church of the mystery. If Paul uses “Prize” in Phil. iii. or “Crown” in II Tim. iv., and if he uses figures that are drawn from athletic sports, which he does, then in these epistles he is not dealing with the high calling itself, but with the prize, crown or reward that is associated with that high calling, and which is held out to encourage the believer to endure to the end.
- (3) The word “run” is *trecho*. This is the word that is used in Heb. xii. 1, where the apostle exhorts the believer “to run with patience the race that is set before us”.
- (4) “To strive for mastery” is the translation of the Greek *agonizomai*. This is the word used by Paul in II Tim. iv. 7, when he says, “I have fought a good fight”, where the crown is in view, and the word *agon* gives us the word “fight” in II Tim. iv. 7 and the word “race” in the passage already cited from Heb. xii. 1.
- (5) One further link with II Timothy is found in I Cor. ix. The reader will have in mind that, following the section now before us (II Tim. ii. 1-13), we have the two central sections and that their key words are “Approved” or “Disapproved”, *Dokimos* and *Adokimos*. This theme is also the sequence of I Cor. ix. 27. Our version translates the word “A castaway” and lends colour to the erroneous idea that a saved child of God can be lost. The word is “Disapproved”, or, in its modern dress, “Disqualified” and has to do with the matter in hand, namely the running for the prize.

We have quoted from the epistle to the Hebrews, and the reader should remember that this epistle does not present the initial way of salvation, but addresses those who are already “holy brethren” and “partakers of the heavenly calling”. It is they who are to consider the history of Israel in the wilderness so that they should not “seem to come short”.

The reader who realizes the importance of thus rightly dividing the Word of truth, as it deals with gift and reward, should make himself familiar with the evidence that is available for the proof that Hebrews and Philippians are expositions of the same line of truth.

What Romans is to the dispensation obtaining during the Acts, Ephesians is to the dispensation of the mystery. Both are basic. What Hebrews is to Romans, namely, an exhortation to endure with a reward in view, Philippians is to Ephesians. The evidence

for the parallel nature of Hebrews and Philippians will be found in our book “The Testimony of the Lord’s Prisoner”, page 194, and in the Volume XX, page 231.

As it is found in the epistle we are now considering, we have not attempted to give an exposition of the matter, but we believe we have demonstrated beyond the possibility of contradiction that when the Apostle speaks of Prize and Crown he has the same thing in mind, and that this Prize or Crown is in the nature of a reward and not to be confused with the gift of grace. Under the mistaken idea that reward cannot exist together with grace, there are some who would rule out from the dispensation of the mystery all thought of reward, but we have only to turn to the epistle to the Colossians to discover that there is no such antipathy.

Perhaps the full and unimpeachable acceptance of the believer in Christ, quite apart from the slightest merit on his side, is expressed in richest language in Col. i. Among these passages of full assurance we find the following:

“Giving thanks unto the Father which hath MADE US MEET to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. i. 12).

In the third chapter of this same epistle we read, in the exhortation of the Apostle to slaves:--

“And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men: knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the REWARD of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respects of persons” (Col. iii. 23-25).

There can be no mistaking the fact that “service”, not “salvation”, is the background of this passage in Col. iii. The reward is given “for ye *serve* the Lord Christ”. Not only so, but the fact is also revealed, that he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong that he hath done, and, lest we should raise the objection and say, “But Lord, this cannot be true of *us*; *we* are exceptions, being members of the one Body”, the Lord adds the words, “and there is no respect of persons”. Again, if the context of the other occurrences of this rebuke are considered, namely, Eph. vi. 9 and Rom. ii. 11, all idea of privilege in this connection will die.

The word “reward” in Col. iii. 24 is *antapodosis* and occurs in a slightly modified form (*apodidomi*) in II Tim. iv. 8, where the Apostle says:

“Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, *shall give me* (give me as a recompense) at that day.”

To remove this element from the N.T. would be to mutilate practically every book and epistle. The opposition to the doctrine of rewards is but a species of Modernism, for Modernism rejects what it does not want to believe.

This article does not by any means exhaust the subject. There is much more than we have touched upon to the same effect in I Corinthians, Hebrews, Philippians and the

Apocalypse. We have accomplished our object, however, if we have at least demonstrated that when the Apostle speaks in this second chapter of II Timothy of enduring, striving for mastery, reigning and receiving a crown, he means just exactly what the words ordinarily import.

#12. The enabling of Grace (ii. 1). pp. 45 - 49

The Apostle began this epistle with personal references to himself and to Timothy. He drew attention to the fact that while he had been obliged to wrench himself away from his home and from his fathers, Timothy had enjoyed the blessings of a Christian home. These personal passages lead up to the impassioned statement and appeal:

“God hath not given us the spirit of cowardice; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. Be not thou therefore ashamed” (II Tim. i. 7, 8).

The Apostle does not hide from Timothy the fact that difficulties accompany the ministry of the truth, but he shows also the other side of the picture, the satisfying and all-sufficient presence of the Lord. All in Asia may forsake him, but the Lord never! After speaking of the refreshing ministry of Onesiphorus the somewhat strange words are added, “this thou knowest very well”. The pronoun “thou” (the Greek *su*) is emphatic, for without the pronoun being used at all, it has to be expressed in English as e.g. in II Tim. i. 8. There is no *su* in this verse; it is enough to see the verb “Be ashamed”. Wherever therefore we read the pronoun *su*, we know that urgency or emphasis is implied. Why then did the Apostle emphasize this fact of Timothy’s knowledge here? As a help, let us first see exactly when and where he used this pronoun in the epistle as a whole.

The emphatic “Thou” (*Su*) in II Timothy.

- A | i. 8. *Su*.—Thou knowest. Onesiphorus. The Lord give mercy.
- B | c | ii. 1. *Su*.—Be strong. Things heard of (*para*) me.
 - d | ii. 3. *Su*.—Suffer evil (*kakopattheo*) as good soldier.
- C | iii. 10. *Su*.—Fully followed my doctrine, manner of life.
- B | c | iii. 14. *Su*.—Continue in things heard of (*para*) whom.
 - d | iv. 5. *Su*.—Watch, suffer evil (*kakopattheo*).
Do work of evangelist.
- A | iv. 15. *Su*.—Beware. Alexander. The Lord reward.

Except it were demonstrated before one’s eyes, one would scarcely credit that even the distribution of so small a word as *su* should so evidently be designed by the Spirit of truth. Yet, beyond cavil so it is. Obviously the opening and closing references are in correspondence and refer to others. The remainder associate Timothy with some phase of the Apostle’s ministry. It may be necessary to explain that the word *para*, which occurs

in ii. 1 and iii. 14, comes in the phrases “Heard of me” and “Of whom thou hast learned them”. In ii. 3 and iv. 5 the word *kakopatheo*, “suffer evil”, is used, while the central reference sums up the whole of the Apostle’s example. Those who use the R.V. will observe that the Revisers were a little uncertain as to whether they should read *sugkakopathesan*, “suffer hardship with me” and so lose the *su*, “thou”, but replacing it by *sug*, “with” or whether the Received Text should stand. But when once the perfect structure of these seven occurrences has been seen all doubt vanishes and the A.V. is seen to be correct.

In connection with these structures, perhaps it will be well if we remind the reader that we may claim to be *discoverers*, for we have not seen them in the writings of other commentators, but we are not *inventors*, for, whether we see them or not, the seven pronouns are there, with their contexts.

We understand therefore that the Apostle intentionally used the emphatic pronoun in i. 18 and in ii. 1 to compel Timothy to consider his own position in the light of the example of others. That this is so, the presence of the word “therefore” makes plain, just as we have opened this paragraph with the words “We understand *therefore*”, the reason being that we are concluding an argument based upon the material that has gone before. This particle *oun*, translated “therefore”, “then”, and similar connectives of argument, should never be passed over lightly.

We find the Apostle using this particle of argument several times in this letter to Timothy. Let us notice the occurrences.

- A | i. 8. Be not thou *therefore* ashamed.—Appeal made to early upbringing and gift.
- B | ii. 1. Be thou *therefore* strong.—Appeal made to be like Onesiphorus, but to avoid likeness to Phygellus and Hermogenes (i. 15).
- C | ii. 3. Thou *therefore* endure.—Appeal to character of trust committed.
- B | ii. 21. If a man *therefore* purge.—Appeal to be a golden vessel, and to avoid likeness to Hymenæus and Philetus (ii. 17).
- A | iv. 1. I charge thee *therefore*.—Appeal to early training in Scripture and equipment.

Here are the five occasions upon which the Apostle used *oun*, and once again we cannot but marvel at the Divine superintendence of their order, even to the two pairs of names that come in the argument, Phygellus and Hermogenes, in the one case, and Hymenæus and Philetus in the other. The appeal, at the beginning and end, to Timothy’s home training in the Word would be very strong to one of his nature.

The third item in the Apostle’s appeal to Timothy is the use of the title “son”. “Thou therefore my *son*.” Three words are used in the N.T. to translate “son”. *Huios*, which carries with it some sense of the dignity of sonship, and *teknon*, which is more a term of endearment. The latter is derived from *tikto*, “to bear”, and is equivalent to the Scotch “bairn”. The third word, *pais*, also means a child, but does not so strongly convey the idea of endearment. It is sometimes translatably by the word “boy”, sometimes by the word “servant”, in much the same way as the word *garçon* is used in French.

The term employed by the Apostle when writing to Timothy is not the *huios* of dignified son-ship—Timothy was too shrinking, and the perils of the time were too great for that to be fitting—neither is it *pais*—for although Timothy was still a comparatively young man the Apostle wanted him to face the serious issues that would arise upon his own death—but *teknon*, “my dear child”.

By taking together the two epistles written to Timothy, another important fact emerges. Let us see the way in which the word *teknon* is used in them.

- A | I Tim. i. 2. Salutation.
- B | I Tim. i. 18. Good warfare (*Kalen strateian*).
- A | II Tim. i. 2. Salutation.
- B | II Tim. ii. 1. Good soldier (*Kalos stratiotes*).

Once again, it is useless to debate the question of this distribution of terms, for we are faced with a *fact*, viz., that the Apostle uses this word *teknon* in these two epistles with one object, to encourage Timothy in the good fight of faith.

While it has taken *us* some time both to set out the features and to acquaint ourselves with the associated arguments, we must remember that, by Timothy, these things would at least be sensed on perusal, if not actually seen. He would recall that in the earlier epistle the endearing term “child” had preceded the exhortation to wage a good warfare and, surrounded by fears and conscious of the growing presence of the enemy, the repetition in II Tim. ii. 1 would strike him forcibly.

In the first epistle Timothy was encouraged by being reminded that the Lord had marked him out for service by “prophecies that went before”, and there can surely be no encouragement to persevere like that which comes from the consciousness that one is definitely called to a work, for the Lord’s commands are always His enablings.

In the second epistle the Apostle does not so much call upon Timothy to *rest* upon the fact of the Divine call, as to realize that, having received the call, and having been endowed with the gifts necessary for performance of the work involved, there was also an element of responsibility laid upon him; consequently in this epistle the Apostle calls upon Timothy to *stir up* the gift of God, which was in him by the laying on of the Apostle’s hands. He reverts to this later in the chapter when he says, “That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the holy ghost which dwelleth in us” (II Tim. i. 14). Here, once more, the special gift of “holy spirit” is intended, for the words are without the article. All this the Apostle gathers up in II Tim. ii. 1, when he says, “Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus”.

On many occasions the writers of Scripture not only positively state their line of doctrine, but condescend to give also the negative side. For example, Eph. iv. 1 opens with the *positive* “Walk worthy”: the section closes with the *negative* “Walk not as the Gentiles” (Eph. iv. 17). So in Phil. iii. 17-20, the Apostle points to his own example, but also includes a warning concerning those whose bad example must be avoided.

When dealing with the question of “power” (for the words “be strong” are the translation of *endunamoo*, and *dunamis* means “power”) many a teacher immediately goes back to Pentecost, to supernatural gifts, to the phenomena of the Acts, whereas, for the member of the body of Christ the one great source of all power is that which raised up Christ from the dead and seated Him far above all (Eph. i. 19-23). Inasmuch as Timothy had been called and commissioned during the Acts period, he had special gifts, as did Paul himself, but even so, there is only one reference in II Tim. to the “spirit” in connection with “power”, namely, in the opening exhortation of II Tim. i. 6, 7. Neither the present writer nor the reader has received a gift by the laying on of an apostle’s hands, and even Timothy, who had, was pointed away from such gifts to the power in “Christ Jesus”. So also the Apostle himself testified and had experienced, as we shall see.

There are eight occurrences of *endunamoo* in the N.T., and it will be helpful to have them before us, so that we may see how the mighty power that the Apostle experienced is spoken of. An examination of the contexts of several of these references will prove that it is “the power of His resurrection” that is in view.

- “But Saul *increased* the more *in strength*” (Acts ix. 22).
- “But *was strong* in faith” (Rom. iv. 20).
- “*Be strong* in the Lord” (Eph. vi. 10).
- “Who *hath enabled* me” (I Tim. i. 12).
- “Thou therefore, my son, *be strong* in the grace in Christ Jesus” (II Tim. ii. 1).
- “The Lord stood with me, and *strengthened* me” (II Tim. iv. 17).
- “Out of weakness were *made strong*” (Heb. xi. 34).

In the first epistle Paul had told Timothy that, in spite of the unlovely features of his past life, the Lord’s call to the office of an apostle was accompanied by “enabling”. Paul recounted how he had been a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious, yet, as Timothy well knew, the Lord *enabled* him. Again, in II Tim. iv., in another context of extreme difficulty, this time, not the Apostle’s failure, but the failure and opposition of others, is fully met by this same *enabling*. Paul was now in prison, withstood by some, forsaken by others, yet, in spite of it all, the Lord strengthened him so that even there, and at that time, the preaching was fully known and all the Gentiles heard. How could Timothy resist the appeal set in these two extremes? “Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus”.

While the Apostle had to record that in his younger days he was a blasphemer, Timothy is reminded of the piety of his mother and grandmother, and his early training in Christian truth. Now, where Paul was already a doomed prisoner, Timothy was free. While Paul was now “aged” Timothy was comparatively young. If the Lord’s enabling was sufficient for Paul, it would be also for Timothy.

Finally, let us see how the Apostle has used this word “grace”, not only for the initial fact and plan of salvation, but for all after life and service. Not only does he affirm that “by the grace of God I am what I am”, but he declares that the grace bestowed upon him enabled him to labour “more abundantly than they all”, adding: “yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me” (I Cor. xv. 10).

He speaks in Rom. i. 5 of having received “grace and apostleship”, or perhaps better, “apostolic grace”, and the implication is that teachers will receive teaching grace, and evangelists, evangelistic grace; in fact “unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ” (Eph. iv. 7). Writing to Titus the Apostle said, “The grace of God that bringeth salvation teaches us” (Titus ii. 11, 12). It is therefore a serious mistake to limit grace to initial salvation: grace operates throughout the whole Christian life; it is at the disposal of the believer at all times, and as the Apostle once so thankfully declared, it is “sufficient” (II Cor. iii. 5), for although the actual word “grace” may not appear in that verse, the sentiment is too similar to that of I Cor. xv. 10 to leave any doubt in the mind as to what the Apostle referred to.

This grace, that was so fully and freely at Timothy’s disposal, is “in Christ Jesus”. That necessarily sets the seal of God upon it, and pledges the whole of heaven’s strength on behalf of the tried believer. His faith “in Christ Jesus” had proved sufficient to make him wise unto salvation (II Tim. iii. 15), and the promise of life “in Christ Jesus” held good whatever man might do or say (II Tim. i. 1). We have the comfort and assurance that our salvation is no afterthought, but that we are the subjects of a purpose and grace that was given us “in Christ Jesus” before age-times (II Tim. i. 9). The grace of the Lord is so exceedingly abundant, that even faith and love are included “in Christ Jesus” (I Tim. i. 14; II Tim. i. 13), and so the Apostle exhorts his son Timothy to be strong in the only strength—“strong in grace”—that can enable in such a conflict, and points away from human upbringing, lovely and precious as it may be; points away from weakness and fear, discouraging and paralyzing though they be; to the fount of all grace, the guarantee of “good success”, the One in Whom the weakest may stand “more than conqueror” *in Christ Jesus*.

#13. The transmission of the Truth (ii. 2). pp. 87 - 92

We have considered the exhortation of II Tim. ii. 1, where the Apostle calls upon his son Timothy to be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. We now turn our attention to the purpose for which this strengthening grace was bestowed.

“And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also” (II Tim. ii. 2).

While of necessity Timothy would be called upon sometimes to preach and sometimes to teach the Word, that is not the point of the Apostle’s statement here. He focuses attention on one thing, “the same commit”. To understand what he intends by “the same” we must, perforce, understand the first half of the verse, “the things which thou hast heard of me”, and to understand the second half of the verse and consider the character of those who were to be thus entrusted.

One of the reasons why Timothy needed such God-given strength is found in the nature of the testimony he was called upon to give. Its chief exponent was a prisoner and one who would soon pay the price of faithfulness in his life's blood, consequently the Apostle prefaces the call to follow in his steps by a reference to "power":

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power (*dunamis*), and of love, and of a sound mind. Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power (*dunamis*) of God" (II Tim. i. 7, 8).

Although disguised by the English "to be able", in his own personal testimony the Apostle introduces the thought of power:

"For the which cause I also suffer these things; nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know Whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able (*dunatos*) to keep that which has been committed, against that day" (II Tim. i. 12).

From the initial call of the Apostle on the road to Damascus, suffering for the truth and for the Name of the Lord went hand in hand with his ministry (Acts ix. 16). When brought together, the list of things that Paul endured is staggering, but if the contemplation of them makes the stoutest heart quail, surely the record of the grace that sustained him should embolden the weakest. So sure is the Apostle that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the future glory, that after he has given a most appalling list of sufferings, he suddenly calls upon his hearers to step out into these sufferings in joyous fellowship.

This matter is too vital, both to the understanding of II Timothy and to ourselves, to leave with only these casual comments. We need to see for ourselves what the Scriptures say. Take the dreadful list in I Cor. iv. 9-13. The Apostle likens himself and his fellow-workers to Roman criminals, in this respect, that they were "set forth last", as in the arena games, a culminating sight, to satisfy the blood lust of the populace, which was glutted by the sight of these criminals, forced to expiate their crimes by mutual slaughter. Added to this he says that he was a "fool", "weak", "despised"; suffering hunger and thirst, nakedness and buffeting, with no certain dwelling-place. Labouring and working, being resisted and persecuted, he says, "We are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things, unto this day". Yet, though reckoned literally as "the scum of the earth", this glorious fool for Christ's sake has the blessed effrontery to conclude this list of horrors by saying to the Corinthians:

"Wherefore I beseech you, *be ye followers of me*" (I Cor. iv. 16).

The same true, uncrushable, invincible trust is seen in II Cor. iv. There he contrasts the earthen vessel with the power of God, and after giving another series of sufferings that are summed up in the words, "We which live are always delivered unto the death for Jesus' sake", he once more concludes on the optimistic note:

"For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen" (II Cor. iv. 17, 18).

All this and more Timothy knew, for in II Tim. iii. 10, 11 the Apostle says: “But thou hast fully known (or followed) my doctrine, manner of life what persecutions I endured”, but the Apostle did not stay there; he adds, “But out of them all the Lord delivered me”. Following this we have the appeal:

“But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them” (II Tim. iii. 14).

which is closely parallel with the exhortation of II Tim. ii. 2, “The things that thou hast heard of me”.

When dealing with the first chapter of this epistle, we paid attention to the “good deposit” entrusted to Paul and which was to constitute a “pattern” for Timothy. While the Apostle insists in II Timothy, Ephesians and Colossians that to himself, and to himself alone, had been entrusted this sacred deposit of truth, and that he had been given the wondrous privilege of enlightening all as to what is the dispensation of the mystery (Eph. iii. 7-9), yet on the other hand he was ever careful to emphasize that what he had to make known was given to him by revelation (Eph. iii. 2, 3). Consequently in II Tim. ii. 2 and iii. 14 he chooses to use the word *para*, “beside”, where we have the preposition “of” in the phrases “heard *of* me”, “knowing *of* whom thou hast learned them”. While the doctrine came from Paul, inasmuch as he had been entrusted with its proclamation, it did not originate with him but came “from above”.

In II Tim. i. 13 he uses the same preposition, *para*, “Hold fast the pattern of sound words, which thou hast heard of me”. To avoid ambiguity it would be better to have translated *para* by the word “from”, so that the idea of origin should not be read into it, thus, “Heard *from* me”, “*From* whom thou hast learned”.

It will be observed that the Apostle would safeguard the message that Timothy was to pass on to others, for he says: “the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses.” When instructing Timothy in matters of church discipline, the Apostle applied the Mosaic law, “Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses” (I Tim. v. 19). When expounding the great doctrine of justification by faith, he is careful to bring forward the law and the prophets as “witnesses” (Rom. iii. 21). So, too, Timothy’s good profession was not something secret or private; it had been made “before many witnesses” (I Tim. vi. 12).

While Timothy was strictly enjoined to pass on the same truth that he had heard of Paul, it was not something that could not be verified, and the Apostle safeguarded any tendency to make this insistence appear too personal by bringing in the attestations of many witnesses. In the earlier epistles he challenges his hearers to bear witness that what he continued to preach was what they had heard from him at the beginning (I Cor. xv. 1, 2, 11; Gal. i. 8).

In Timothy’s day there was, of course, no such thing as a New Testament; the epistles had been written and were beginning to be circulated, but the witnesses would have to be

those churches among whom the Apostle had laboured and who had received the epistles of the mystery. To-day we have no need to appeal to any authority or witness beyond the complete canon of Scripture, and for the distinctive teaching of the mystery, the four great prison epistles are all-sufficient: they constitute the good deposit.

The Apostle enjoins that this sacred deposit of truth shall be committed to a definite class of believer.

“The same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also”
(II Tim. ii. 2).

Note the order of the qualifications of these teachers: (1) Faithful; (2) Able. No degree of ability can compensate for unfaithfulness, while, conversely, it is true that a teacher must not only be faithful, but must have the ability to teach. The extremely important office of the teacher is manifested by the derivatives of *didasko*, “to teach”. It would take us too far afield to follow all the ramifications of this word, but we shall profit by observing those which are used in II Timothy. First of all, the verb itself, *didasko*, “to teach”. The word is probably derived from an obsolete verb, *deikoto*, “show”, “exhibit”, and, through the Latin, the Saxon word *taecan*: hence the English word *teach*: “Able to teach (*didasko*) others also” (II Tim. ii. 2).

From *didasko* comes *didaskalos*, “the teacher”: “Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles” (II Tim. i. 11).

Didaskalia is the teaching of the *didaskalos*, the teacher, and is often translated doctrine, even as *didaskalo* is translated at times doctor (Luke ii. 46).

“My doctrine” (II Tim. iii. 10).

“Profitable for doctrine” (II Tim. iii. 16).

“The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine” (II Tim. iv. 3).

Didache, doctrine, the art of teaching: “Exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine” (II Tim. iv. 2).

Didaktikos, “Apt to teach” (II Tim. ii. 24).

In II Tim. ii. 2 the Apostle insists upon two things: the subject-matter (*the doctrine*) and the instrument (*the teacher*). Regarding the subject-matter, he has made it clear that it must conform to that good deposit entrusted to him and which constitutes the pattern for all concerned to follow. Regarding the instrument, he says the teachers shall be “faithful men” and that they shall be “sufficient to teach others”. “It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful” (I Cor. iv. 2).

We are not at liberty here to pass by the fact that the Apostle said “faithful *men*”. If a writer in Greek wished to make his statement open, so that either sex could be included, facilities lay to his hand. For example, in II Tim. ii. 5, the A.V. reads, “If a *man* also strive for masteries”, but this is the rendering of *tis*, “someone”. So also in II Tim. ii. 21.

In the first epistle and in the companion epistle to Titus, the Apostle had given instruction as to the nature and extent of women's ministry. In other epistles he had expressed deep gratitude for the help and assistance of many sisters in Christ, but he makes it clear that it was not the Lord's will that women should teach (I Tim. ii. 12), and both in I Tim. ii. and in I Cor. xi. he goes back to the early chapters of Genesis for his reasons. These are as fundamentals as the facts of creation and of the fall upon which they are based, and those who are "faithful stewards" will neither argue, rebel, nor explain away these items of sound teaching.

To repeat, these faithful men must however be "apt to teach", or as II Tim. ii. 2 has it, they must be "sufficient" to be able to teach others. The word which we have translated, "sufficient" is *hikanos* and is derived from *hikanoo*, "to reach or attain unto". The word is a figure, and the idea of attaining, or reaching, becomes that of competence, ability, or sufficiency.

We come across different forms of the word in Col. i. 12, "to make meet" and in II Cor. iii. 5, "sufficient". In I Cor. xv. 9 it is rendered "I am not meet". It is most evident that the Apostle, who had already said of himself:

"Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, Who also hath made us able (*hikanoo*, sufficient) ministers of the New Covenant" (II Cor. iii. 5, 6).

had no thought that those who were described as "sufficient to teach" found their sufficiency in themselves; rather, he indicated a most important item of practical truth. The man who is called by God to visit the sick will have a truly blessed "bed-side manner". The man who cannot make himself heard in a small hall, whose speech is imperfect, who is lost for words, who can never overcome what is called "stage-fright", who finds it almost impossible to explain or illustrate the truth so that the young and inexperienced may learn; that man *may* be an appointed teacher, for grace can work wonders, but if the wonders are never wrought, both he and his hearers would be justified in believing that he had mistaken his calling.

The principle as to gifts already declared in Rom. xii. 6-8 is capable of unlimited expansion. It was this passing on, this entrusting of the right message to the right men that was the deep concern of the Apostle as he stood at the end of his course. He had finished. The foundation had been laid, but others must follow and build.

Here is the only apostolic succession that these epistles know. The privilege of thus continuing, however feebly, the glorious work commenced by such an apostle is overwhelming, but the same grace that equipped a Paul or a Timothy is at the disposal of the lowliest and weakest of his servants to-day, and will be until sower and reaper, planter and waterer, stand together in the presence of the *Faithful Witness* (Rev. i. 5) *Himself*.

#14. The Good Soldier.
Together with the structure of II Tim. ii. 1-13.
pp. 121 - 126

We have already devoted two articles to this third section of the epistle, but, before going further, it is imperative that we discover the structure, otherwise we shall miss the Divine underscoring, emphasize parts that appeal to ourselves, and so fail in our quest.

It has already been made evident that the testimony of the Lord's prisoner was not only despised and rejected but opposed and hated. The preceding section, II Tim. i. 8-18, opens with a reference to afflictions, as though the testimony of the Lord's prisoner and enduring afflictions necessarily went together. Three times in this brief compass of eleven verses we meet the word "ashamed"; "be not ashamed", "I am not ashamed", "he was not ashamed", while in verse 12 Paul categorically states that he suffered because he was a preacher, an apostle and a teacher of the Gentiles.

The Lord's answer to this discouraging aspect of things is the encouragement given in the third section, where suffering is intimately associated with reigning, and enduring with a crown.

Shorn of detail, the structure is resolved into three parts, thus:

II Timothy ii. 1 - 13.

- A | 1-7. The Crown.
- B | 8-10. I suffer, I endure.
- A | 11-13. The Reign.

the key note being Suffering and Reigning. But the following fuller analysis is necessary to our understanding of the epistle, before we can effectively proceed to its exposition.

II Timothy ii. 1 - 13. *Suffering and Reigning.*

- C1 | 1-7. Suffer evil (*kakopatheo*). C R O W N. |
i1 | 1, 2. Things heard of me.
j1 | k1 | 3. The SOLDIER.
11 | 4. No entanglement.
k2 | 5. The ATHLETE.
12 | 5. Contend lawfully.
k3 | 6. The HUSBANDMAN.
13 | 7. Labour; more fruit.
- C2 | 8, 9. I suffer evil (*kakopatheo*). |
i2 | 8. My gospel.
j2 | 9. Suffering unto bonds.
- C3 | 9, 10. I endure (*hupomeno*). |
i3 | 9. The Word of God.
j3 | 10. Endurance for elect.
- C4 | 11-13. If we endure (*hupomeno*). R E I G N. |
i4 | 11. The faithful WORD.
j4 | 13. The faithful LORD.
k4 | 11. If we died . . . live.
14 | 12. If we endure . . . reign.
l4 | 12. If we deny . . . deny us.
k4 | 13. If we faithless . . . He faithful.

It will be observed that the fourfold reference to suffering, or enduring, is related to a fourfold reference to the ministry of the Apostle:--

- “Things heard of me” (II Tim. i. 2).
- “My gospel” (ii. 8).
- “The Word of God” (ii. 9).
- “The faithful word” (ii. 11).

Suffering *for its own sake* is to be avoided: it may be merely an exhibition of morbid and debased feelings. Suffering that comes upon us *because of our own folly and misdeeds* must be borne patiently and with penitence, but suffering that comes upon us *because of the truth we hold and teach*, should be a matter of rejoicing, not only for the honour put upon us to be counted worthy to suffer shame for the Name of the Lord, but because there is associated with this present suffering the crown and the prize.

In introducing this aspect of his teaching to Timothy the Apostle uses three figures, (1) The Soldier, (2) The Athlete, (3) The Husbandman. These are, as it were, the premises of his argument, and if we have unscriptural views as to these, we shall also have them in our conclusions.

Take the first figure, the *Soldier*. What we immediately associate with the profession of the soldier is fighting, but we look in vain in II Tim. ii. 3, 4 for reference to fighting qualities or fighting prowess, the Apostle’s use of the word being restricted to the

qualities of endurance and non-entanglement with the things of this life. We must therefore call a halt in our advance through this third section to make sure that the figures intended by Paul are understood by ourselves.

“*The good soldier.*”—The word “good” is the translation in the N.T. (A.V.) of several words.

- Agathos.*—“The evil and the good” (Matt. v. 45).
- Bios.*—“This world’s good” (I John iii. 17).
- Eu.*—“Ye may do them good” (Mark xiv. 7).
- Kalon.*—“When I would do good” (Rom. vii. 21).
- Kalos.*—“Bringeth not forth good fruit” (Matt. iii. 10).
- Kalòs.*—“Do good to them that hate you” (Matt. v. 44).
- Chrestos.*—“Evil communications corrupt good manners” (I Cor. xv. 33).
- Chrestotes.*—“There is none that doeth good” (Rom. iii. 12).

There are other occurrences of the word where the words so translated are compounds, such as “Be of good cheer”, etc. These we have not tabulated.

The word used by Paul in II Tim. ii. 3 for “good” soldier is *kalos*. Cremer says of the two words *agathos* and *kalos*, that: “*kalos* is related to its synonym, *agathos*, as the appearance to the essence.” Confining our attention to the second epistle to Timothy, we find that the Apostle uses *agathos* twice, “good works” (II Tim. ii. 21; iii. 17), and *kalos* thrice, viz.:

- “That good thing which was committed” (II Tim. i. 14).
- “Endure as a good soldier of Jesus Christ” (II Tim. ii. 3).
- “I have fought a good fight” (II Tim. iv. 7).

Here are three “good” things that are stressed in this epistle. Anticipating a possible objection to what has been observed as to the soldier and “fighting”, we remark that the word “fight” in II Tim. iv. 7 is *agon*, a word meaning an athletic contest or race (Heb. xii. 1), which we must consider more fully when we reach the fourth chapter. The word translated “soldier” is *stratiotes*, and a variant of it appears in our own language in the words “stratagem” and “strategy”, both of which refer to “the device of a general of an army”. The following occurrences should be compared so that some true idea of the word may be obtained.

- Strateia.*—“Warfare” (II Cor. x. 4; I Tim. i. 18).
- Strateuma.*—“Army” (Matt. xxii. 7, etc.).
- Strateuo.*—“To war” (I Cor. ix. 7, etc.).
- Strategos.*—“Captain” (Luke xxii. 4, etc.).
- Stratia.*—“Host” (Luke ii. 13; Acts vii. 42).
- Stratiotes.*—“Soldier” (Acts xxviii. 16, etc.).
- Stratologeo.*—“To enroll a soldier” (II Tim. ii. 4).
- Stratopedarche.*—“Captain of the guard” (Acts xxviii. 16).
- Stratopedon.*—“Army” or “Camp” (Luke xxi. 20).

The true basis of the Apostle’s teaching lies in *what he says of* the “good soldier”, and to this we now turn. The Apostle was at liberty to select any one or more of the

characteristics of the soldier. As he has done elsewhere, he could speak of his arms and of his armour; he could speak of his bravery, his discipline, his prowess, his obedience, his chivalry or his cruelty. But none of these things were in the Apostle's mind in the writing of II Tim. ii. 3, 4. What he selects and brings forward are:

- (1) The quality of endurance, which was so fully exhibited in the Roman Soldier.
- (2) The complete freedom from all business entanglements and property which was demanded of the Roman soldier upon his enrolment.

“Enduring hardness” is a passive quality and one not immediately associated with soldiering. Yet who is there that passed through the horrors of the Great War, whether personally or in imagination, that does not know that the long drawn-out horror of mud, filth and suspense of the trenches, demanded more from the soldier than the short, sharp, decisive, conflict of arms? These words, “Endure hardness”, translate the Greek *kakopatheo*, “To suffer evil”. *Kakos* is just the opposite of *kalos*, the word translated “good” in the same verse.

Josephus uses this word in his “Wars of the Jews”, saying:

“Now here it was that, upon the many *hardships* which the Roman underwent, Pompey could not but admire the Jews' fortitude” (Wars of the Jews, i. 7. 4).

Again, in the “Antiquities of the Jews”, speaking of the father of Nebuchadnezzar, he writes:

“When his father heard that the governor had revolted, while he was not himself able any longer *to undergo the hardships of war*, he committed to his son Nebuchadnezzar some part of his army” (Ant. of Jews, x. 11. 1).

It is highly significant to learn that *kakos*, evil, is derived from *chazo*, to recede, retire, retreat in battle (So Eustath, quoted by Leigh). Homer and other Greek writers frequently use *kakos* in this sense (see Xen. An. ii. 6, 17. Eur. Phoen. 1022; Hom. Od. G. 375), and so the word meant cowardly, dastardly, faint-hearted. If these unsoldierly qualities inhere in the word *kakos*, “evil”, one can readily appreciate the Apostle's choice of the word *kalos* for the “good” soldier.

In Matt. xxi. 41 we have brought together *kakòs* and *kakos*, “He will *miserably* destroy those *wicked* men”.

Coming to the word *kakopatheo*, “to suffer evil”, we find it in two forms and in all five references. Let us see them together:

Kakopatheia, “A suffering of evil”.

“Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of *suffering affliction*, and patience” (James v. 10).

Kakopatheo, “To suffer evil”.

“Thou therefore endure hardness (*kakos*), as a good (*kalos*) soldier of Jesus Christ” (II Tim. ii. 3).

“Wherein I suffer trouble (*kakos*), as an evil doer (*kakos*)” (II Tim. ii. 9).

“Endure affliction, do the work of an evangelist” (II Tim. iv. 5).

“Is any among you afflicted? Let him pray” (James v. 13)

Sugkakopatheo, “To suffer evil together”.

“Be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God”
(II Tim. i. 8).

The reader will have noticed that this word is confined to the epistles written to Timothy and to the epistle of James. From one point of view these epistles are poles asunder, yet, if we make due allowances for dispensational distinctions, we shall find that they are united by a common theme. Is II Timothy the epistle of the crown? So also is the epistle of James. Does Paul associate the crown of righteousness with suffering evil and patient endurance? James associates the same endurance with the crown of life, “Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life” (James i. 12). Does the Apostle Paul associate the crown of righteousness with “loving His appearing?” (II Tim. iv. 8). James says that the crown of life is promised by the Lord “to them that love Him” (James i. 12). Does the Apostle Paul speak of “finishing” (*teleo*) his course? James speaks of “perfecting” of the faith (*teleioo*) and the “perfect” work of patience.

In addition to this willingness to suffer evil, the Apostle says of the good soldier: “No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life” (II Tim. ii. 4). Conybeare and Howson translate the above passage:

“The soldier when on service”, and draw attention to the force of *strateuomenos*.

The military law of Rome did not allow a soldier to engage in merchandise or mechanical employment; *armis non privitas negotus occupari*.

The word “entangle” is a translation of *empleko* and occurs only once more in the N.T., namely in II Pet. ii. 20. *Empleke*, a noun form, occurs in the reference to “plaiting the hair” (I Pet. iii. 3). *Pleko*, from which these words are formed, is found three times translated “To plait”, as the crown of thorns (Matt. xxvii. 29; Mark xv. 17; John xix. 2). There is a reference to *empleko* in the LXX version of Prov. xxviii. 18 which reads in that version, “He that walks uprightly is assisted; but he that walks in crooked ways shall be entangled” (Prov. xxviii. 18). A similar idea, but expressed by a different word, is found in Heb. xii. 1 where the runner is enjoined to lay aside every weight and the “easily encompassing” sin.

That which the Apostle says will “entangle” the good soldier, if he yields, is called “the affairs of this life”. “Affairs” translates *pragmateia*, and *pragma* is variously rendered “business”, “work” “matter”, “thing”. *Pragmateuomai* is the word that gives us “occupy” in Luke xix. 13. From the verb *prasso* has come into our own tongue the words “practice”, “practical”, and the like.

The affairs, or business, which the soldier is to avoid, are “the affairs of this life”. The word translated “life” here is not *zoe* but *bios*, and refers more to the “livelihood” than the life-principle itself. Here are some examples of its usage and meaning:--

“She did cast in all that she had, even all her *living*” (Mark xii. 44).

“A woman spent all her *living* upon physicians” (Luke viii. 43).
“He divided unto them his *living*” (Luke xv. 12).

Biosis gives us “manner of life” (Acts xxvi. 4), and *bioo* “live”, in the sense of manner of life (I Pet. iv. 2).

Very near to the meaning of the Apostle in II Tim. ii. 4 is the word *biotikos*:

“And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and *cares of this life*” (Luke xxi. 34).

We have not arrived at a stage in our studies where we can “point the moral”. All our time and attention has been devoted to the acquisition of some Scriptural conception of the terms employed by the Apostle. But before we are ready to gather the lesson intended by the Apostle we shall need to examine the figures of the athlete and the husbandman. These we must consider in a subsequent article, and we trust that no reader will consider the time ill-spent that endeavours to ascertain the meaning of the words “which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual” (I Cor. ii. 13).

#15. The Athlete and the Husbandman (ii. 5, 6). pp. 182 - 185

We have examined the words used in the first of the three figures employed by Paul in II Tim. ii. 1-13, namely “The good soldier”. We now pass on to the remaining two, “The Athlete” and “The Husbandman”.

To pass so easily from the figure of the soldier to that of the athlete is a transition quite in harmony with the Apostle’s thought and teaching. The classic example of course is Eph. vi. 11, 12, where the Apostle sees no incongruity in speaking of one clad from head to foot in armour and equipped with sword and shield, as engaged in “wrestling”.

“Strive for mastery” translates the Greek word *athleo*. This word covered all the public games, such as running, wrestling and boxing, in which competitors met and struggled for the victor’s crown. In Heb. x. 32 we have the word *athlesis*, “a great fight”, associated with endurance and suffering. The exhortation that follows this enumeration of sufferings refers to the “great recompense of reward” (Heb. x. 35) which awaited the sufferers. In Phil. i. 27 and iv. 3 we have the compound form, *sunathleo*, “To strive together”, and the whole of the epistle to the Philippians is written in the atmosphere of conflict and race, with a prize in view.

When we come to the references made by the Apostle to this conflict and crown in II Tim. iv. 7, 8, we shall have to extend our studies. Meanwhile we pass on to observe what is particularly said of the athlete here. As with the figure of the soldier, so again here the Apostle might have chosen for notice many qualities. He could have referred to

the endurance displayed by these athletes; he could have repeated what he says in I Cor. ix. concerning their self-discipline and temperance, but these he had already introduced in connection with the good soldier. Here, he passes on to make the most important observation that “If a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, *except he strive lawfully*” (II Tim. ii. 5). It is this point that the Apostle wishes to make and which is repeated in doctrinal terms in verse 12, “If we suffer, we shall reign with Him; if we deny Him, He will also deny us”. Those who transgressed the laws governing the Greek games were fined. Pausanias tells us that at Olympia, there were six statues of Jupiter made from fines imposed upon those who had not “contended lawfully”. Epictetus speaks of the severe discipline to which the contestants were subjected, using very similar terms to those which occur in I Cor. ix. He says,

“You wish to conquer at the Olympic games? so also do I; for I it is honourable: but bethink yourself what this attempt implies, and then begin the undertaking. You must submit yourself to a determinate course; must submit to dietetic discipline; must pursue the established exercises at fixed hours, in heat and cold; must abstain from all delicacies in meat and drink; yield yourselves unreservedly to the control of the presiding physicians, and even endure flogging” (Epictetus, *Enchiridion*).

The rigorous examination to which the candidates had to submit before being permitted to enter the contest throws further light upon the meaning of this rule that contestants must “strive lawfully”. They had to satisfy their examiners as to whether they were slaves or freemen, and whether they were true Greeks. This was amplified in the public stadium by the herald laying his hand upon the head of the candidate and asking, “Can any accuse this man of any crime? Is he a robber, or a slave? or wicked or depraved in his life?” Finally if the candidate satisfactorily passed this ordeal he was taken to the altar of Jupiter where he was required to swear that he had gone through the discipline enjoined, and that he would abstain from every breach of the laws governing the contest.

Paul makes direct allusion to this in I Cor. ix. 24-27, where the race, the prize, the crown, the discipline, are all emphasized. In the concluding sentence Paul refers to the office of the herald, and the possibility, that he, after heralding to others, should himself be “disapproved” and fail to pass the equivalent of the examination to which we have referred. When referring to his own expectations regarding the race, the crown and the prize his language is characterized by extreme humility. Here, in I Cor. ix., he expresses the thought that he may not even pass the entrance examination. In Phil. iii. he has got as far as to be in the running, but has neither “apprehended” nor reached his goal, and not until he pens the last of his epistles can he say, “I have finished my course henceforth a crown” (II Tim. iv. 7, 8).

The time to deal more fully with this subject will be when we come to the central members of II Timothy where the key words are *dokimos*, (“approved”) and *adokimos* (“disapproved”).

Meantime we must still refrain from any attempt to apply the teaching of the passage to the believer, and must also make one more survey in order to embrace the threefold figure used by the Apostle in this passage.

The Husbandman.—The word so translated is *georgos*, the origin of our English name George, and which means “an earth worker”, *ge* meaning “the earth” and *ergo* “to work”. This work establishes another link between II Timothy and the epistle of James (see previous article), for the only other occurrence of *georgos* in the epistle is in James:

“Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and later rain” (James v. 7).

Here, as in II Tim. ii., patient waiting is associated with harvest. The English “husbandman” is derived from *hus* (Old English) a house, and *bondi* (old Norse) to dwell, and so does not originally mean a married man, but a peasant owning his own house and land; a freeholder, or yeoman.

Apart from the two references already given, the remaining seventeen occurrences of *georgos* in the N.T. are found in the Gospels, where the husbandman are usually associated with a vineyard. (Matt. xxi.; Mark xii; Luke xx. and John xv.). One occurrence of the verb *georgeomai* is found in Hebrews; and there the use of the word transfers the teaching of II Tim. ii. from the husbandman himself to the field that he cultivates.

“For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed (*georgeomai*), receiveth blessing from God: but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected (*adokimos*, ‘castaway’, I Cor. ix. 27, see note above) and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned” (Heb. vi. 7, 8).

The next verse shows that salvation is not in view here, but “things that *accompany* salvation”. In like manner, the “reigning” or the “denying” of II Tim. ii. 12, 13 has not to do with salvation itself, but the added glory that may go with it. Yet once more, *georgion*, “husbandry”, occurs in I Cor. iii., a passage dealing, not with salvation but service; not with foundation but superstructure; not with the possibility of “*being* lost” but with the possibility of “*suffering* loss”, while at the same time “being saved so as through fire”.

It is not the husbandman merely that is in view in II Tim. ii.: the original reads, *Ton kepionta georgon*, “The toiling husbandman”. *Kopias*, it to “labour”, “toil”, even to weariness—from *kopto*, “to strike”. There are 23 occurrences of this verb in the N.T. and of these 14 occur in Paul’s epistles. It is usually translated by the word “labour”, but there is one reference where the idea of fatigue is uppermost, “Being *wearied* with His journey” (John iv. 6).

Kopos, “labour”, occurs 14 times in the N.T. and is once translated “weariness”: “In weariness and painfulness” (II Cor. xi. 27). We have already referred to I Cor. iii. in connection with the word “husbandry”, and we find that in that passage the Apostle speaks of one’s “own reward according to his own *labour*” (I Cor. iii. 8). Toil, says the Apostle, must come before partaking of the fruits, even as endurance must come before the award of a crown.

There are some who would refer the word “first” in II Tim. ii. 6 to the verb “toiling” rather than to the verb “partaking”. It is a truth, certainly, that the husbandman must toil first before he can partake of the fruits, but it seems fairly certain that the meaning of the Apostle here is that, having toiled, he ought to be “a first-partaker” of the fruits (*See Companion Bible*). Valpy is of the opposite opinion, which is however shared neither by the A.V. nor the R.V. Conybeare and Howson say: “The Authorized Version, not its margin, is here correct” and translate: “The husbandman who toils must share the fruits of the ground before the idler.” This is the thought of the Apostle in all his references to the prize, the out-resurrection, the better resurrection, etc. Wordsworth’s note is:

“The Apostle here alludes to that system of husbandry, according to which the *georgos*, or tenant, who tilled the ground, was allowed to participate with the landlord in the fruits of the soil, such as wine, oil, corn—and paid a portion to the landlord as rent (Matt. xxi. 34) according to his *kopos* (labour) so will his *karpos* (fruit) be.”

We trust these notes will have brought before the reader with some clearness not only the three figures themselves, but a realization of the Apostle’s intention in the choice of them.

Before concluding let us set out the threefold figure, together with the particular points that the Apostle desired to make.

The GOOD SOLDIER . . .	Endurance . . .	Non-entanglement.
The ATHLETE . . .	The Crown . . .	Keeping the rules.
The HUSBANDMAN . . .	Toil . . .	First partaker of fruits.

It will be seen that the three figures, having served their purpose, can be expunged, thus throwing into relief the three words which embody the teaching upon which the exhortations are based.

We must in our next article see how these figures with their associated qualities are connected with the remainder of the passage. Meanwhile it will be a healthy exercise for us all to search our own hearts and ways to see how far we conform, by abounding grace, to either or all of these examples. Unless there be a fairly close conformity, our attitude should be that of the Apostle who wondered whether, after all, he would be reckoned to be *adokimos*, and therefore not be allowed even to start the contest.

#16. Consideration and Understanding (ii. 3-7).
pp. 194 - 199

The last two articles have been largely devoted to material, any spiritual application of its teaching being deferred until it was in some measure appreciated at its Scriptural value.

It is evidently intentional that there should be three “good” (*kalos*) things mentioned in II Timothy, and that these should be associated:

- (1) THE GOOD DEPOSIT (II Tim. i. 14).
- (2) THE GOOD SOLDIER (II Tim. ii. 3).
- (3) THE GOOD CONTEST (II Tim. iv. 7).

The first comes in an exhortation to Timothy himself, in which he is urged to “guard” that good deposit of sacred truth which had been entrusted to him. The second is an impersonal figure, setting before Timothy the qualities so necessary to be possessed if this sacred trust is to be maintained. The third is the clinching example of the Apostle himself—he had endured; the crown was won. In each case there is insistence upon the ministry of the Word, and the particular ministry associated with the apostle Paul.

In the context of the first we find the exhortation, “Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of the Lord, nor of me His prisoner”, coupled with joyful acceptance of “the afflictions of the gospel” (II Tim. i. 8). This is followed by a reference to the Apostle’s suffering and ministry (II Tim. i. 11, 12), and then the exhortation to “hold fast the form of sound words” which Timothy had heard of Paul.

The passage however is not without its comfort and strength. If afflictions are to be expected, they can be endured “according to the power of God” (II Tim. i. 8). If Paul is forsaken and suffering, he knows Whom he has believed, and is persuaded that He can keep until that day (II Tim. i. 12). So also the enjoinder to guard the good deposit is not made without a reminder that it is to be accomplished “by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us” (II Tim. i. 14).

So, when we come to the context of the second “good” thing, the good *soldier*, we find emphasis laid upon the special ministry and message of the apostle Paul: “The things heard of me”; “according to my gospel” (II Tim. ii. 2, 8). There is the same emphasis upon endurance and suffering which we have considered in relation to the soldier, athlete and husbandman, and there is the same comforting assurance of mighty power, “Be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus” (II Tim. ii. 1).

In the passage dealing with the third “good” thing, the good *contest*, these features recur. There is an allusion to the unpopular nature of the message that Paul and Timothy had to give; there is the same “turning away”; there is the same insistence upon

“enduring afflictions”, and there is also the same strengthening by the Lord Himself (II Tim. iv. 1-17).

It is therefore obvious that we shall best learn the lesson of the good soldier by taking a wider view than that of the immediate context. We are not surprised to find that the word *aresko*, “to please” (II Tim. ii. 4), occurs 14 times in Paul’s epistles, and if the significance of number goes for anything, it is even more interesting to note that 13 of the references occur in the early epistles, and one only in the later, viz., II Tim. ii. 4, which as it were “completes” the word of God (Col. i. 25).

This guiding principle, “that he may please Him”, is echoed in II Tim. ii. 15, “Study to show thyself approved unto God”. To forget or omit it is to fail, but to hold to it and emphasize it is halfway toward success, for it rids one of the fear of man that bringeth a snare.

The Apostle’s own exhortation to Timothy as an immediate consequence of setting forth the three figures of the soldier, the athlete and the husbandman is, “Consider” (II Tim. ii. 7); “Remember” (II Tim. ii. 8); and “Study” (II Tim. ii. 15). Of these three II Tim. ii. 15 belongs to the central section of the epistle, and its consideration must be deferred until that section has been analyzed. Let us note the two that belong to the section before us:

“Consider what I say; for the Lord shall give thee understanding in all things”
(II Tim. ii. 7).

We have followed the R.V. here because the best texts read *dosei* (future), “he shall give”, instead of *doe*, as in the A.V. The word translated “consider” is *noeo*, which is generally translated “understand”. Again we have to record that this word occurs 14 times in the N.T.

The reader should observe that Timothy was called upon to use his “mind”, *noeo*, and told that the Lord would give him understanding, *sunesis*. There is an important lesson here. The “mind”, or *nous*, is the organ of mental perception.

“The *nous* takes cognizance of external objects, and denotes the reasoning faculty. Its chief material organ is the brain, but all the senses serve it actively and passively. *Nous* is the human side of God’s spirit in man; as to its source, it is Spirit; as to its action in man for intellectual purposes it is mind, i.e. the product of the spirit”
(Dr. E. W. Bullinger’s Lexicon).

The *nous* in man has been impaired by the fall (Eph. iv. 17), but the believer in Christ has experienced a renewing of its spirit (Eph. iv. 23).

Let us not hurry over this, for it is of great importance. There are so many who decry “reason”, as though “faith” could ever be irrational or believe anything that was not “right”, but if God has renewed the spirit of the mind, it is in order that the believer should use it to His glory.

The following diagram would find little favour with a psychologist, and does not pretend to be an accurate presentation of the human mind; but at the same time it may enable the reader to appreciate the relationship that exists between things seen and unseen; between the perceptions of sensation and the concepts of the mind.

- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - - (BE-XXXIII.197).

The *nous*, or thinking part of man, is placed midway between the body, with its great organ of “sensation”, the brain, and the spirit of man that is in him, whereby man “knows”.

The relationship between the senses is implied in such a passage as Isa. vi. 9, 10.

“Hear ye indeed (i.e. with the outer ear), but understand not (i.e. with the inner man); and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat lest they understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed.”

Here it is evident that, had the heart of the people been right, the outward hearing and outward seeing would have led to inward understanding and inward perceiving.

If we could imagine such a horrible things as a man who could neither see, hear, touch, taste nor smell, we can readily see that there would be no way of getting at his inner consciousness; no way of communication; he would be idea-less and, to all intents, dead. When however we become acquainted with the outer world through the medium of our senses, we provide material out of which the mind arrives, by the processes of intelligence and reason, at all the wonder of mental conception. Owing to the fall of man, human reason is an unsafe guide, but the redeemed undergo a “renewing of the spirit of that mind” and are enabled by the eye of faith to see things that are invisible.

The reader will have no need to turn to the passage indicated for the spiritual equivalents of sight, hearing, touch and taste: they come readily to mind, but an equivalent to the sense of smell in the spiritual sphere may at first seem improbable.

The following passage in Isaiah however provides an instance:

“And He shall make Him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord” (Isa. xi. 3).

the margin drawing attention to the Hebrew, which reads “scent or smell”. The figure intended is that of an animal scenting the air, keen and apprehensive.

We remember however that this article is an exposition of II Tim. ii. and not a treatise on the human mind, much as we should all profit by a study of the Scriptures along that line.

Returning therefore to II Tim. ii. 7 we observe that the Apostle says: (1) Consider; (2) What I say; (3) The Lord will give thee understanding. These words have been distributed on the diagram under the realms of sensation, mind, or of spiritual understanding.

“*What I say.*”—The Apostle was writing a letter to Timothy, and consequently could not send Timothy his “thoughts”, for these are invisible and intangible. All he could do was to send a series of black marks made with pen and ink on paper. The organ of vision would record these marks, straight lines and curved, and, without conscious effort, Timothy’s memory would on his part translate these into words, which, in their turn, would be associated with distinct meanings; he would “consider”, *noeo*, “perceive, implying the perception of the mind consequent upon sight” (Dr. E. W. Bullinger’s Lexicon).

The *nous*, or mind, forms the connecting link between the world of sense and the world of spirit, and so we reach the third statement, “The Lord will give thee understanding”.

“*Sunesis*, the collecting together of single features into a whole, to reflect morally, to lay to hear. *Sunesis* is used of *reflective thought*; *sophia* (wisdom) of *productive thought*” (Dr. E. W. Bullinger’s Lexicon).

The Apostle prays for the Colossians that the Lord would give them “spiritual understanding” (Col. i. 9), and this is his desire for Timothy here.

That it is quite possible to “consider what the Apostle had said” and yet not to arrive at a spiritual understanding is patent to all. The Lord spoke in parables to Israel, so that they would indeed “hear” His actual words, but not “perceive” the true import of His illustrations. But the Apostle wanted Timothy to ponder before the Lord the three figures he had used, (the good soldier, the athlete and the husbandman), so that, through revealing grace, he might see the will of the Lord for himself.

While mere “reasoning” can never lead us to the truth, which can only be revealed by the Lord, and while “faith” must apprehend that which lies outside the scope of human investigation, to rule out the exercise of the highest faculties that God has given is spiritual suicide. The very construction of the sentences is in the province of reason. Nouns, verbs, prepositions are a part of the material of reason. Faith can make nothing even of an inspired sentence if it is written in a tongue unknown to the reader, e.g., it is an impossible question to ask, “Do you believe *Beroshith bara elohim eth hashamayim ve eth ha erets?*” (Gen. i. 1) unless the person addressed is acquainted with the Hebrew tongue, and the question reveals the fact that it is foolish to talk about “believing” what we do not “understand”.

Of course those who desire to exercise lordship over the faith of the Lord’s people will naturally keep back from them the means of arriving at a personal understanding of the matters of revelation, but it is of the essence of the true Berean spirit “to search and see”.

Let us therefore ponder the message of the Apostle, knowing that if we on our part will but “consider” what he says, the Lord will surely give us understanding, so that, knowing His will, we may intelligently serve Him and walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing.

Tools for the Unashamed Workman.

#2. The Concordance: its use.

pp. 17 - 20

In our last paper we ran over the history of the Concordance to the Scriptures. In this we propose to give a word or two upon its use. If we looked into the kit of a mechanic we should find, for instance, that he possessed more hammers than one and saws of different sizes and shapes, and that he suited the tool to the job. In like manner we will examine some of the “tools” we have at our disposal for the work to which we have put our hand.

As it is the one in common use, and may be purchased for a few shillings, let us first take a look at Cruden’s Concordance. While Cruden can take no account of the original words of Scripture and must list together all occurrences of the same *English* word, whatever original words it may translate, he does sub-divide his subject in a manner that is distinctly helpful. For example, take the word “Glory”. Before giving a concordance to the word, Cruden commences with most helpful analyses of its usage, which run into over a thousand words. He then sub-divides his concordance as follows: (1) Glory. (2) Give glory. (3) Glory of God. (4) His Glory. (5) My Glory. (6) Glory of the Lord. (7) Thy Glory. (8) Glorious. (9) Gloriously. (10) Glory, *the verb*. (11) Gloriest. (12) Glorieth. (13) Glorying. (14) See Crown, Honour, Vain. No student, however erudite, could fail to be considerably helped by this sub-division of the subject, a work entailing more hours of labour than most of us realize. The word “Go” is found under 28 sub-divisions, and the word “God” under 23, beside which a careful explanatory column and side references (as “See Almighty”, “See Lord God”), of which there are 53 in number, and so throughout the work. Modern editions contain a concordance to the proper names of the Old and New Testaments.

The next concordance, to which we must give more than a passing reference, is “Young’s Analytical Concordance”. As its title page tells us, this work is “on an entirely new plan, containing about 311,000 references, sub-divided under the Hebrew and Greek originals, with the literal meaning and pronunciation of each, designed for the simplest reader of the English Bible”. The 7th edition contains a most valuable index-lexicon, which makes the whole work twice as valuable, and no student should purchase any earlier edition. Dr. Young in his preface says:--

“Its great object, as Tyndale said of his New Testament, is to enable every ‘plough-boy’ to know more of the Scriptures than the ‘ancients’, by enabling him at a glance to find out THREE DISTINCT POINTS—*First*, What is the *original* Hebrew or Greek of any ordinary word in his English Bible; *Second*, What is the *literal* and primitive meaning of every such original word; and *Third*, What are thoroughly true and reliable *parallel passages*.”

As an illustration of the use of “Young’s Concordance” we open the book at random, and our eye falls upon the word “Abundance”. This is what we find:

ABUNDANCE.

- (1) *Multitude*, (The word in Hebrew characters) *hamon*.
I Kings 18:41. for (there is) a sound of abundance of rain (and two more refs.).
- (2) *Brightness*, (. . .) *ziz*.
Isa. 66:11. delighted with the abundance of her.
- (3) *Abundance, remnant*, (. . .) *yithrah*.
Isa. 15:7. Therefore the abundance they have gotten.
- (4) *Strength, substance*, (. . .) *otmah*.
Isa. 47:9. for the great abundance of thine
- (5) *Abundance, residue*, (. . .) *athereth*.
Jer. 33:6. and will reveal unto them the abundance.
- (6) *Abundance, multitude*, (. . .) *rob*.
Deut. 28:47. for the abundance of all (things) (and 34 more refs.).
- (7) *To make abundant*, (. . .) *rabah*, 5.
II Sam. 12:30. spoil of the city in great abundance
- (8) *Satiety, plenty, fullness*, (. . .) *saba*.
Eccles. 5:12. but the abundance of the rich will not
- (9) *Ease, rest*, (. . .) *shalvah*.
Ezek. 16:49. and abundance of idleness was in her
- (10) *Abundance*, (. . .) *shepha*.
Deut. 33:19. they shall suck (of) the abundance of the
- (11) *Abundance, company*, (. . .) *shiphah*.
Job 22:11. Or darkness . . . and abundance of waters (and 2 more refs.).
- (12) *Without number*, (. . .) *le-en mispar*.
I Chron. 22:4. Also cedar trees in abundance; for the
- (13) *Abundance*, (The word in Greek characters) *hadrotos*.
II Cor. 8:20. no man . . . blame us in this abundance
- (14) *Power, ability*, (. . .) *dunamis*.
Rev. 18:3. the abundance of her delicacies
- (15) *Over-abundance*, (. . .) *perisseia*.
Rom. 5:17. they which receive abundance of grace (and 1 more ref.).
- (16) *Superfluity*, (. . .) *perisseuma*.
Matt. 12:34. out of the abundance of the heart of (and 2 more refs.).
- (17) *To be over and above*, (. . .) *perisseuo*.
Mark 12:44. all . . . did cast in of their abundance (and 2 more refs.).
- (18) *Excess, over abundance*, (. . .) *hyperbole*.
II Cor. 12:7. exalted . . . through the abundance of the

This is a typical example of the difference in plan between Young's and Cruden's Concordances.

In sub-division No.7 the reader will observe that the Hebrew word *rabah* is followed by the figure 5. Such figures indicate the number that has been allotted to the conjugation of the Hebrew verb. Thus Nos.1, 3, 5 are *active*, Nos.2, 4, 6 *passive*, and No.7 *reflexive*. So that *Qatal*, in the first conjugation, is "He killed", in the second, "He was killed", the third, "He killed violently", the fourth, "He was killed violently",

the fifth, “He caused to kill”, the sixth, “He was caused to kill” and in the seventh, “He killed himself”. While there are many exceptions, the general formula holds good. We now turn to the valuable indexes. On the sample page we have taken we notice that the first Hebrew word is *Hamon*. Accordingly we turn up the Hebrew Index, and find the following:

HAMON.

abundance 3.	noise 4.	store 2.
company 1.	riches 1.	tumult 4.
many 3.	rumbling 1.	
multitude 62.	sounding 1.	

The figures indicate the number of times the word is translated by each English word. We observe that the word most used in the A.V. to translate *hamon* is “multitude”, and accordingly gather that such is its primary meaning.

We may be interested enough to look back into the Concordance to see how and where the word *hamon* is used. Accordingly we look up “noise”, or any of the other translations, and, in nearly every case, find further avenues opening up before us. We look up the Greek word *dunamis* (i.e., No.14 in the Concordance) and find a long list of words into which it is translated. Of these the outstanding word is “power” which translates *dunamis* 77 times.

Not only is Young’s Concordance useful and valuable as an aid in distinguishing things that differ, but there is prefaced to the Concordance, 71 illustrations of Bible Idioms. The reader may here also become acquainted with a few figures of speech, and profit by the useful hints and helps to Bible interpretation so liberally given by the compiler. Then, at the end of the Concordance, beyond the two Index-Lexicons, is a useful treatise and concordance of Proper Names of the O.T. with their modern pronunciation and the exact form of the original Hebrew.

The Seventh Edition of Young’s Analytical Concordance has been revised throughout by Wm. B. Stevenson, B.D. (Edinburgh), and in the latest impression of this edition there is added a sketch of recent exploration in Bible lands, by Thomas Nicol, D.D., together with a series of plates depicting facsimiles of Samaritan, Hebrew, and Greek MSS, and a number of engravings showing many sites and cities mentioned in the Bible.

There is hope that a new edition containing all these features will be published as soon as circumstances permit, but students who seek second-hand copies should examine the title page before completing the purchase.

Where possible, we strongly advise the purchase of a leather bound copy. The Concordance is a heavy volume, it is bought once only in a lifetime, and will give better service if it has the protection and strength afforded by leather binding, at least for the back.

To facilitate reference, we have lettered, alphabetically, the edge of our own copy so that the book can be easily opened approximately at the required place.

#3. Lexicons. **pp. 50 - 53**

While there are several Lexicons and Concordances in one Volume, it must be remembered that a Lexicon, like a Dictionary, is concerned with the *meaning* of words, whereas a Concordance is concerned with the *occurrence* of words. A Lexicon and Concordance combines the two functions. Most know Liddell and Scott's Greek and English Lexicon. While this work takes cognizance of all words used in the N.T., it also draws many of its illustrations and instances from the writings of Greek philosophers. The meanings assigned to Greek words must be checked by *usage*, and not accepted without reserve, as absolutely true of the N.T. Schrevelius' Lexicon is useful and has much the same character as Liddell and Scott's.

The name, however, that comes to mind in association with Lexicons that have a distinct bearing upon the Scriptures is that of Parkhurst. There are two from his pen; one for the Hebrew and one for the Greek. We quote the title page of the Hebrew Lexicon, which is fairly descriptive and gives a good idea of the nature and scope of both works:--

“An Hebrew and English Lexicon, without points, in which the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* words of the Old Testament are explained in their leading and derived senses, the *derivative* words are ranged under their respective *primitives*, and the *meanings* assigned to each authorized by references to passages of Scripture, and frequently illustrated and confirmed by citations from various Authors, ancient and modern.”

To this work is prefixed an Hebrew and a Chaldee Grammar, without points. The 7th edition, corrected and improved, was published in 1813. Parkhurst stresses the importance of the Hebrew tri-literal root. Care is necessary in taking his English derivations from the Hebrew. It is easy to mistake similar sounds for evidences of similar pedigrees, but this error is not confined to Parkhurst. Dr. McCaul, Professor of Hebrew in King's College, London, wrote:--

“With regard to the Hebrew roots assigned by Parkhurst, the student will observe that, in consequence of his rejection of the system of vowel points, they sometimes differ considerably from those given in modern Hebrew Lexicons. In such cases, the reader must be led by the weight of evidence and analogy, and receive or reject Parkhurst's conjectures accordingly. He will, however, often find them both sagacious and valuable anticipations of that system of comparative etymology which now obtains in the Indo-European languages, and which has of late been applied to the Hebrew and its sister dialects.”

After an interval of seven years, Parkhurst published his companion Lexicon to the Greek of the N.T. Its title page reads as follows:--

“A Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament in which the words and phrases occurring in those sacred books are distinctly explained, and the meanings assigned to each authorized by references to passages of Scripture, and frequently illustrated and confirmed by citations from the Old Testament and from the Greek writers. To this work is prefixed a plain and easy Greek Grammar, adapted to the use of learners, and those who understand no other language than English.”

Later editions contain additional information compiled by Hugh James Rose, B.D., and Dr. J. R. Major added points to the Hebrew words that are cited, and an Appendix of proper names. Each Lexicon runs into over 700 pages and, while they must be used with discrimination, they are a library in themselves. They can often be obtained, second-hand, at a low price, the two copies in our own possession costing but a few pence each!

Another name that stands high among Lexicographers is that of Gesenius. His work, however, is spoiled by rationalistic and neological comments. A very fine abridgement, that is freed from these disagreeable elements, is published by S. Bagster & Sons. An analytical index of different words is included, and the meanings adopted by Dr. Furst in his Hebrew Lexicon have been added, with, in some case, brackets indicating where the Editor differs in opinion from Gesenius. The work is from the English translation of Dr. Tragelles.

Another Lexicon published by S. Bagster & Sons is the Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon by B. Davidson. As its name implies, this differs from those already mentioned in that every separate word of the Old Testament original, in every variety of conformation, is exhibited in its alphabetical place, accompanied by a full grammatical analysis of its composition, the indication of its root, and its English meaning after the best authorities. Although its primary design is to supply the learner with the utmost possible assistance, it is no less serviceable for permanent use by those who have attained a scholarly proficiency in the study of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures. A grammar both of the Hebrew and Chaldee occupies nearly 90 of its pages, while the Lexicon itself occupies 784 pages.

As a companion volume, the same publishers issued the Analytical Greek Lexicon, consisting of an alphabetical arrangement of every occurring inflexion of every word contain in the Greek New Testament Scriptures, with a grammatical analysis of each word and a lexicographical illustration of meanings. A complete series of paradigms (examples) with grammatical remarks and explanations is also included. To enhance the critical value of the work, various readings of importance, with the authorities supporting them, are incorporated in their respective places. The Grammar occupies 42 pages, and the Lexicon 444.

We have already referred to Dr. Bullinger’s Lexicon-Concordance, when speaking of Concordances, but we did not exhibit its important characteristic. This we will now seek to do:

“The design of this work is to give every English word in alphabetical order, and under each the Greek word or words so translated, with a list of the passages in which the

English word occurs, showing, by a reference figure, which is the Greek word used in each particular passage. Thus, at one view, the Greek word with its literal and derivative meanings may be found for every word in the English New Testament.”

As an example let us look at the word “Allow”.

Allow (Alloweth; Allowed).

- (1) *dokimazo*, to prove, assay, *as refiners do metals by fire*, to try, examine, try the fitness or goodness of; *hence*, to have experience of by trial, to approve.
- (2) *ginosko*, to perceive, to observe, to obtain a knowledge or insight into, to know, *ginosko frequently denotes a personal relation between the person knowing and the object known; equivalent to*, to be influenced by our knowledge of the object, *and hence*, to allow oneself to be determined by one’s knowledge.
- (3) *prosdechomai*, to accept, to receive, to expect, to wait for.
- (4) *suneudokeo*, to think well together with, to consent to, approve of, be well pleased with, take complacency in.

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| 4. Luke xi. 48. | | 2. Rom. vii. 15 (margin know) | | 1. I Thess. ii. 4. |
| 3. Acts xxiv. 15. | | 1. Rom. xiv. 22. | | |

At page 921 there is an alphabetical Index of every Greek word used in the N.T., together with every English word used in the translation of them, the number of occurrences of each translation being indicated by a figure. We look up *dokimazo*, the first of the foregoing examples, and find the following:--

dokimazo.

- | | |
|------------|--|
| try 4. | <i>try 2 (italic type indicates a marginal reading).</i> |
| prove 10. | allow 2. |
| examine 1. | like 1. |
| approve 3. | |

Following the Index are three Appendixes; the first of various readings of the Greek text, the second of grammatical features, and the third showing the variant readings of the Sinaitic MSS.

One other Lexicon must be noted, and that is the one familiarly known either as “Grimm’s” or “Thayer’s”, its full title being “A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm’s Wilke’s Clavis Novi Testamenti, translated, revised and enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D. Corrected Edition, 1896”. The editor gives some of the leading objects of the revision in a note to the Preface which will be sufficient commendation of this valuable work.

“To verify all references (biblical, classical, and—so far as practicable—modern); to note more generally the extra-biblical usage of words; to give the derivation of words in cases where it is agreed upon by the best etymologists and is of interest to the general student; to render complete the enumeration of (representative) verbal forms actually found in the New Testament (and exclude all others); to append to every verb a list of those of its compounds which occur in the Greek Testament; to note more fully the variations in the Greek text of current editions; to introduce brief discussions of New Testament synonyms; to give the more noteworthy renderings not only of the ‘Authorized Version’ but also the Revised New Testament; to multiply cross references;

references to grammatical works, both sacred and classical; also to the best English and American commentaries, as well as to the latest exegetical works that have appeared on the Continent; and to the recent Bible Dictionaries and Cyclopædias, besides the various Lives of Christ and of the Apostle Paul.”

The reader will, by this extract, have no doubt as to the extreme value of this Lexicon, and would find it of constant service in the study of the New Testament.

Lastly, we draw attention to the Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the New Testament Greek, by Herman Cremer, D.D., translated from the German by William Urwick, M.A., and published by T. F. Clark. In the preface of this work, Cremer says:

“A Lexical handling of N.T. Greek must, if it is to be really a help to the understanding of the documents of revelation, be directed mainly to that department of the linguistic store which is necessarily affected by the influence we have described, *i.e.*, to the expressions of spiritual life, moral and religious. For other portions of the linguistic treasury the Lexicons of classical Greek suffice.”

We have had to abandon giving a sample of Cremer’s treatment for lack of space, and because of the necessity of using various types to stand for Greek and Hebrew words. A short quotation would indicate little and be no true exhibition of this monumental work. Its 913 pages are followed by an alphabetical Index of Greek Words, an Index of Synonyms Compared, an Index of Texts in the N.T. specially referred to, an Index of Biblico-Theological Subjects, and lastly an Index of Hebrew Words referred to.

There are other Lexicons which the reader may consult with profit, but those now passed in review provide a selection that should suffice for any ordinary student of the Word. We have purposely refrained from referring to works inaccessible to the ordinary reader, or prohibitive in price. Every one reviewed in this article is on our own shelves, and has been bought at a fairly low price by patient search over a period of years in second-hand bookstalls, where theological literature is often a drug in the market.

TRUST.

#1. A Sevenfold Aspect. Volume XXXII, pp. 221, 222

The body of truth that constitutes the ground of our calling is called “The Faith”, and the one condition for the obtaining of salvation, justification or life is “faith”, and in a world where all was perfect and ideal “faith” and “trust” would be but two sides of one state or attitude. In the everyday outworking of truth, however, honesty compels us to admit that a person may be a believer and be saved by grace, yet at the same time not always and completely trusting the Lord. As an illustration, Abraham “believed” in the Lord and his faith was counted for righteousness—yet in spite of this we find him in Gen. xx. 1-18 resorting to the same deceitful measures that he had previously employed regarding Sarah and the Egyptians (Gen. xii. 10-20). “Trust”, therefore, is not always commensurate with “faith”, although, as we have said, most certainly it should be.

In moments of great peril, or after long testing and trial, the believer sometimes echoes the words of David, “I shall now perish one day by the hand of Saul” (I Sam. xxviii. 1), yet both David and the believer today would, at the same time and with the same breath, maintain the inspiration of God’s Word and His utter and eternal faithfulness. At the time of writing this series of short articles peril is on every hand, and it is with a view to strengthen faith, in its intimate and personal sense of committal or “trust”, that these words are written.

In the absence of specific scriptural definition of “trust”, there is no surer way of arriving at an understanding of the term than an examination of the different words translated by it and of the way in which these are used. There are seven words used in the O.T. Scriptures which have been translated “trust”, and observance of their peculiar meanings will form the basis of this first article of the series.

The Seven Words translated “Trust” in the O.T.

We should hardly think of going to the record of Israel’s unbelief and murmuring in Numb. xi. to discover the first meaning of “trust”, but in it mention is made of the “melons” which they ate in Egypt, and in the original the name of this fruit is “The Clinger”, by reason of its manner of growth, and it is this word that provides the most important of the seven that are translated “trust”: “They that know Thy name will put their trust in (or *cling to*) Thee” (Psa. ix. 10). About ninety of the occurrences of the word in the O.T. are translations of this word.

The second word is more obvious; it is “shelter” or “refuge”, as in the passage: “Thou hast been a *shelter* for me” (Psa. lxi. 3), or, “God is our *refuge* and strength” (Psa. xlvi. 1). This provides the word translated “trust” in over thirty occurrences, as, for example, “He is a buckler to all them that *trust* in Him” (II Sam. xxii. 31). “Trust” therefore may “cling”, in conscious weakness, or “shelter”, in time of stress.

Of the three examples that follow each occurs but once and is translated “trust”, but they supply important aspects of meaning that are necessary to the complete conception of “trust”.

The idea of “staying” oneself upon someone underlies the word used by Elihu, when he said to Job: “Judgment is before Him: therefore trust thou in Him” (Job xxxv. 14).

In that dread experience recorded in Psa. xxii., the Psalm of the Cross, the word translated “trust” means “To roll on”, and is used in Gen. xxix. 3, where it speaks of rolling a stone from the mouth of a well. This is the word chosen as a taunt by the wicked when they said, “He trusted on the Lord that He would deliver him” (Psa. xxii. 8).

The next example is taken from the Aramaic, or Chaldee, language, and is found in Nebuchadnezzar’s frank utterance after the deliverance of the three from the furnace. The word used by that great king primarily means “To rely on”, and is found in Dan. iii. 28, where he is recorded as saying of God, “Who hath sent his angel and delivered His servants that trusted in Him”.

Two more words remain to complete the set.

The word “Amen” is known to every believer, and is the Hebrew word for “truth” and “faithfulness”. It occurs five times in the form of “trust”, but refers always to a misplaced trust or a trust withheld: “Behold He put no trust in His servants” (Job iv. 18).

And, lastly, the seventh word occurs in that moving utterance of Job when he said, “Though He slay me, yet will I *trust* in Him”, and introduces into the idea of trusting the thought of “waiting” and “hoping”.

Here then is a sevenfold presentation of the idea embodied in the words “To trust”. It means To cling, To find shelter, To stay upon, To roll upon, To rely on, To put faith in, and To wait with hope.

Without further exposition, here, in this sevenfold concept of “Trust”, is a message for the tired and tested believer in these days. Here is a trust that has as many aspects as there are days of the week. Here is a trust for all times and all occasions, and we therefore commend to the reader’s prayerful meditation this initial study.

#2. Seven results of a trust that clings. p. 13

Having seen something of the scriptural meaning of the seven O.T. words translated “trust”, we now consider a few relative outstanding passages, and note the bearing of the context upon the varied ways in which trust may be exercised.

Confining ourselves first to the one conception of trust which we saw was illustrated by the clinging of the melon by its tendrils, we observe the following conditions which Scripture associates with it:

- (1) BLESSING.—“Blessed is that man that maketh the Lord his trust” (Psa. xl. 4).
- (2) HOPE.—“Thou art my hope, O Lord God; thou art my trust from my youth” (Psa. lxxi. 5).
- (3) PRE-EMINENT PIETY.—“He trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that after him was none like him among all the Kings of Judah, nor any before him” (II Kings xviii. 5).
- (4) ANSWERED PRAYER.—“They cried to God in the battle, and He was intreated of them; because they put their trust in Him” (I Chron. v. 20).
- (5) REMOVAL OF FEAR.—“What time I am afraid, I will trust in Thee” (Psa. lvi. 3, 4, 11).
- (6) HEART FIXED.—“His heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord” (Psa. cxii. 7).
- (7) RIGHTLY DIVIDED PATH.—“Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths” (Prov. iii. 5, 6).

Here are seven selected passages revealing seven most important adjuncts, or associations, of this trust that “clings” to God and His Word.

In the same manner as the seven different conceptions of trust were placed before the reader in the opening article, so this list is placed before him in order that he may see the field of experience covered, perceive the all-round fitness to this reliance upon the Lord, and be moved to emulate those who, in other days, have tasted that the Lord is gracious. But before giving any further subdivisions of these seven all-covering words, we must devote at least one article to each of the seven passages selected in the present article.

We look forward to ministering to the reader’s *Blessing*, strengthening his *Hope*, encouraging him in his growth in grace and *Godliness*, assuring him of *Answered Prayer*, establishing his *Heart*, and, in the matter of practical guidance, indicating the conditions that lead to a pathway *Rightly Divided*. While there are many other phases of spiritual experience embedded in the hundred or more passages which use “trust” in the sense of “clinging”, we believe most will be covered by the seven selected above.

#3. The blessedness of this trust (Psa. xl. 4). pp. 35, 36

In the O.T. there are seven different words translated "Trust". These we considered in the opening article of this series. We discovered that the first one of this set of seven has the significance of "clinging", as the Melon plant does by means of its tendrils. Out of the hundred or more occurrences of this word we selected seven, and set them out on page 13. The first of this set of seven was the "blessedness" that was pronounced upon the man that trusted in the Lord (Psa. xl. 4).

Upon examination we find that there are four occasions when this peculiar blessedness is pronounced. They are as follows:--

- (1) "Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him" (Psa. ii. 12).
- (2) "O taste and see that the Lord is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in Him" (Psa. xxiv. 8).
- (3) "Blessed is that man that maketh the Lord his trust" (Psa. xl. 4).
- (4) "O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man that trusteth in Thee" (Psa. lxxxiv. 12).

These four Psalms, with their blessing upon the man that trusts in the Lord, have four very different contexts.

(1) THE DAY OF THE LORD.—Psalm ii. is prophetic of the days immediately preceding the coming of the Lord. People and king alike agree in counsel against the Lord and His anointed. It will be a day when any who cling to the Messianic hope will be persecuted. As indicated in verse 12 of this Psalm, it is upon such that the Divine benediction rests. They believe the prophecies and the promises, they cling to the Lord and His faithful fulfillment of them, and receive the Divine approval, "Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him".

(2) THE DAY OF TROUBLE.—Psalm xxxiv. 8 deals largely with the deliverance of the righteous in all his troubles. We read his experiences; we are called upon "to taste and see". The Psalmist places on record,

"I sought the Lord, and He heard me, and delivered me from all my fears This poor man cried, and the Lord heard him, and saved him out of all his troubles. The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them out of all their troubles Many are the afflictions of the righteous: but the Lord delivereth him out of them all" (Psa. xxxiv. 4, 6, 7, 17, 19).

(3) THE DAY OF CONFLICT.—In this fortieth Psalm the writer tells of his deliverance from a horrible pit and from miry clay. The marginal note to the words "horrible pit" reads, "a pit of noise", and if the reader will note that these words were penned in London towards the end of June 1944, he will probably realize why they struck a responsive chord. The Psalm indicates the exemplary effect of this deliverance, saying,

“Many shall see it, and fear, and shall trust in the Lord”, and this statement is followed by the Divine benediction on all such (verse 4).

(4) THE DAY OF EXILE.—The eighty-fourth Psalm was written for the sons of Korah whose duties are defined in I Chron. ix. 19 as “Keepers of the gates”, or thresholds and “Keepers of the entry”. The Psalmist remembers, with poignant feeling, the tabernacle and courts of the Lord, for there he had found the presence of the living God. He says, in verse 4, “Blessed are they that dwell in thy house”, and then, in the second part of the Psalm, although for the time being unable to join in worship in the house of the Lord, yet preferring a doorkeeper’s post in the house of God to luxurious living in wickedness outside of it, he has found full compensation in that simple “clinging” to the Lord, recognizing that even though separated from the tabernacle of the Lord, He is nevertheless both Sun and Shield, and will give both grace and glory. He therefore readily concludes, “Blessed is the man that trusteth in Thee” (Psa. lxxxiv. 12).

#4. The association of trust and hope (Psa. lxxi. 5). pp. 53, 54

We have before us at the moment certain blessings and experiences which are linked together in the Scriptures with that form of trust which can be represented by “clinging” to the Lord.

In the present article we consider the relation of “hope” with “trust” which is indicated in Psa. lxxi. 5.

“For thou art my HOPE, O Lord God, Thou art my TRUST from my youth.”

The word “youth” is used with some latitude: it can refer to a new-born child (Exod. ii. 6), or to one who has reached approximately the age of twenty, as in the case of Joseph in Gen. xli. 12. The form in which it occurs implies that the words “the day of” are to be supplied mentally (the evidence for this lies outside the scope of these articles).

Psalm lxxi. speaks of “hope” and “trust”, and by the disposition of the subject-matter, “trust” appears to be associated with all the days of this life, from the earliest recollections of youth to the days of old age and infirmity. “Hope”, on the other hand, appears to be used as though it were the logical outcome of this “trust”, but whereas “trust” extends to the limits of present life—youth and old age—“hope” goes back to the unconscious moments of birth, and forward to the awakening and renewing of resurrection. This argument of faith is one that is worth pondering. When we view the whole stretch of time, and then attempt to visualize within it our own tiny span, so small and insignificant is it that, were it not for the trust that clings to the Lord in all our conscious weakness, we should be overwhelmed by the surrounding immensity. Ages

preceded our birth, and ages will succeed our death, yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a wise and merciful Providence was at work on our behalf before we have our being and birth, which supplies us with the argument that the same gracious Providence can and will provide for us during that second period of silence called death, and bring us to something even more wonderful than our birth into this world.

To show that these thoughts may be rightly adduced from the subject-matter of this Psalm we give the following features:

T r u s t.

- (1) YOUTH.—“Thou art my trust from my youth” (5).
“O God, Thou hast taught me from my youth” (17).
- (2) OLD AGE.—“Cast me not off in the time of old age; forsake me not when my strength faileth” (9).
“Now also when I am old and greyheaded, O God, forsake me not” (18).

H o p e.

- (1) BIRTH.—“By thee have I been holden up from the womb: Thou art He that took me out of my mother’s bowels” (6).
- (2) RESURRECTION.—“Thou, which hast shewed me great and sore troubles, shalt quicken me again, and shalt bring me up again from the depths of the earth” (20).

This association of “trust” (operating during the days of our present life), with “hope” (which operates beyond our present experience even to the day of “quicken again”, when death shall be swallowed up of victory), contains a word of comfort for the present day. So the believer, as he trusts in the Lord Who has watched over him from youth to old age, can sing,

“His love in times past,
Forbids me to think;
He’ll leave me at last
In trouble to sink.”

“Each fresh Ebenezer
He brings to review
Confirms His good pleasure
To help me right through.”

**#5. Hezekiah's pre-eminence (II Kings xviii. 5).
pp. 69, 70**

It is interesting and sometimes corrective to observe exactly what feature is singled out by the Holy Spirit as of eminence in the lives of those who figure in the Scriptures.

For instance, were we to be called upon to do so, what one thing of eminence should we choose out of all the many incidents in the life of Joseph? It is morally certain we should not have lifted into isolated pre-eminence the fact that Joseph "gave commandment concerning his bones", yet this is the one fact brought forward in Heb. xi. 22. So in the case of Hezekiah who comes before us in this matter of trust in the Lord. He was eminent in many ways. His action in breaking down the images, cutting down the groves, and his possession of sufficient spiritual insight and courage to see the necessity of destroying the time-honoured brazen serpent made by Moses, calling it *Nehushtan*, "A piece of brass", would alone have lifted his name and memory above the commonplace (II Kings xviii. 1-4). But this might be a negative attitude, for one can be an iconoclast, or a Protestant, without being definitely for God or for the truth. This could never be said of Hezekiah for the parallel record in II Chron. xxix. makes no mention of his attack upon idolatry, but of his opening of the doors of the house of the Lord and the call of the Levites to a rededication. The feature that is stressed is Hezekiah's trust in the Lord:

"He trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him" (II Kings xviii. 5).

As identical language is used of another king, namely Josiah, in II Kings xxiii. 25, we realize that Hezekiah's pre-eminence was in the one stated thing, his trust in the Lord, even as Josiah's pre-eminence was in the stated being, that "he turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might".

It is alas possible to discover in the recorded actions of Hezekiah some things for which praise and commendation cannot be given; in this common frailty we all have a share. The great moment comes when things look blackest, and Rabshakeh's taunts seem to have stiffened Hezekiah's backbone, for the more that evil emissary vilified Hezekiah's trust, the more that trust grew. There are nine occurrences of the word "Trust" in the second book of Kings. All of them are found in chapters xviii. and xix., and all have to do with Hezekiah and the invasion of Sennacherib. It will help us if we note them together.

Hezekiah.

"He trusted in the Lord God of Israel" (II Kings xviii. 5).

Rabshakeh.

"Thus saith the great king, the king of Assyria, What confidence is this wherein thou trustest?" (verse 19).

"Now on whom dost thou trust, that thou rebellest against me?" (verse 20).

“Now, behold, thou trustest upon the staff of this bruised reed, even upon Egypt, on which if a man lean, it will go into his hand, and pierce it; so is Pharaoh King of Egypt unto all that trust in him” (verse 21).

“But if ye say unto me, We trust in the Lord our God: is not that he, whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away, and hath said to Judah and Jerusalem, Ye shall worship before this altar at Jerusalem” (verse 22).

“How put thy trust on Egypt for chariots and for horsemen?” (verse 24).

“Let not Hezekiah deceive you: for he shall not be able to deliver you out of his hand: neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the Lord, saying, The Lord will surely deliver us, and this city shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria” (verses 29, 30).

“Let not thy God in Whom thou trustest deceive thee Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed?” (II Kings xix. 10-12).

Unwittingly, Rabshakeh may have been used to reveal to Hezekiah the way of true trust. He had questioned the ground of his trust, “Whom dost thou trust?” What answer could Hezekiah make but that he trusted in the living God, the God of Abraham, and covenant promises?

He had revealed the utter untrustworthiness of Pharaoh, and had confused the idolatry—which Hezekiah had sought to stamp out—with the worship of the true God. The more Rabshakeh taunted him regarding the foolishness of his trust, the more his trust in the living God grew—such at least ought to be one of the lessons from this ninefold emphasis on the word “trust” in this book of Kings.

It may not be for us to attain pre-eminence in the affairs of men or in the eyes of the world, but, Oh, for a trust that could receive such commendation as is given in II Kings xviii. 5!

#6. Prayer and Deliverance (I Chron. v. 20). pp. 227, 228

Trust in the Lord is not confined to one aspect of experience, but, as the Scripture itself enjoins, should be exhibited “at all times” (Psa. lxii. 8), and not only at “what time I am afraid” (Psa. lvi. 3). As we have seen in the case of Hezekiah under the threats and taunts of Rabshakeh and Sennacherib, it is nevertheless true to experience that times of great peril or distress are often occasions when trust rises to its supreme place.

“They were helped for they cried to God in the battle, and He was intreated of them; because they put their trust in Him” (I Chron. v. 20).

These words are written, not of those who were defenceless, aged, infirm, or otherwise bereft of all external help, but of men who could be described as “Valiant men, men able to bear buckler and sword, and to shoot with the bow, and skilful in war” (verse 18). The expression “Valiant men” is given in the margin as “Sons of valour”, and the phrase “Mighty men of valour” is constantly used as a description of famous men of arms who figured in Israel’s history. A man may be fearless yet hopelessly outclassed in the matter

of skill or equipment, but it was not so with these men of valour; they were “able” to bear buckler and sword, they could “shoot” with the bow, and were “skilful in war”, an expression that covers discipline, instruction and familiarity with the arts of war. Men so equipped and so trained might be excused if they felt that crying to the Lord in battle was a thing to be ashamed of, yet here, in the record of battle, it seems to have come as the crown and climax of their previous preparation. Recounting the peculiar experiences of the past, the Psalmist sings:

“We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work Thou didst in their days, in the times of old they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them; but Thy right hand, and Thine arm, and the light of Thy countenance, because Thou hadst a favour unto them. Thou art my King, O God; command deliverances for Jacob. Through Thee will we push down our enemies, through Thy name will we tread them under that rise up against us. For I will not trust in my bow, neither shall my sword save me” (Psa. xlv. 1-6).

In all these things there is need to strike a balance. Trust in the Lord does not mean foolhardiness, exposure to unnecessary risks, bravado, or even the failure to take reasonable precautions, measures, or equipment that is to be avoided. Fear has been implanted as a danger signal, and need not necessarily be antagonistic to faith. For instance, we lost count of the number of times we have had to break off the writing of this series and take cover during the recent war. The case of Noah is a classic example of the combination of faith and fear, trust and reasonable care.

“By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house” (Heb. xi. 7).

So it is written of these sons of Reuben, “They were helped for they cried He was intreated they put their trust in Him”.

This however is not all. God is a God of truth, and is righteous and holy. However perfect the equipment, the discipline, the valour; however fervent the cry, and however deep the trust, one other thing is wanted to complete the case. “There fell down many slain, because *the war was of God*” (I Chron. v. 22).

Private quarrels, the invasion of the rights of others, the war prompted by greed or vainglory, cannot thus be entitled, nor come under this pledge of deliverance. For us, to-day, these terms, both of battle and equipment, need translating into their spiritual equivalents. We to-day wrestle, not with flesh and blood, but with foes who are spiritual; the weapons of our warfare are spiritual also, and in this battle prayer and trust are essential. The girdle is truth; the helmet, salvation; the breastplate, righteousness; the shield, faith; and the sword, the Word of God. We too must “put on” the Divine equipment; we, too, must be men of valour, and then, in the battle which we know to be “of God”, our cry will be heard, help will be forthcoming, and He will be entreated of us, for we too shall be found trusting in Him.

Truth in the Balance.

#1. A Preliminary Study of the Figure of the Balances in Scripture. pp. 81 - 84

Every reader of the Scriptures is familiar with that dramatic incident recorded by Daniel, where a finger writes upon the plaster of the wall of the King's palace the words of doom; *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*, which, being interpreted, meant:--

“MENE: God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it.
TEKEL: Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting.
PERES: Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians”
(Dan. v. 26-28).

What, in a specific sense, was true of Belshazzar, is true of us all, for it is written, “There is none righteous, no, not one all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. iii. 10, 23).

In this series we purpose taking the figure of the balances, and bringing before the reader several aspects of divine truth wherein an observation of *balance* is of the utmost importance. Before doing so, however, it will be well if we acquaint ourselves with the way in which this figure of the balances is used in Scripture. The earliest reference is in Gen. xxiii. 16, where “Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver, which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchants”.

Anyone at all acquainted with the religion of ancient Egypt will remember the prominent place the “weighing of the heart” occupies in the, so-called, Book of the Dead, and the constellation known as *Libra*, “The Scales”, in the signs of the Zodiac, shows that from earliest antiquity scales and weighs were known to men. The Hebrew word *Moznayim*, which is found in the O.T., is the Hebrew name for this sign, *Libra*, and the brightest star of this constellation is named *Zuben al Genubi*, “The price which is deficient”, and another bright star is named *Zuben al Chemali*, “The price which covers” (Dr. Bullinger's *The Witness of the Stars*).

The standard weight was fixed as far back as the time of Moses, for we read of “The shekel (or weight) of the sanctuary” (Exod. xxx. 13, 24; Lev. v. 15). Job also uses the figure of the balance, saying:

“Oh that my grief were thoroughly weighed, and my calamity laid in the *balances* together! For now it would be heavier than the sand of the sea” (Job vi. 2, 3).
“Let me be weighed in an even *balance*, that God may know mine integrity” (Job xxxi. 6).

The word translated “even” here is *tsedeq*, “right” or “just”.

Job speaks also of “the weight” for the winds and of the waters (Job xxviii. 25), and “the balancings” of the clouds (Job xxxvii. 16), while Isaiah takes note of the “small dust of the balance” (Isa. xl. 15), an indication that the system of weights in Israel was far from being either crude or primitive. The word that is translated “weight” in the O.T. is the Hebrew word *eben*, “A stone”, and there is much to be said for a weight being made of stone, as it is less likely than a metal one to gain or lose.

Throughout the Scriptures balances are used as a figure of righteousness, just as to-day they are used as a symbol of justice:

“Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have” (Lev. xix. 35, 36).
“Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight” (Deut. xxv. 13-15).
“A false balance is abomination to the Lord, but a just weight is His delight” (Prov. xi. 1).
“A just weight and balance are the Lord’s: all the weights of the bag are His work” (Prov. xvi. 11).

These are references are to literal weights and balances, but, in turn, they typify the righteous judgment of the Lord. In the second verse of this same sixteenth chapter of Proverbs we are reminded that “the Lord weigheth the spirits”, while in I Sam. ii. 3 we are told that by Him “actions are weighed”. Hosea charged Ephraim with using “balances of deceit” (Hos. xii. 7). Amos makes similar charges against Israel, saying that they make the ephah “small” and the shekel “great” and that they “falsify the balances by deceit” (Amos viii. 5), while Micah asks concerning Judah, “Shall I count them pure with the wicked balances, and with the bag of deceitful weights?” (Micah vi. 11).

The A.V. translates several Hebrew words by the English “weigh”, “weight”, or “balance”, the most important being the verb *shaqal*, which gives us the familiar “shekel”. The word *tekel* used in the writing on the wall in Belshazzar’s palace is a Chaldean equivalent of this word.

While we do not suggest that the Hebrew prophets anticipated Newton’s discovery of the law of gravity, the fact that this self-same word, *shaqal*, gives us the word “plummet” (II Kings xxi. 13; Isa. xxviii. 17), shows that all who used these words would know that the force which enabled them to weigh their bread likewise enabled them to build to a perpendicular line. So to this day we speak of a “right” line and a “right” angle, using the word that gives us “righteousness”. Another word translated “weigh” is the Hebrew word *palas*, which means “To make level, or even”. As a noun it means “the beam of a balance” (Prov. xvi. 11; Isa. xl. 12). The verb is used generally for the mental process of “pondering” or “adjusting”: “Ponder the path of thy feet” (Prov. iv. 26). The one other word translated “weigh” is *takan*. Its primary meaning can be seen in the fact that in the *Niphal future* it is always translated “equal”, the essential element in weighing with a balance.

The word translated “balances” is *moznayim*, a dual word indicating “a pair”. It is derived from the same root that gives us *ozen*, “the ear”, as though the ear “weighed” or

“balanced” the sounds that reached it. “The ear” often indicates the faculty of understanding, as in Job xii. 11, “Doth not the ear *try* words”, not merely “hear” them.

In the N.T. the one occurrence of the word “balances” is in Rev. vi. 5, where the Greek word *zugos*, “yoke”, or “crossbar” is used. But four occurrences of the word “weight” are found in the N.T., viz.:

“The eternal weight (*baros*) of glory” (II Cor. iv. 17).

“His letters are weighty (*barus*)” (II Cor. x. 10).

“The weightier (*baruteros*) matters of the law” (Matt. xxiii. 23).

Here the word *baros* and *barus* mean “pressure”, a meaning with which we are familiar in the word “barometer”.

The other, and fourth, word is that used in Heb. xii. 1, where we are enjoined to “lay aside every weight”, and is the Greek word *ogkos* (pronounced *ongkos*). This word means a tumour or a swelling, then a mass, as of corpulence, and then a swelling with pride. These meanings we gather from its use in the classics: it occurs but one in the N.T. Such a twofold meaning however exactly fits the context, for if a runner were to enter a race encumbered with too much flesh he could not hope to complete successfully, even as, in the spiritual sense, pride or pandering to the flesh is fatal to the believer’s hopes of finishing his course.

We trust that these opening remarks will be useful in themselves and will, moreover, stimulate our study of this principle of balance, as we seek to apply it to doctrine and practice. This we hope to do in subsequent studies.

#2. The Purpose of the Ages.

Peter’s testimony of the three Creations (II Pet. iii. 1-13).

pp. 113 - 117

In our opening article we introduced the figure of the balances and examined the terms in which this figure is presented to us in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. It is our intention in this series to test the doctrine and practice of the Scriptures by this principle of balance, and endeavour to discover how far it underlies the ways and will of God.

Scripture opens with the creation of heaven and earth (Gen. i. 1); it closes with the creation of heaven and earth (Rev. xxi. 1), and, intervening between these two extremes, are “the heavens and the earth which are now” (II Pet. iii. 7).

We are indebted to the second epistle of Peter for a comprehensive statement concerning these three phases of creation, which are dealt with, not scientifically, but in so far as they bear upon the purpose of the ages, which is the background of all Scripture.

Before we can attempt to interpret II Pet. iii. it is essential that we view the whole epistle, so that we may neither misplace, nor over, nor under, emphasize any one feature. The Apostle has before him one theme, namely, the fact of the second coming of Christ, and one great thing to do, defend that hope against the attack of the scoffers of his own day. These scoffers, in their turn, were prophetic of the attitude of men generally against the doctrine of the second coming and the day of judgment, which will characterize the last days. Consequently in writing the epistle we find the Apostle adopting (consciously or unconsciously) the principle of the balance. Omitting for the present the exhortative introduction and conclusion (II Pet. i. 1-11, and iii. 14-18) we discover that the theme of the epistle is distributed thus:--

II Peter i. 12 - iii. 13.

- A | i. 12-15. PETER. | *Parousia* truth.
Stir up remembrance.
- B | i. 16-21. APOSTLES and PROPHETS. |
Visions of second coming confirmed by Prophets.
- C | ii. 1-22. FALSE PROPHETS. |
Judgment neither lingers nor slumbers.
Angels, the Flood, Sodom, are evidences
that God does not intervene in judgment.
He knows how “to reserve” angels and man
for the day of judgment.
Noah saved through the Flood.
- A | iii. 1. PETER. | Second Epistle.
Stir up remembrance.
- B | iii. 2. PROPHETS and APOSTLES. |
Words of Prophets confirmed by Apostles.
- C | iii. 3-13. SCOFFERS. |
God is not slack concerning His promise.
Creation itself bears evidence that He does intervene.
He has reserved unto fire the present system.
The godly will be preserved just as Noah was through the Flood.

The recognition of this “balance” is worth more than pages of comment. Peter has but one theme, and he presents it in this twofold manner so that we shall not miss the point he desires to make. The second coming of Christ, he said, was not a fable, but based solidly upon the testimony of prophecy, which came, not by human intelligence, but by inspiration of God. The scoffers said, “Where is the promise of His coming?” (II Pet. iii. 4). “Where is?” (*Pou estin*). This is the formula of incredulity, not a genuine enquiry. Another instance of its use is, “My tears have been my meat day and night, while they continually say unto me, *Where is thy God?*” (Ps. xlii. 3). The “promise” in II Pet. iii. 4 is put for “the fulfillment of that promise”, which these scoffers denied, and indicates no desire on their part for instruction in the text of prophecy. Weymouth renders the passage, “What has become of His promised return?” The scoffers do not

wait for an answer but themselves supply it: “For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation” (II Pet. iii. 4).

The words supplied by the A.V. “as they were”, *houtos*, “thus”, would be better paraphrased “as they are” or “as we now see them”.

- (1) The time from which waiting for the fulfillment of the promise dates is from the death of the fathers, to whom these promises were originally made, and
- (2) These promises imply a violent interference with the course of nature, which is unscientific, for since the beginning of the creation until this same time no such interference has been experienced.

Peter takes up this challenge and in the first place reveals that the real reason for the rejection of the promise of the second coming is the condition of heart; the wish to have it so. That is why he prefaced this section with a reference to the believers’ “pure”, or “honest”, minds (II Pet. iii. 1), and why he said these scoffers were “walking after their own lusts (or desires)” (II Pet. iii. 3). They were not honest doubters who could not make prophecy square with science or philosophy.

“For this they willingly are ignorant of” (II Pet. iii. 5, A.V.).
“For this they willingly forget” (R.V.).
“For this purposely escapes them” (Diaglott).
“For they are willfully blind to the fact” (Weymouth).
“They willfully ignore the fact” (Moffatt).
“For this hidden from them through their own willfulness” (Darby).
“For this they willfully forget” (Rotherham).

Here are seven different renderings, but each preserves the true meaning of the Apostle. Perhaps Alford’s translation and notes are as near as the English idiom will permit.

“*For* (i.e. they speak thus, because) *this* (viz., this fact which follows) *escapes them* (passes unnoticed by them) *of their own will* (i.e., they shut their eyes to the fact).”

As the wisdom of the world has put it, “There is none so blind as he that will not see”. What these scoffers willfully ignored was the testimony of the Scriptures, the observation and findings of philosophy, and the traditions of their own faith.

In reading these few verses of II Pet. iii.—the references to the heavens of old; the complicated statement regarding “the earth standing out of the water and in the water”—many questions are started and many problems suggested, with the result that we may easily miss Peter’s intention. Perhaps the following paraphrase will help.

“Instead of it being true that ‘since the beginning of the creation’ things have continued without interruption and interference, such a statement is palpably false. The surface of the earth bears evidence of the disintegration that has gone on for ages, and amongst the most active agents has been water. Gen. i. 1, 2, the findings of the earliest philosophers (Thales for example), and the very tradition preserved among us of the prophetic utterance of Adam himself, should make men pause before uttering so obviously untenable a statement. Further, observe this. The world that has passed away

was destroyed by the very water, in which and out of which it consisted, the self-same Word of God, which had called it into being, had pronounced the words that had accomplished its end. The heavens and the earth which are now, we know, by the activity of volcanoes and the presence of hot springs, are stored with fire, 'by the same word', and this is purposely reserved against the day of judgment and the perdition of ungodly men."

Josephus, in his "Antiquities of the Jews", preserves a tradition which was common knowledge in the days of Peter. According to this, Adam predicted "that the world was to be destroyed at one time by the force of fire, and at another time by the violence and quantity of water" (Ant. I. ii. 3), and while there is nothing to warrant this in the book of Genesis, neither is there any statement in Genesis that would lead us to conclude that Enoch prophesied of the second coming of Christ, yet Jude, writing by inspiration, assures us that he did (Jude 14).

No, the scoffer must willfully forget, not only Gen. i. 2, and the record of the Flood, but he must deny the record of the destruction of Sodom, the plagues of Egypt, the deliverance of Israel, the giving of the law at Sinai, the crossing of the Jordan, the fall of Jericho—in fact the whole of O.T. testimony and the unwritten testimony of the earth's crust.

The following analysis may be of service to the earnest student. We cannot now pursue the detailed argument, but after giving the structure of the passages must examine more definitely the truth about the three phases of creation, which was our purpose in turning to II Pet. iii.

II Peter iii. 3-13.

- A | 3-5-. Wilful ignorance. |
 - a | Knowing this first.
 - b | The last days.
 - c | The promise of His coming.
 - c | Since the fathers fell asleep.
 - b | The beginning of creation.
- a | Wilful ignorance.
- B | -5-8. Heavens and Earth. |
 - d | By the Word of God.
 - e | f | Heavens of old and earth.
 - g | Water.
 - d | By the same Word.
 - e | f | Heaven and earth which are now.
 - g | Fire.
- A | 9-12. Be not ignorant. |
 - h1 | Day—like 1,000 years and vice versa.
 - i | j | Not slack.
 - k | Longsuffering. Come to repentance.
 - h2 | Day of the Lord.
 - l | In which, dissolution
 - i | k | What manner of persons?
 - j | Hastening unto.
 - h3 | Day of God.
 - l | By reason of which, dissolution
- B | 13. Heavens and Earth. |
 - m | His promise (the Word as above).
 - n | New heavens and new earth.
 - o | Dwelleth righteousness (No more destruction).

The whole of the Word of God, from Genesis to Revelation, deals with these three phases of creation.

The heavens and the earth that were at the beginning (Gen. i. 1).

The world that then was perished by water (Gen. i. 2).

To this, the words “before the foundations (Gk. *katabole*, overthrow) of the world” refer (Eph. i. 4).

As also do the word “without form and void” (Hebrew, *tohu va bohu*) (Gen. i. 2).

The heavens and the earth which are now (Gen. i. 3 - ii. 3).

The heavens of this creation are limited (Gen. i. 6-8).

They are called “an expansion” (Hebrew, *raqia*) (Gen. i. 6).

They have been spread out as a curtain (Isa. xl. 22).

They are to roll up like a scroll (Isa. xxxiv. 4; Rev. vi. 14).

All the host of heaven shall be dissolved (Isa. xxxiv. 4).

And *tohu* and *bohu* again be their state (Isa. xxxiv. 11; Jer. iv. 23-27).

The heavens and the earth which are new (Rev. xxi. 1).

John notes the absence of the sea (Rev. xxi. 1; Gen. i. 2).

No more death, no more curse (Rev. xxi. 4; xxii. 3).

God all in all (I Cor. xv. 28).

We are only too conscious that in this outline there is more left unexplained than is clarified. This of course is due to the magnitude of the subject, and we cannot here offer proof of the many relative points, such as the true translation of *katabole*, or the bearing of *tohu* and *bohu* upon the theme, but the “Indices to the Berean Expositor, Volumes I-XX, 1909-1930” indicate, under the Greek words *katabole* and *kataballo*, explanatory articles in four different volumes and, under the Hebrew words *tohu* and *bohu*, references in another four volumes. The subject inseparable from dispensational truth and the interested reader will find under “The Subjects”, “Scripture References”, “Hebrew Words” and “Greek Words” Indexes at least enough evidence to render the enquiry one of serious import.

#3. The Purpose of the Ages.
The Underlying Correspondence of All Scripture.
pp. 164 - 168

In our preceding article, we saw that the whole purpose of the ages is set out in the Scriptures as related to a creation that has passed away, a creation that is present, and a creation which is yet to come. The past and the future are, as it were, pivoted upon the present, and it is the purpose of redemption, which covers the whole of the present creation, to rectify the chaos which sin introduced into it, and so bring all back to balance and equipoise.

While any human attempt to set out this great purpose must of necessity be exceedingly limited both in scope and vision, and marked with errors and serious omissions, yet, if ever he is going to comprehend in the barest outline the purpose of the ages, the mind of the believer must make some attempt at the task. In this, however, there is no room for license. What God doeth “from the beginning to the end” is wisely hid from man’s eyes (Eccles. iii. 11); no one is permitted to “find out God unto perfection” (Job xi. 7). But it does not require great knowledge or profound scholarship to attempt a comparison of Genesis with Revelation, even though the surface of these great books be merely scratched, and their full hidden wealth remain unknown. The following parallel has been taken from Appendix 3 of the Companion Bible. Doubtless other lists can be, and have been, compiled, but this is sufficient for our present purpose.

<i>Genesis.</i>	<i>Revelation.</i>
(1) Genesis, the book of beginning.	(1) The Revelation, the book of the end.
(2) The earth created (i. 1 - ii. 3).	(2) The earth passed away (xxi. 1).
(3) Satan's first rebellion.	(3) Satan's final rebellion (xx. 3, 7-10).
(4) Sun, moon and stars for the earth's government (i. 14-16).	(4) Sun, moon, and stars, connected with earth's judgment (vi. 13; viii. 12; xvi. 8).
(5) Sun to govern the day (i. 16).	(5) No need of the sun (xxi. 23).
(6) Darkness called night (i. 5).	(6) No night there (xxii. 5).
(7) Waters called seas (i. 10).	(7) No more sea (xxi. 1).
(8) A river for earth's blessing (ii. 10-14).	(8) A river for the new earth (xxii. 1, 2).
(9) Man in God's image (i. 26).	(9) Man headed by one in Satan's image (xiii.).
(10) Entrance of sin (iii.).	(10) Development and end of sin (xxi.; xxii.).
(11) Curse pronounced (iii. 14,17).	(11) No more curse (xxii. 3).
(12) Death entered (iii. 19).	(12) No more death (xxi. 4).
(13) Cherubim, first mentioned in connection with man's fall and expulsion (iii. 24).	(13) Cherubim, finally mentioned in connection with man's redemption and restitution (iv. 6).
(14) Man driven out from Eden (iii. 24).	(14) Man restored (xxii.).
(15) Tree of life forfeited (iii. 24).	(15) Right to the Tree of Life (xxii. 14).
(16) Sorrow and suffering enter (iii. 17).	(16) No more sorrow (xxi. 4).
(17) Man's religion, art, and science, resorted to for enjoyment, apart from God (iv.).	(17) Man's religion, luxury, art, and science, in their full glory, judged and destroyed by God (xviii.).
(18) Nimrod, a great rebel and king, and <i>hidden</i> anti-God, the founder of Babylon (x. 8,9).	(18) The Beast, the great rebel, a king, and <i>manifested</i> anti-God, the reviver of Babylon (xiii.-xviii.).
(19) A flood from God to destroy an evil generation (vi.-ix.).	(19) A flood from Satan to destroy an elect generation (xii. 15).
(20) The bow, the token of God's covenant with the Earth (ix. 13).	(20) The bow, betokening God's remembrance of His covenant with the earth (iv. 3; x. 1).
(21) Sodom and Egypt, the place of corruption and temptation (xiii.; xix.).	(21) Sodom and Egypt again: (spiritually representing Jerusalem) (xi. 8).
(22) A confederacy against Abraham's people overthrown (xiv.).	(22) A confederacy against Abraham's seed overthrown (xii.).
(23) Marriage of first Adam (ii. 18-23).	(23) Marriage of last Adam (xix.).
(24) A bride sought for Abraham's son (Isaac) and found (xxiv.).	(24) A bride made ready and brought to Abraham's son (xix. 7) See Matt. i. 1.
(25) Two angels acting for God on behalf of His people (xix.).	(25) Two witnesses acting for God on behalf of His People (xi.).
(26) A promised seed to possess the gate of his enemies (xxii. 17).	(26) The promised seed coming into possession (xi. 18; xxi. 12).
(27) Man's dominion ceased, and Satan's begun (iii. 24).	(27) Satan's dominion ended, and man's restored (xxii.).
(28) The old serpent causing sin, suffering, and death (iii. 1).	(28) The old serpent bound for 1,000 years (xx. 1-3).
(29) The doom of the old serpent pronounced (iii. 15).	(29) The doom on the old serpent executed (xx. 10).
(30) Sun, moon, and stars, associated with Israel (xxxvii. 9).	(30) Sun, moon, and stars, associated again with Israel (xii.).

The balance of the scriptural record of the outworking of the purpose of the ages is not only seen in the wonderful correspondence of Genesis and Revelation, but also in the equally wonderful balancing steps that intervene. Let us attempt to show something of the way in which this mighty subject is unfolded in the Word.

The opening words of Gen. i. strike a note that is never quite silenced throughout the ages, but awaits its full harmony at the end;

“In the beginning God” (Gen. i. 1).

“Then cometh the end that God might be all in all” (I Cor. xv. 24, 28).

From what we understand of the nature of God, He is entirely self-sufficient. He needs nothing that anything external to Himself could supply. But God is love, and love demands objects that will be both recipients of love and lovers in return. And so we realize the purpose of the ages, with its “valley of the shadow”; with its moral creatures that can say NO, when God is longing that they should say YES; with its bitter cross, triumphant resurrection, glorious coming, and blessed “end”.

There are three great corresponding truths revealed at the beginning and at the end of this purpose. Christ is set forth as the Firstborn of all creation; Satan is seen as the Anointed Cherub, and this opening period of the purpose ends with the overthrow of the world. At the other end, in perfect balance, Christ is set forth as the Head of all things. Satan is destroyed, and the Church is found in heavenly places, whilst the reconciliation of all things round off the overthrow of the world.

Immediately following this three-fold beginning of the purpose of the ages is a section which we denominate: “THE AGES BEGIN: PARADISE LOST.” This section is divided into four by the sub-headings: *Earth; Man; Usurper; Hope*. The Earth is made for man and blessed. Man is created in the image of God, and made, for a little, lower than the angels, with dominion over the work of God’s hands. The Usurper (the Serpent), by a false hope of immortality, robs man of his life and peace, and the only Hope left is in the promised “Seed”.

The corresponding section is denominated: “THE CONSUMMATION OF THE AGES: PARADISE RESTORED.” This, too, has four sub-headings: *Earth; Man; True Heir; Hope*. Earth is restored and blessed (Hos. ii. 18-23). The curse removed (Isa. lv. 13). The man, Christ Jesus, the last Adam, the express Image of God, has dominion in heaven and earth (Matt. xxviii.). He is the Heir of all things, and the Hope of Creation itself; the Seed of the woman, of Abraham, and of David.

We retrace our steps to see the way this great purpose is unfolded, and must be satisfied with the exhibition of the succeeding pairs in the Structure which are ranged on either side of the central number, the “MYSTERY”.

The days of Noah. The nations just before the call of Abraham
As it was in the days of Noah. The nations before Israel are saved.

Promises made to Abraham, Moses and David.
Promises fulfilled that were made to these Patriarchs.

Christ comes as King of the Jews. Rejected.
Christ comes the second time as King. In power and great glory.

The complete Structure of “The Purpose of the Ages” is set out in detail on pages 248 and 249 of *Dispensational Truth*, a Volume known and possessed by many of our readers, and is still obtainable. To appreciate this attempt to indicate the element of *balance* in the outworking of this purpose, the reader is urged to consult that Volume and go over the Structure line by line.

We believe such an examination will justify fully the claim that the Scriptures are an organic whole; that God has a sublime purpose; that each succeeding dispensation unfolds further and fuller details of that purpose; that the dispensation of the Mystery is the pivot on which this purpose revolves, and that at the close of this dispensation the inverse correspondence commences, placing in the second scale the fulfillment of what is predicated at the opening of the Word.

If the reader can look, not merely at this outline but investigate its details, comparing feature with feature as they are given in its corresponding members, he will be in possession of a view of the whole of the Word, which, if deficient in the matter of detail, will be sufficient to encourage the fullest search and study, and, taken together with Peter’s analysis studied in the preceding paper, should prove to be no small equipment in true, scriptural service.

The reader who consults *Dispensational Truth* will perceive that, without Christ, this outline has no connecting ties, but that with Him, in His various offices, the purpose of the ages is carried forward from glory to glory.

The central figure, the Mystery, has been given the same denominating letter, A*, as the beginning and the end, in order that it may be as apparent to the eye as to the understanding; that the Mystery, purposed before the ages and concealed for so long, is the pivot upon which the balance of this purpose depends.

(* - “H” in the Fourth ‘revised’ Edition, page 240, 241).

A friend and reader who had recently been attacked by reason of his faith in the inspiration of Scripture, secured a hearing, and extracted a reluctant acknowledgment from his opponents that he had grounds for his faith, by presenting them with another, but somewhat similar, outline to the one printed in *Dispensational Truth*.

Apart from divine inspiration, it is difficult to explain the presence of such a perfect plan in the long series of books, written by different men, over a period of more than a thousand years, some in Hebrew and some in Greek, which constitute the Bible, and it is

difficult for the believer to appreciate any but the most superficial of its doctrines, except he be persuaded that such doctrines constitute part of a connected, intelligible, whole.

The lesson we learn from the balance of the teaching of the three Creations is expanded and supplemented by perceiving the equally important balance of subject-matter which forms the skeleton framework upon which the whole revelation is woven.

When we come to details and smaller features in subsequent studies, we hope to show that this same principle is involved, and, throughout the series, may we be continually impressed with the need for balance in our thinking, in our manner of life, in our witness, and in all our ways.

#4. The Balance of Doctrine and Practice. **pp. 204 - 207**

In the last two papers we have been exercised with a subject so vast, that, while it may be granted to the earnest believer to obtain some glimpse of the perfection of the great purpose of the ages, in this life no one can ever hope to comprehend a tittle of what the Scriptures actually teach on the subject. Let us now leave this vast and overwhelming aspect of truth and turn to something that is within our grasp. Let us consider the necessary balance that the Scripture insist should be maintained between doctrine and practice.

The example of the apostle Paul and the character of his teaching will supply sufficient material to show how vital to all living faith this balance is. First, the Apostle's own example.

At the close of his life's work he thus wrote to Timothy:

“Thou has fully known (didst follow up) my doctrine, manner of life” (II Tim. iii. 10).

What consistency of walk is implied in such a challenging statement! Having joined the Apostle early in life, when Paul and Barnabas had but traveled half way round their first missionary journey (Acts xvi.), Timothy had thereafter remained in close contact with the Apostle. It is comparatively easy to maintain a “platform” or “pulpit” consistency, but it is another matter to challenge investigation into one's life, especially one spent in perilous journeyings, bitter feuds, periods of want, general misunderstanding, and unmitigated opposition from within and without. Yet the Apostle was able to do this. “I have showed you, and taught you” said he on another and earlier occasion (Acts xx. 20), and in the same passage he supplemented this statement by saying:

“I have coveted no man’s silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive” (Acts xx. 33-35).

Hupodeiknumi, “shewed” (Acts xx. 35), gives us *hupodeigma*, “example” (John xiii. 15), and Paul, fulfilling his doctrine by his practice, is found following in the footsteps of His Lord. This is teaching indeed, compared with which mere exactness in the form of doctrine and accuracy of presentation appear cold and lifeless.

The Apostle exhorted the Philippians to stand fast, being in nothing terrified by their adversaries, adding, “For unto you it is given, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake” (i. 28, 29), and then concluded on the personal note, “Having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me” (i. 30).

How near his Lord the Apostle must have walked to have taken this thought further, as he did in the fourth chapter:

“Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the Lord of peace shall be with you” (Phil. iv. 9).

Let us take some of the doctrines that we have received through the Apostle’s writings, and see how he urges us to balance them by practice.

Forgiveness.

“Having forgiven you all trespasses” (Col. ii. 13).

That is the doctrine. What is the corresponding practice?

“Forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye” (Col. iii. 13).

“Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you” (Eph. iv. 32).

Kindness.

In this second practical exhortation there is the word *chrestos*, “kind”. This in its turn is the practical outcome of the doctrinal truth revealed in Eph. ii.:

“That in the ages to come He might show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness (*chrestotes*) toward us through Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 7).

This same practical outworking is found in Col. iii.:

“Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness (*chrestotes*)” (Col. iii. 12).

Put on.

The exhortation, “put on”, reminds us of the passage in Eph. iv., which in its turn is the practical answer to the doctrinal passage of Eph. ii.:

“For to create in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace” (Eph. ii. 15).
 “Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness”
 (Eph. iv. 24).

This passage makes us think of Col. iii. 10, where we read:

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

but this in its turn is the practical outworking of the doctrine contained in that wondrous passage concerning Christ:

“Who is *the image* of the invisible God, the firstborn of every *creature*” (Col. i. 15).

Again, several items of the Unity of the Spirit which, in Eph. iv., the believer is enjoined to keep, are found in the doctrine of Eph. i., ii., and iii.

Ephesians i. - iii.	Eph. iv. 3 – 6.
Reconcile in One Body (ii. 16).	One Body.
Access by one Spirit (ii. 18).	One Spirit.
The Hope of His calling (i. 18).	One Hope of your calling.
Head over all things (i. 22).	One Lord.
Faith according to the Lord Jesus Christ (i. 17).	One Faith.
Fellowheirs, body, partakers (iii. 6).	One Baptism.
Blessed be the God and Father (i. 3).	One God and Father.
He is our Peace, Who hath made both one (ii. 14).	The Bond of Peace.

While the Apostle uses the word *prosagoge*, “access”, in Eph. ii. 18, we have to turn to Peter’s testimony to discover the actual doctrinal fact, of which this “access” is the practical balance:

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God” (I Pet. iii. 18).

“That He might bring” is the verb *prosago* from which “access”, *prosagoge*, is derived. In other words, we “draw nigh”, personally, because we have been “made nigh” by the finished work of Christ.

As the concluding example of this balance between doctrine and practice, let us take the great fundamental of Paul’s gospel, “righteousness”, *dikaiosune*. Nothing is more incisive than the teaching of the Apostle concerning the way in which righteousness must be received under the gospel. It is “by faith” (Phil. iii. 9), it is “not by works” (Tit. iii. 5), it is not “by the law” (Rom. iii. 21), it is “reckoned”, not as a wage, but as a gift (Rom. iv. 5). Christ is “made unto us righteousness” (I Cor. i. 30), and is “the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth” (Rom. x. 4).

Here is the doctrinal basis; what of the practical correspondence? Those thus justified by faith are told that they have become “the servants of righteousness” (Rom. vi. 18), that their members should be yielded as “instruments of righteousness” (Rom. vi. 13); and that the armour in which they stand contains “the breastplate” of righteousness

(Eph. vi. 14), and is itself called “the armour of righteousness” (II Cor. vi. 7). Timothy is exhorted to “follow after righteousness” (I Tim. vi. 11; II Tim. ii. 22), and the Apostle looked forward to receiving “a crown of righteousness” (II Tim. iv. 8) from the hand of the Lord, as the recognition by Him that the Apostle had finished his course and kept the faith.

Those of us to whom the Lord has shown such “longsuffering” as He did to Paul, the pattern of those who should after him believe (I Tim. i. 16), should find it comparatively easy to walk “with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love” (Eph. iv. 2), but, if we are to be guided by the evidence of our senses, it seems, alas, easier to leave the presence of the Lord, having been forgiven so great a debt, and to take one’s fellow-servant by the throat and say “pay me that thou owest”.

We shall never err by exercising too much longsuffering and forbearance, for we can never estimate in this life the debt that has been forgiven us by grace. Let us seek this wonderful balance, so that in our degree, low and little though it be, we shall be able, with all humility, to draw attention to both our “doctrine” and our “manner of life”.

“Who is sufficient for these things? My grace is sufficient for thee”
(I Cor. ii. 16; xii. 9).

War in Heaven (An Analogy).

#7. Underlying Principles. pp. 55, 56

It is impossible to read the Old Testament Scriptures without becoming acquainted with war from a great variety of angles. We read of the conquest of Canaan, of civil war, and of war inflicted as a Divine scourge. Under the old dispensation God does not stand aloof from war. Indeed Moses, in Exod. xv. 3, speaks of Him as “a man of war”. We shall, therefore, expect to find that there will be some passages of Scripture, dealing with Israel, and with some particular conflict, that will nevertheless contain principles which can legitimately be applied by believers of all times and callings.

At the exodus from Egypt, Moses gave utterance to the first of these great principles:

“Fear ye not. Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord the Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace” (Exod. xiv. 13, 14).

Long afterwards in the days of Jehoshaphat, we hear some of these words again:

“Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God’s Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed: tomorrow go out against them: for the Lord will be with you” (II Chron. xx. 15-17).

Then again, in I Sam. xvii. 47, we have David’s words: “The battle is the Lord’s.”

Before, however, we go further with our application of these principles we must examine the contexts of the passages concerned.

In the first passage from Exodus, it might appear that Israel were perfectly passive, but this is not quite true. *Immediately* following the words: “The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace” comes the command: “Wherefore criest thou unto Me? Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward. But lift thou up thy rod” (Exod. xiv. 15, 16).

Similarly, the citation of II Chron. xx. 15-17, if it unduly stresses the words “stand still” or “not need to fight” to the exclusion of all else that is said, will not supply the true Scriptural principle. Those who would have “no need to fight” are nevertheless told to “set” themselves, and we must also remember that the words “with you” are included:

“Stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord *with you* for the Lord will be *with you*” (II Chron. xx. 17).

Again, in I Sam. xvii., the youthful David, who declared that “the battle is the Lord’s”, was actually preparing at that very moment to go out and meet the champion of the Philistines in single combat.

It is evident, therefore, that, while the battle is indeed the Lord’s, and it is He alone Who gives victory and deliverance, it is equally true that He calls us into association with Himself. We must “go forward”. The salvation of the Lord is “with”, and not independent of, His believing people, and, as in David’s case, while we acknowledge at all times our utter dependence upon the Lord, there is also need for unflinching courage.

Another similar association of “faith” and “works” is found in the record of the battle with Amalek, in Exod. xvii. Joshua was bidden to “fight with Amalek” and Moses undertook to “stand” on the top of the hill with the rod of God in his hand.

“And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed” (Exod. xvii. 11).

While we recognize the supreme importance given here to the place filled by Moses—a type of the glorious intercession of Christ on high—we must not shut our eyes to the fact that it does not say that “*Moses* prevailed” or that “*Moses* fought”. There is no suggestion that, had Joshua or Israel refused to fight, the extended rod of Moses would have prevailed by itself.

These examples will perhaps suffice to illustrate the nature of the principle that underlies the spiritual conflict—a conflict in which the redeemed of the Lord have a definite part to play, assigned to them by the Captain of their salvation.

#8. “There’s a War On.”
Its effect upon the liberty of the subject.
pp. 71, 72

Having reviewed the teaching of the Scriptures regarding the existence and character of the conflict of the ages, we now apply the lessons we may learn to the affairs of daily Christian life and experience.

A skeptical objection, which we occasionally met, to the belief that a wise and beneficent Deity still holds sway over this world, may be illustrated by the following conversation, which has been recorded elsewhere. The speakers were two seafaring men, the one a Commander in the Royal Navy and the other a Captain in the Merchant Service.

Said the Commander, “If there be a God, what a mess He has made of His world. Look at my ship. Every plank is scrubbed white; every piece of brass shines; every man is at his post; I have made a far better job of my ship, than your God has made of His world”.

“Yes”, replied the Captain, “but tell me, WHAT WILL YOUR SHIP LOOK LIKE WHEN THERE’S A WAR ON AND YOUR SHIP HAS BEEN IN ACTION?”

When we meet anyone who is inclined to grumble at the necessary restrictions imposed by the Government on individual freedom of action and speech, we silence his objection by the observation, "*There's a War on*". Traveling facilities are curtailed; certain discomforts are inevitable; passengers have to wait a little longer for their particular bus, or a convenient train service has been suspended. Certain areas that once were common property or open of access become restricted and prohibited. But it were folly to murmur and wise to recognize that these things must be, if "there is a War on".

One of the things that strike us as sad is to realize, that by reason of the fact that they were born after 4th September, 1939, there are children suffering the consequences of War who have never lived in any other atmosphere. For them, the air has never been without its menace: for them, there has never been unlimited supply of the fruits of the earth: for them, there has never been the ability or opportunity of abundant life. Thus, also, it is of the utmost importance that we should remember that since the creation of Adam, it can be as truly said of mankind as of the children born since 4th Sept., 1939, that *it has never yet known what it is to live without the conditions of War*. Before Adam was formed in the image of his Maker, the spiritual conflict had broken out. The Anointed Cherub had rebelled against his Lord; he had attempted the usurpation of Heaven's dominion, and at the reconstruction of this present world and the creation of man with dominion in it, he immediately recognized in this new being his incipient foe, and laid plans for his overthrow. Man has never yet known true liberty. The presence of spiritual foes; the threat of invasion of his territory; the destruction of his fair inheritance; the employment of every artifice of deceit; all these have rendered the odds against him very great. They have beset man before and behind with all the spiritual equivalents of War conditions, so that, even though by his very constitution as a moral agent, whose will can remain "will" only if it be "free", he finds himself so surrounded by the consequences of conflict as to realize that his "liberty" must, for the time being, be seriously curtailed, and can only be fully enjoyed when the present conditions of conflict shall cease.

We find this limitation of full liberty in the command to abstain from one tree in the garden of Eden. We find it in operation when, in order that weaker brethren might not be stumbled, the Apostle Paul gladly and willingly curtailed some of the very liberty he might as a Christian legitimately have enjoyed. Had anyone challenged the Apostle on this point, asserting that his actions denied the championship of liberty and freedom with which his epistles abound, he might pertinently have replied, "There's a War on". His advice to the Corinthians regarding buying and selling, marriage or abstinence, was governed by "the present necessity" (or "distress") (I Cor. vii. 26). He urged those who used this world, not to "use it to the full" ("abuse") (I Cor. vii. 31); and that while they knew that "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof", they might recognize that it might, on occasion, nevertheless be incumbent on them to allow another man's conscience to limit their own individual freedom (I Cor. x. 28, 29).

For over a thousand years the peoples of these islands of Great Britain have slowly and patiently acquired a liberty that has become the envy of other lands. Yet, with less

stir and fewer headlines in the daily press than would be given to the sinking of one battleship, this people, of their own free will, have yielded the blood-bought rights of a thousand years, handed over their most sacred liberties for the duration of the conflict, voluntarily placed themselves in a state of bondage and accepted the possibility of a curtailment of rights comparable with that obtaining in a slave state. For what reason? There is but one answer: "There's a War on."

With this national lesson before his eyes the believer would do well to ponder its application in the spiritual realm, and as he becomes conscious of many restraints, of irksome limitations of his present enjoyment of spiritual freedom, let him acknowledge that in their willing renunciation the children of this generation can teach a wonderful lesson to the children of light, for true liberty must wait the crown of true peace for its unrestricted enjoyment. "The liberty of the glory of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21).

#9. "There's a War On."

**The legitimate use of the Scriptures in a day of darkness and strife.
pp. 126, 127**

Among the conditions of life imposed by the Great War was one which was called "The black-out". Like Israel, the believer can have "light" *in* his dwelling, but the outside world will be found covered with a darkness that may be felt. It is the characteristic of our spiritual foe to work in darkness; our enemies, said the Apostle, are "The rulers of the darkness of this world" (Eph. vi. 12).

For the safety of those who must walk abroad in the period of the "black-out" it was arranged that while, owing to the conditions of the conflict, they were not permitted the indiscriminate use of lamp or torch or to throw light upon any and every object, they could use a torch of sufficient power to show their immediate path, and thus avoid obstacles and find their required haven. When, therefore, we meet any who complain that the Bible does not illuminate the vast geological ages preceding the advent of man; when the Scriptures leave much unsaid regarding the nations outside Israel, and leave untouched numerous philosophical problems, there is but one covering answer: "There's a war on". The Scriptures have been given for the use of the wayfarer during the present spiritual "black-out" and, if rightly used, they will indeed prove to be what the Psalmist said God's Word was to him, "A lamp unto my *feet*, and a light unto my *path*" (Psalm cxix. 105).

To avoid accident during the darkness we were urged to look carefully before we stepped off the curb into the traffic, and the Apostle advises the believer in similar spiritual conditions, to "Walk circumspectly because the days are evil" (Eph. v. 15, 16). While the word "circumspectly" well conveys the idea of "looking all round", the word *akribos* which it translates is one indicative of even more insistent care and accuracy. There were, moreover, special crossings which were safe for pedestrians who

observed the rules, even as the believer who attends to the Scriptures will hear a voice saying “This is the way, walk ye in it” (Isa. xxx. 21).

Not only may we learn from the analogy of the “black-out” to appreciate the true purpose of wise limitations of the Scriptures, but also from the censorship of news which the presence of the enemy imposed. No man in this country was prevented from listening to the wireless news that came from the four quarters of the earth, but he did not expect his government, in the name of liberty, to proclaim for all the world to hear, the disposition of its troops, the position and strength of its navy, and the hundred and one items of news then forbidden which, in days of peace, would have been common knowledge.

Similarly, the Scriptures contain indications of the wise censorship of their Author. Did the Apostles enquire whether the kingdom would be restored again to Israel at the time of the Lord’s last days upon earth? They were reminded, “It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power” (Acts i. 7). Are we inclined to compute the date of the second coming of Christ? We are met by the censorship of the truth, “But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but My Father only” (Matt. xxiv. 36).

Instead, therefore, of likening the inspired Scriptures to the sun in the noonday heavens, we shall be wise if we remember the figure of the lamp to our feet in the present dispensational night. Instead of maintaining that the Scriptures contain full light upon any and every conceivable theme, we draw attention to the fact that those selfsame Scriptures inform us that there are some features of importance which the Father has kept even from the angels of heaven: “For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face” (I Cor. xiii. 12).

This is the testimony of the Word itself. To-day, owing to the presence of spiritual foes, we must be blessedly content to leave many a problem unsolved, and wait patiently the full-orbed illumination of “that day”. That the Scriptures have not been written to satisfy all our curiosity and to answer all our questions, is no implication of their imperfection. Most assuredly they are perfectly adapted to their special work of providing enough information for the guidance and direction of the believer during life’s journey, without at the same time giving away information that would be of help to our spiritual foe. To know even as we are known, we must await the day of peace.

#10. The Censorship of Information. pp. 147, 148

The full inspiration of the Scriptures and the divinely appointed limits of the subject-matter revealed in them, as, for example, indicated in I Cor. xiii. 12, do not conflict with one another any more than the effectiveness of the electric torch as “a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path”, is nullified because it does not equal the light of day. In this respect the Scriptures are as and what they are because “There’s a war on”.

Another indication of intentional limitation of information, parallel to the censorship of news in war-time, is the presence in the Scriptures of a series of “mysteries”. This word, as used in Scripture, must not be limited to its modern usage, as, for instance, the “mysterious” nature of the spirit-world, but rather has the meaning of a “secret”, purposely hid because of the presence of an enemy, and revealed only at the appointed time. This can be seen in passages where we first meet with the word. “The mysteries of the kingdom of heaven”, which fill the thirteenth chapter of Matthew’s Gospel, with their twofold teaching concerning the outer and inner courses of the purpose relating to the kingdom in the absence of the rejected King, reveal the presence and activity of an enemy. In the parable of the Tares, we read, “An enemy hath done this” (Matt. xiii. 28), and because the time was ripe, the disciples then hear and see truth that many prophets and righteous men had desired to see (Matt. xiii. 16, 17).

So, too, “The mystery” that fills the present dispensation with its distinctive glory was “hid in God”, and “hidden since the ages and generations” and therefore not revealed until the people of Israel, together with their hope and calling, were temporarily set aside at Acts xxviii. Inasmuch as this mystery goes back to a period “before the overthrow (*katabole*) of the world”, when the great enemy of all truth was cast out as profane, we can understand the wisdom that decreed that certain aspects of the purpose of the ages should be kept secret until the appropriate time. The phrase, “The mystery of His will”, found in Eph. i. 9, is very similar to one found in classical use, where it refers to the “plan of campaign” made by a king but naturally kept secret because of the enemy.

A feature which has never been absent from warfare but which has come very much to the fore in the present conflict is the use of the “spy” and his confederates. So much is this the case that it has given rise to the new names of “Quisling” and “Fifth Columnist”. The Churches of Galatia suffered from the activity of fifth columnists (Acts xv. 1, 5), and when the Apostle Paul went up to Jerusalem about this very matter he found that “false brethren” had been brought in “unawares”, who had come in “privily” “to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus that they might bring us into bondage” (Gal. ii. 4).

These churches had a “troubler” (Gal. i. 7) in their midst, whose object was “to pervert the gospel of Christ”. The truth and the church were being “leavened” (Gal. v. 9), the cross of Christ emptied of its sacred worth, and its message nullified.

Another part of this campaign of deceit is disclosed in the statement made by Paul in II Thess. ii. 1, 2, showing that false messages came by “spirit”, by “word” and by “a letter, as from the Apostle”, to counter which the Apostle in his epistles was led to use a distinctive phrase which he always wrote with his own hand (II Thess. iii. 17).

This campaign of deceit never ceases. So far as man is concerned it began in the Garden of Eden, and it is resumed even after the millennial reign, when the devil, being let loose, shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth (Rev. xx. 7, 8).

Deception is raised to a fine art in the dispensation of the mystery, as will be seen by the efforts of translators to do justice to the intensity of the words used in the passages that reveal it.

“By the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive”
(Eph. iv. 14).

“By the sleight of men in craftiness, after the wiles of error” (R.V.).

“In the sleight of men, in cunning, with a view to systematized error” (Darby).

Rotherham, Weymouth, Moffatt and others may also be consulted, for each adds his help in throwing light upon the dark theme.

We must ever be on our guard against rumour and false teaching and remember that our spiritual foe is a past-master at the dreadful work of deception. By analogy, we may learn from the children of this generation, in their attempts to counteract the campaign of lies that often prepares the way for attack and conquest, the need of constant watchfulness.

#11. Measures of Defence and of Offence. pp. 186 - 188

Because there was a war on, the man of the world voluntarily relinquished many legitimate pleasures, forgoed even some necessities, endured a deal of discomfort, and in many ways put into practice, in the secular sphere, the tenets of Scripture laid down for the guidance of the believer in the days of spiritual conflict.

The subject is as endless as life’s experiences, for, from the cradle to the grave, man lives his life in a world of war. We cannot make this series of articles as exhaustive as life itself, but we can point out a few of the more obvious features, leaving the rest to the spiritual understanding of each reader.

We will then look for a moment at defensive and offensive measures that find parallels in spiritual warfare. Among these every believer observed the parallel between the “Anderson Shelter” and that Refuge which has been provided by the God of our

salvation. It may be fanciful, but it is at least suggestive, that the name John Anderson means The Gift of God, the Son of man. John, and Jonathan, are composed of Nathan, a gift, and the name Jah. Andrew, which is allied to Anderson, is the genitive form of the Greek *aner*, man. The reader will find the subject of Refuge elaborated in a series of articles in Volume XXX entitled “The Eternal God is thy Refuge” (also in pamphlet form) and from some of the Scripture references appearing therein we now quote.

“God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble” (Psa. xli. 1).

“He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty” (Psa. xci. 1).

“Thou has been a shelter for me” (Psa. lxi. 3).

We may be surprised to find in Scripture such a modern term as a shelter from blast, or to read of effective protection against incendiaries, but they are there:

“A Refuge from the storm when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall” (Isa. xxv. 4).

“The shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked” (Eph. vi. 16).

Decontamination is provided by “the washing of water by the Word” (Eph. v. 26); and the complete armour of God is detailed in Eph. vi. 14-17. The one weapon of offence with which the believer is provided is “The sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God” (Eph. vi. 17). He is exhorted to “stand” rather than enter into a campaign; he is so train and discipline himself that he may be able “to withstand in the evil day” (Eph. vi. 13). Just as the civil population and peaceful towns and villages became, at times, the front line, and just as the recent conflict was called “An all-in war”, where the slogan “Business as usual” was both untrue and impossible, so is it with the conflict of truth and error. There can be no holding back: all the redeemed are intimately involved, and their time, talents, and possessions must be freely used in the service of their Captain.

Unless we are watchful our “communications” will be cut, and many a believer has become either a casualty or has given up the conflict, because his fellowship with God has become slack or discontinued. Moreover, the enemy knows that starvation will bring the proudest nation to its knees. To the believer, the Bread of Life is Christ as ministered by the Word of God, and prayer is his line of communication, but the Scriptures represent our food. If therefore either prayer or Bible study can be hindered, our spiritual foe will gain an advantage.

Internal dissension, seeds of jealousy and distrust are fruitful causes of failure, as is also distorted and partially-quoted truth. The leader of the opposing force is a “liar” and a “murderer” (John viii. 44), and is obsessed with the awful ambition to occupy the place that alone belongs to Deity (II Thess. ii. 4; Matt. iv. 9; Rev. xiii. 4).

Thus at every turn, the recent earthly conflict reflected the heavenly in unseen warfare.

Terms of victory and the true meaning of peace will be considered in a separate series of articles, which should be consulted. Perhaps enough has been said in the present series

for our immediate purpose, and we trust that as a result of pondering the teaching of the Word, and observing the many parallels that exist between the earthly and heavenly warfare, every reader will become that most envied of servants: “A *good soldier of Jesus Christ*”.

Worship.

#1. The meaning of the term. pp. 93 - 95

The first occurrence of the word “worship” in the A.V. is in Gen. xxii. 5, the significance of which will be appreciated by all who realize how near to the heart of all doctrine is the great offering therein set forth in type. While the *word* “worship” does not appear earlier, the student of Scripture is very conscious as he reads Gen. iii. that the words of the Serpent, “Ye shall be as God”, would have been no lure to our first parents had true worship and its central significance been understood by them. Moreover, had Cain entered into the meaning of worship, as did his brother Abel, he might have enjoyed like acceptance with Abel, and have avoided the murderer’s curse.

Those who see in Ezek. xxviii. something more than a reference to an ordinary King of Tyre, may perceive that an attack upon true worship, a usurpation of Divine prerogative, lie behind the judgment that caused the chaos of Gen. i. 2.

Coming to the end of the sacred volume and viewing the crisis and conflict there depicted, it can be truthfully asserted that it is mainly a conflict between true and false worship. Worship lies in the forefront of the ten commandments and is found in every section of the inspired Scriptures. The heart of the redeemed responds to the call:

“O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker”
(Psa. xcv. 6).

Redemption, the gospel, prophecy, dispensational truth, are the outer court of the temple of truth, but the inner shrine, the goal towards which the whole purpose of the ages leads, namely, “that God may be all in all”, is the summing up in word and in fact of all that acceptable worship means. A theme that is so near the centre of all truth should, therefore, receive from all who love the Lord the most earnest and prayerful attention, for if we are right here, we have a corrective against all other evils, doctrinal, dispensational and practical. On the other hand, if we are wrong here, we are exposed to all the assaults of the wicked one.

In every argument or study it is a necessity that terms be defined. We must arrive at a clear, scriptural understanding of what the word “worship” means and all that the term connotes. The inspired Scriptures were not given in our mother tongue, but in Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek, yet, upon examination, the English word “worship” will yield its quota.

The meaning of the word “worship”.—The reader will not need a long explanation concerning the qualifying suffix, “ship”, which is used in such words as “fellowship”, “discipleship”, or in the less familiar form as in “landscape”. The word worship comes from the Anglo-Saxon *weordhscipe*, “worth”, or “worthy”, with the added suffix, and

primarily means acknowledgment of “worth”, wherever found. Formerly the word “worship” was not so restricted as it is now, e.g., Wycliffe gives a startling rendering of John xii. 26, “If any man serve Me, My Father shall *worship* him”! a usage of the word that would now not be tolerated. In our A.V., however, we still read, “Thou shalt have *worship* in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee” (Luke xiv. 10). The Church of England marriage service contains the word, to be uttered by the husband, “With my body I thee worship”, yet, not idolatry, but recognition of the high place of honour in which the husband holds the woman who has given herself so wholly into his keeping is intended. We still speak of a magistrate as “Your worship”, and of certain Guilds, as a “worshipful” company, without transgressing either Bible teaching or good taste. In all these usages the primary meaning, “worthy-ship”, is retained. In every act of worship there is either expressed or implied the sentiment, “Thou art worthy”, and, commensurately with the advancing ranks in the scale of being and holiness of those to whom this recognition is addressed will the “worship” offered grow richer, fuller and more exclusive.

All this however but skims the surface of meaning. The only words that can unfold the mind of God in this, and all other matters of truth, are the inspired words of holy writ.

As we have commenced with the English, let us go back to the Hebrew by way of the Greek of the N.T.

(1) *Proskuneo*.—There is a superficial resemblance in this word to the Greek *kuon*, “a dog”, and some have given the primary meaning of the word as “To crouch, crawl, or fawn, like a dog at his master’s feet”. But there is a sense of degradation about this figure, and it is entirely contrary to any scriptural conception of “worship” that the Father seeks those who will crouch, crawl, or fawn to Him like a dog. There is another word, unused in the Scriptures but used in classical Greek, namely *kuneo*, “to kiss”, and it is from this root that Cremer, Thayer, H. J. Rose in his footnote in the later edition of Parkhurst, and other lexicographers derive this word for “worship”. *Proskuneo* means properly, “to kiss the hand (towards) one, in token of reverence”, “to make a salaam” (Thayer). Liddell and Scott give instances where *kuneo*, “to kiss”, is used in the sense of *proskuneo*, “to worship”. The root *kus* has come through into many languages beside the Greek. The Anglo-Saxon *coss*, the Danish *kys*, the German *kuss* and the English *kiss*, being instances that come readily to mind.

The scriptures moreover associate kissing with worship. “And Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and did obeisance, and kissed him” (Exod. xviii. 7). The word translated “do obeisance” is translated “worship” ninety-nine times in the O.T. Again, there is no doubt about the close association of the kiss with worship in the following passages:

“Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him” (I Kings xix. 18).

“Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves” (Hosea xiii. 2).

“If I beheld the sun moon and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand I should have denied the God above” (Job xxxi. 26-28).

The marginal reading of Gen. xli. 40, too, is suggestive. The A.V. reads, "Thou shalt be over my house, and according unto thy word shall my people be ruled". The word translated "word" here is "mouth", the cause put for the effect, and "be ruled" the verb *nashaq*, "kiss", as in Gen. xlvi. 10.

Omitting therefore the sense of the fawning of a dog, we can adopt the remainder of the definition given in Dr. Bullinger's Lexicon:

"To prostrate oneself after the eastern custom, to do reverence or homage to any one, by kneeling or prostrating oneself before him (LXX everywhere for *shachah*, to bow down, to prostrate oneself in reverence). Used there ore as the act of worship."

(2) *Sebomai*, *sebazomai*, *eusebeo*.—The word just examined is used of the *act* of worship, whereas, these three words are used rather for the *feeling* associated with it. The meaning of *sebomai* is "To stand in awe". It is never used in the epistles. *Sebazomai* occurs but once and that in connection with "the worship of the creature" (Rom. i. 25). In the Acts *sebasma* is used once, of the "devotions" of the Athenians, and once in "all that is called God or worshipped" (II Thess. ii. 4). While *eusebeia*, 'godliness', is used in the epistles, neither *eusebeia* is there translated "worship". Their bearing upon the question of present-day worship must be examined later.

(3) *Latreuo*, means "to serve for hire", and when related to God means "to worship". It is used by Paul in Phil. iii. 3.

(4) *Therapeuo* is generally associated with medical service, and is derived from *therapeuein*, "To wait on". It is from an old Sanskrit root meaning "to maintain or support". It occurs but once, namely, in Acts xvii. 25, "neither is worshipped with men's hands" which the R.V. translates "serve".

(5) *Threskeia*.—This word refers rather to ceremonial and ritual than the inner meaning of worship. It occurs in Col. ii. 18, where the word is used of "the worshipping of angels" and, in combination with *thelo*, it is found in Col. ii. 23, where it is translated "will-worship".

The O.T. uses three words, two of which need not detain us long. *Segad* is Chaldee, and is used in Dan. iii. where it means "to bow down, do obeisance", and *abad*, which is Hebrew, and found translated "worship" only in II Kings x., where it speaks of the worship of Baal. The third word, *shachah*, is the equivalent of *proskuneo*.

Just as tubes of oil-paint do not produce on the mind the same effect as a picture, so these words supply the material, but do not teach the meaning, of worship. It must be our delight as well as our duty to use these materials, and under the guidance of the Spirit, to learn something of what is meant by the worship of God.

#2. Worship: its relation to Leading, Gospel, Sacrifice and Revelation. pp. 143 - 147

The implications of posture have occupied the attention both of Doctors of Divinity and of Medicine. A lazy posture is inimical both to serious study and reverence in worship. And as the close association of “bowing the head” with worship meets us very early in the Scriptures, let us commence our study with an examination of the passages in which this expression is found.

The word used, is the Hebrew *qadad*, and occurs fifteen times. Of this number of references, nine deal with the worship of God, and six with various acts of reverence or fear in the presence of man or angel. We shall be following the Divine method of instruction if we begin with the three passages that refer to man, for, after all, the bowing of the head in the act of worshipping One who is spirit, borrowed as it is from this evident token of human respect, can have no *intrinsic* meaning as related to God Himself, Who sees the thoughts and intents of the heart, whatever attitude or posture is adopted.

The first pair of references occurs in I Kings i.:

“And Bath-sheba went in unto the king into the chamber; and the king was very old and Bathsheba bowed, and did obeisance unto the king. And the king said, What wouldest thou?” (verse 15 and 16).

“Then Bath-sheba bowed with her face to the earth, and did reverence” (verse 31).

Between the two verses lies the asking of a request and the granting of it. The subject of Bath-sheba’s request was the fulfillment of David’s oath that her son Solomon should succeed to the throne, but that need not take our attention here. It is sufficient to see that in making the request of the king and in her acknowledgment of the answer given, Bath-sheba “bowed and did obeisance” and “bowed and did reverence”.

The reader will not be surprised to learn that both “obeisance” and “to do reverence”, here, are translations of the Hebrew word *shachah*, “to worship”. It is a simple matter to translate the attitude of Bath-sheba, when making her request and in thanksgiving before an earthly and aged king, into higher terms, and see their application to the worshipper who approaches the “King Immortal” with requests and thanksgiving.

The next two references need not long detain us. I Sam. xxiv. 8 tells us that, after he had spared the life of Saul, David cried out to the king and “stooped with his face to the earth, and bowed himself”. We only stay to observe here that the word “stooped” is the word translated “bow” in the other fourteen occurrences, whereas the word “bow” in this passage, is the translation of *shachah*, “do obeisance”, “do reverence”, or “worship”. The same words are found in I Sam. xxviii. 14, where Saul, who had restored to the witch of Endor, “perceived that it was Samuel” and “stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself”. While the two passages refer to occasions of a very different nature,

they are linked together in that, whether it be David bowing before the Lord's anointed, or Saul fancying he is in the presence of a miracle, the attitude is one of reverence, whether genuine or misguided.

The fifth reference is in Numb. xxii. 31, where the eyes of Balaam are opened to see the Angel of the Lord in the way. We read: "And he bowed his head, and fell flat on his face." Although the word here translated "to fall down flat" is still *shachah*, "to worship", it is the only occurrence of the word being followed by such an expression as "on his face", which lowers it from its true meaning of fear, to sheer fright, leaving therefore fourteen examples of the use of the word "to bow" associated with the higher meaning of obeisance or worship.

The only remaining reference in this series is Gen. xliii. 28, where the brethren of Joseph "bowed down their heads, and made obeisance", fulfilling the dream that had excited their early animosity and foreshadowing the day when Israel shall look upon Him Whom they have pierced and give Him the long-deferred honour that is due.

We now have left for our meditation the nine occurrences of *qadad*, "to bow", all of which are definitely associated with the worship of God.

As we pursue this study let it be kept in mind that we are seeking fuller light upon the essential nature of true worship. A satisfactory definition of worship is hard to find, and it is hoped that the present studies will be a useful contribution to the subject. The nine references are Gen. xxiv. 26 and 48; Exod. iv. 31, xii. 27, and xxxiv. 8; I Chron. xxix. 20; II Chron. xx. 18; xxix. 30 and Neh. viii. 6.

The first pair show us worship in the presence of most evident leading. Abraham had sent his servant to Mesopotamia to seek a wife of his own kindred for Isaac. Upon arrival, the servant made the camels kneel down by the well, and prayed:

"O Lord God of my master Abraham, I pray thee, send me good speed this day, and show kindness unto my master Abraham. Behold, I stand here by the well of water; and the daughters of the men of the city come out to draw water: And let it come to pass, that the damsel to whom I shall say, Let down thy pitcher, I pray thee, that I may drink also, let the same be she that Thou hast appointed for Thy servant Isaac; and thereby shall I know that Thou has showed kindness unto my master" (Gen. xxiv. 12-14).

In this prayer there is a delightfully robust, yet simple, faith which the Lord was pleased to honour. Before the man had done speaking, Rebekah is seen approaching, carrying her pitcher, not on her head, but upon her shoulder, indicating, as some have said, her higher caste. Thompson, in "The Land and the Book", is worth quoting here:

"She went *down* to the well; and nearly all wells in the East are in wadies and many of them have steps down to the water—fountains of course have. Eliezer asks water to drink; she hastens and *lets down the pitcher in her hand*. How often have I had this identical act performed for myself, when traveling in this thirsty land. Rebekah's address to the *servant*, 'Drink, my Lord'—*Ishrub ya seedy*—will be given to you in the exact idiom by the first gentle Rebekah you ask water from."

Reading these words the prayer of Eliezer at first seems to lose its point. If it was tolerably certain that any damsel in the East would thus respond, no great advance towards identification would seem to have been accomplished. However, Thompson's comment continues:

“But I have never found any young lady so generous as this fair daughter of Bethuel. She drew for all his camels, and for nothing, while I have often found it difficult to get my horse watered even for money.”

That there should be a voluntary undertaking to water such thirsty creatures as camels, was a testing stipulation, and would indicate an exceptionally generous nature in the person sought. We can therefore understand the man “wondering at her” and “holding his peace, to wit whether the Lord had made his journey prosperous or not”. But when he discovered that the damsel was actually Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel, the Son of Milcah, he “bowed down his head, and worshipped the Lord, and he said, Blessed be the Lord God of my master of His master Abraham, who hath not left destitute my master of His mercy and His truth; I being in the way, the Lord led me to the house of my master's brethren” (Gen. xxiv. 26, 27).

Here is food for thought and light upon the nature of worship. The ascription of “blessedness” to God, the reference to “mercy and truth”, and the most evident leading of Eliezer, combine to provide a warm and living atmosphere for the first reference to “worship” in association with the key word we are at present using, *qadad*, “to bow”.

The book of Redemption, Exodus, contains three occurrences of *qadad*. The first is Exod. iv. 31, after Moses and Aaron had demonstrated by word and sign that the Lord had visited the children of Israel and had looked upon their affliction. These afflicted people did two associated things, “They believed they bowed their head and worshipped”. Worship therefore here springs from believing the good news of salvation. It must be as spontaneous as breathing, and can only be offered by a believing people.

The second reference is found in Exod. xii., the chapter of the Passover. God had now redeemed His promise; He had visited His people and when Moses enjoined upon them annually to remember this great Passover deliverance and teach their children its significance, the people, realizing something of the solemn nature of this great salvation, “bowed the head and worshipped” (Exod. xii. 27). Be it noted also, that “worship”, or “bowed head”, is closely allied with obeisance, for the next verse says: “And the children of Israel went away, and did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they.”

The third reference is Exod. xxiv. 8. Moses had prayed of the Lord that he might be shown His glory. The Lord had replied, “I will make all My goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy. And He said, Thou canst not see My face; for there shall no man see My face and live” (Exod. xxxiii. 19, 20). Moses is therefore put into a cleft of the rock and, while the glory of the Lord passed by, Moses was covered by the Lord's hand, only such a revelation being permitted

as was within the spiritual ability of Moses to receive, the Lord taking away His hand after He had passed by so that His “back parts” only might be seen. Then follows the writing of the fresh set of tables of stone, the proclamation of the name of the Lord, His mercy and His justice, “And Moses made haste, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped” (Exod. xxxiv. 8).

It is somewhat striking to observe that in the four outstanding passages we have as yet reviewed, the words “make haste” (Hebrew *mahar*) occur.

“And she *made haste*, and let down her pitcher” (Gen. xxiv. 46).

“And Joseph *made haste*; for his bowels did yearn upon his brother” (Gen. xliii. 30).

“Send them out of the land *in haste*” (Exod. xii. 33).

“And Moses *made haste*, and bowed and worshipped” (Exod. xxxiv. 8).

To attempt an analysis of this expression and consider its bearing upon the subject before us would take us too far afield and prevent the inclusion of the remaining references, but some readers may be interested enough to pursue the matter further for themselves.

As a result of this revelation of divine goodness we read, “Behold, the skin of his face shone”, although he wist it not.

The three passages from Exodus associate worship with the believing of the typical gospel, with the memorial of the typical passover, and with the proclamation of the name of the Lord, His goodness, His mercy, His justice, and with the transfiguring effect upon the face of Moses—a foreshadowing of that antitypical change, when “we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord” (II Cor. iii. 18).

Before we have traversed the references that employ the word *qadad*, “to bow”, four more illuminating episodes await us, but these must be left for our next article. In this we have seen worship associated with leading, gospel, sacrifice and revelation, each of which has its fellow in the fuller teaching found in the N.T., and consequently demands fuller and higher worship than was possible in a dispensation of types and shadows.

#3. Further examples and illustrations of worship. pp. 169 - 173

Continuing our examination of those texts of Scripture which contain references both to “worship” and “the bowing of the head”, we pass from the days of Moses to the time of the Kings; to *David*, and the offering made by both king and people for the building of the temple (I Chron. xxix.).

In the preceding chapter (I Chron. xxviii.) we find that David assembled the princes and officers of Israel and revealed to them how he had had in his heart the desire to build a house of rest for the Ark of the Covenant, and had made ready for the building, but that the Lord had intervened, saying that, seeing he had been a man of war, he could not build His house, but that Solomon his son should do so after his succession to the throne. After publicly exhorting Solomon to faithfulness, David gave him the pattern of the house and its service that he had received from the Lord. Furthermore the last chapter of Chronicles recounts how, after the people had been told of his intensive preparation for the building of the house, David made an appeal to them saying, “And who then is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?” (verse 5). The response was magnificent. First the princes and then the people “offered themselves willingly” (verses 6 and 9). In the confession that followed, when David blessed the Lord before all the congregation, this willingness comes as a refrain (verse 14, 17). The subsequent exhortation, “Now bless the Lord your God”, is followed by worship, “And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord, and the king” (verse 20).

If we inquire what “blessing the Lord” implies and involves, we have an answer here in the language of David which suggests that it is the recognition of all His grace and glory:

“Blessed be Thou, Lord God of Israel our Father, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the GREATNESS, and the POWER, and the GLORY, and the VICTORY, and the MAJESTY: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine; Thine is the KINGDOM, O Lord, and Thou art exalted as HEAD above all. Both RICHES and HONOUR come of Thee, and Thou REIGNEST over all; and in Thine hand is POWER and MIGHT; and in Thine hand it is to make GREAT, and to give STRENGTH unto all. Now *therefore* our God, we thank Thee, and praise Thy glorious name” (I Chron. xxix. 10-13).

Worship contains more, but never less, than this great ascription of praise. Greatness that is intrinsic and His own, and greatness that is solely at His disposal. A God Who is sovereign, and a God of sovereign grace.

Mingled with this glorious ascription is the recognition of human frailty: “Our days on the earth are as a shadow, and there is none abiding” and the fact that all the service we can ever render to the Lord is but using the gifts which He has originally bestowed on us:

“O Lord our God, all this store that we have prepared to build Thee an house for Thine holy name cometh of Thine hand, and IS ALL THINE OWN Of Thine own have we given Thee” (I Chron. xxix. 14-16).

These chapters contain abundant material out of which a very full conception could be reached of what true worship involves, and we therefore commend to our readers the desirability of a prayerful and careful re-reading of them.

From David we pass on to the story of another king, namely, *Jehoshaphat*, and the triumph of praise (II Chron. xx. 1-30). The record opens with the report of an invasion by Moab (verses 1, 2), and ends with “rest and quiet” (verse 30). Fear of Moab (verse 3) is exchanged for fear of God in all the invading kingdoms when they heard that the Lord fought against Israel’s enemies (verse 29). The people gathered themselves together to ask *help* of the Lord (verse 4), and when the battle was over they assembled themselves to *bless* the Lord (verses 26-28).

The central section of this record is divided as follows:

- A | 5-13. Prayer and Confession.
- B | 14-17. Prophecy: Given.
- A | 18, 19. Praise and Worship.
- B | 20-25. Prophecy: Fulfilled.

In his prayer Jehoshaphat acknowledged that the Lord God was not only the God of his fathers, and therefore in covenant relationship, but also God in heaven, Who ruled over the heathen, and his prayer for deliverance from the ungrateful invasion of Ammon and Moab is based upon these two facts. The prayer ends with a confession that Israel had neither power nor wisdom in the matter:

“O our God, wilt Thou not judge them? for we have no might against this great company that cometh against us; neither know we what to do: but our eyes are upon Thee. And all Judah stood before the Lord, with their little ones, their wives and their sons” (II Chron. xx. 12-13).

This prayer is answered by the prophecy of Jahaziel, whose name means, “God reveals”, who said:

“Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not your’s but God’s ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you” (verses 15-17).

Upon hearing these words “Jehoshaphat bowed his head with his face to the ground: and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell before the Lord, worshipping the Lord” (verse 18).

Once more Jehoshaphat speaks, this time to the people: “Believe in the Lord our God, so shall ye be established; believe His prophets, so shall ye prosper” (verse 20). Then he consulted with the people to ascertain their attitude, with the result that singers were

appointed to “praise the beauty of holiness”, and the heartening sequel is described in the words:

“And when they began to sing and to praise, the Lord set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, which were come against Judah; and they were smitten every one helped to destroy another” (II Chron. xx. 22, 23).

On the fourth day the people assembled in a valley, and there blessed the Lord, the place from that day being called the Valley of Berachah, or Blessing (verse 26).

Here therefore is another telling context associated with the meaning and adjuncts of worship. The worshippers confess that they have neither power nor wisdom, but they believe the Lord and His prophets; they set themselves in battle array, armed, not with weapons known to men, but with praise, emphasizing the beauty of holiness and ending with the blessing the Lord. The eye that has looked to Christ as the “power” and “wisdom” of God will see in this passage much to illuminate the great subject of “worship”.

Turning now to II Chron. xxix., we come to the reign of *Hezekiah*, and the restoration of worship carried out under his command. His first recorded act was to “open the doors of the house of the Lord” and repaired them. The priests and Levites were assembled, and sanctified themselves and cleansed the temple and the court, beginning on the first day of the first month. Suitable offerings were selected, and reconciliation made with their blood, “for the king commanded that the burnt offering and the sin offering should be made for all Israel” (verse 24).

“And when they had made an end of offering, the king and all that were present with him bowed themselves and worshipped” (II Chron. xxix. 29).

Consecration and cleansing being accomplished, the congregation brought their thank offerings, “as many as were of a free heart”, but because the number was so great, and the number of the priests too few, the Levites “did help them, till the work was ended, and until the other priests had sanctified themselves: for the Levites were more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than the priests” (verse 34). At the end of the chapter we read, “And Hezekiah rejoiced, and all the people, that God had prepared the people: for the thing was done suddenly” (verse 36).

There is much to exercise our hearts in this record, especially the breadth of view that is manifested. The ten tribes, known as “Israel”, were separated from Judah, Hoshea being king of Israel, in the ninth year of whose reign (which year coincided with the first year of Hezekiah), Samaria was taken, and Israel carried away captive. Hezekiah did not exclude the captive Israelites from a place in this great service, but insisted (as previously mentioned) that the offerings should be made “for *all* Israel” (verse 24). This is comparable with the repeated use of the expression “all saints” found in the N.T., and reveals a further and fuller aspect of worship, irrespective of the presence or absence of many who should have made up the congregation.

The second important point is the employment of the Levites, who were “more upright in heart”, to act for the priests, who were too few in number for the work. This too must be remembered in days like those in which we live. Even in the epistle to the Philippians we discover that there were “bishops and deacons”, but we doubt if such exist in sufficient number or of sufficient sanctity to-day. Nevertheless the worship of God is acceptable.

A further illustration of this principle is found in II Chron. xxx. 15-19. Here, as provided by the law of Moses, the Passover was observed on the fourteenth of the *second month* (see Numb. ix. 6-13), the Levites killing the passover lamb of every one that was not clean.

“Yet did they eat the passover otherwise than it was written. But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, the good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary” (II Chron. xxx. 18, 19).

In the eyes of the Lord “preparation of heart” counted far more than ceremonial cleansing, a word of grace to many in these distracted days in which we now seek to worship Him.

We now come to the last of this series of references where “bowing the head” is associated with “worship”, and to the days of *Nehemiah* and *Ezra*, when the Word of God was opened in the sight of all the people (Neh. viii. 1-8). Though neglected, Hezekiah’s temple did still stand, but in the days of Nehemiah the temple and city of Jerusalem were in ruins. The rebuilding of the walls had commenced, and the foundation of the new temple had been laid, but just between the two great works comes the story of Neh. viii. Hezekiah “opened” the doors of the temple; Ezra “opened” the book. In the revival of Hezekiah’s day the worshippers assembled in the courts of the temple. But in the revival of Neh. viii. they “gathered themselves together as one man in the street”. Here was no altar, no singing, no music, but instead of the elaborate ceremonial enjoined by the law, we have the “book of the law” and a “pulpit of wood”. The Levites were here, but not to flay the sacrifices or to offer Passover lambs, “the Levites caused the people to understand the law” (Neh. viii. 7). The great central feature in this moving story is “The pulpit of wood”. Ezra the priest is not seen officiating at an altar, but standing upon a pulpit of wood where he “opened the book in the sight of all the people”. When the book was opened, the people “stood up” in token of reverence:

“And Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the Lord with their faces to the ground So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading” (Neh. viii. 6-8).

The days of Nehemiah are in many respects like our own. Organized religion has failed. The externals of the faith have gone. Like a bulwark in a flood stands “a pulpit of wood, which had been made for this purpose”, and gathered around the “opened book” stand the worshipping multitude. To-day our High Priest is in heaven. We have no altar on earth. The Sacrifice has been offered, never to be repeated; the central point of our

gathering now is not an altar but a pulpit; the great ministry now is, not the shedding of the blood of bulls and of goats, but the preaching of the Word that point away from all type and symbol to the finished work of Christ, now seated at the right hand of God.

Prayerfully considered, there is much in this series of studies upon which the enlightened mind can meditate, and thus knowledge be gained on the subject of “worship in spirit and in truth”.

We must now turn our attention to other aspects of this important theme, and trust that when our quest is finished we shall have a clearer understanding of what is involved when we speak of the worship of God.

#4. Worship and Liberty. **pp. 221 - 225**

We have already learned something of the nature of worship by following the lead given by the use of the expression “bow down”. There are, of course, other lines of thought that we may pursue, and one that comes readily to mind is the connection between the word “worship” and “serve”.

The Hebrew words *Ebed*, “a servant”, and *Abad*, “to serve”, are familiar in such names as Obadiah (“Servant of Jah”), and Obed (“Serving”), the son of Ruth, and the father of Jesse. The prophet Isaiah, also, has much to say of Israel, the Servant of the Lord, and of the Coming One, Who is called “My Servant, Whom I uphold” (Isa. xlii. 1). *Ebed* is the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek *doulos*, a “bond-slave”, as in Rom. i. 1.

The word *shachah*, “worship”, occurs upwards of one hundred and ninety times in the O.T., while *abad* occurs upwards of two hundred and eighty times. With numbers of this magnitude, the amount of labour involved in determining the number of references in which “serve” and “worship” come together can only be appreciated by those who have actually carried out investigations of this kind. We will not, therefore, be dogmatic, but so far as we have investigated, it would seem that there is not a single passage in the O.T. where “serve” and “worship” come together when the context is concerned with the worship of God. On the other hand, there are nineteen references where the two words come together in connection with the worship of other gods. We will not quote these nineteen passages in full, but the reader may like to have the references:

Commands in the Law concerning “serving and worshipping” other gods:
Exod. xx. 5; xxiii. 24; Deut. iv. 19; v. 9; xi. 16; xvii. 3; xxix. 26; xxx. 17.

References to “serving and worshipping” other gods in the Prophets: I Kings ix. 9; xvi. 31; xxii. 53; II King xxi. 3; II Chron. vii. 22; xxxiii. 3; Jer. xiii. 10; xxii. 9; xxv. 6.

In one passage a discrimination is made between “worshippers” of Baal, and “servants” of the Lord (II Kings x. 23).

While these references were being considered, we had at the back of our mind the well known words, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve”. And yet these words did not appear in any of the passages we had collected. The reader will hardly need to be reminded that the words concerned occur in Matt. iv. 10 in connection with the Lord’s temptation in the wilderness, but although the Saviour used the words, “It is written”, it must be admitted that no such text occurs in our O.T. Scriptures. When we turn to the Septuagint Version, however, we find that Deut. vi. 13 is quoted word for word from the version, except for the one word “worship”. In Matt. iv. 10 the Greek word is *proskuneo*, but in the LXX of Deut. vi. 13 the Greek word is *phobeo*, “fear”, a correct translation of the Hebrew *yare*. We have here a problem of the first magnitude, but it comes more appropriately under the heading of *Quotations from the O.T. in the New* rather than under the simpler heading of *Worship*. It will perhaps suffice for the moment if we quote the words with which Appendix 107 of *The Companion Bible* opens:

“It is a fact that in quotations from the Old Testament the Greek text sometimes differs from the Hebrew.

The difficulties found in connection with the subject arise from our thinking and speaking only of the human agent as the writer, instead of having regard to the fact that the Word of God is the record of the words which He Himself employed when He spoke ‘at sundry times and in divers manners’ denying the Divine speaker and Author the right that is claimed by every human writer for himself.”

Matt. iv. 10 is included in a list of twelve such passages where the words of the quotation are varied “by omission, addition, or transposition”. In dealing with Satan, the Saviour adopted the LXX version with the substitution of *proskuneo* for *phobeo*, and the addition of the word “only” for His own wise purposes.

Coming back now to the general question, we must try to discover why the words “serve” and “worship” should be used together when idolatry is spoken of, but not so used when the object of the service or the worship is the true God. Can we truly “worship” God, if we do not “serve” Him? Can we hope that any “service” we render can be acceptable to Him if “worship” is absent? These are our problems, and we have found no solution to them in the writings of men. The answer, if it comes at all, must come from the same source that has provided the problem, the Word of God itself.

In Psalm cv. 42 Abraham is called a “servant” of the Lord, but Melchisedec, who was a priest, and so connected with worship, is not so described. Moses, too, is called a “servant” (Josh. i. 1, 2), but not Aaron the priest. Joshua, the Captain of the Lord’s host, is referred to as the “servant” of the Lord (Josh. xxiv. 29); but not Eleazar the priest. David is given the title “servant” of the Lord, (Psa. xviii., title, and lxxxix. 3), but not Abiathar the priest. Eliakim, the master of Hezekiah’s household, is called a “servant” (Isa. xxii. 20), also Isaiah the prophet (Isa. xx. 3); but not Hilkiyah the priest. The people themselves, both as “Jacob” (Isa. xlv. 1) and “Israel” (Isa. xlix. 3) are called the “servant” of the Lord, but their priestly office is reserved for a future day (Isa. lxi. 6). And even in the case of Christ Himself, who is spoken of prophetically as “My Servant” (Isa. xlii. 1) and “My Servant the Branch” (Zech. iii. 8), we have the testimony of

Scripture that “If He were on earth, He should not be a priest” (Heb. viii. 4). Why, then, is there this consistent exclusion of “service” from the realm of “worship”?

In spite, however, of this evident separation of the words “worship” and “service” when used of the Lord, it is clear that when the Lord promised Moses, “Ye shall serve God upon this mountain” (Exod. iii. 12), and when he commanded Pharaoh, “Let My son go, that he may serve Me” (Exod. iv. 23), the “service” concerned was largely an act of worship, for we read that Moses demanded of Pharaoh “sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God” (Exod. x. 25). Again, the memorial of the Passover is called a “service” (Exod. xii. 25, 25), and the feast of unleavened bread (Exod. xiii. 5), but these are also called “ordinances” (Exod. xii. 14, 17, 24, 43; xiii. 10). The care of all the instruments of the tabernacle (Numb. iii. 7, 8), and the ministry of Aaron and his sons were all “service” (Numb. xviii. 7), as were the individual elements of this ritual such as the “vessels” (Exod. xxvii. 19), the things of gold, silver, and brass, and the skins, linen, incense and oil (Exod. xxxv.).

We have therefore, to keep in mind two facts:

- (1) “Worship” is not used with the word “service” when that worship is directed to God; it is only so allied when used of idolatry.
- (2) On the other hand, the work of the Priests and Levites in connection with the sacrifices, prayers and other ceremonials relating to the tabernacle are freely called “service”.

The prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah have some searching things to say in connection with the service of the temple. In Jer. vii. we read:

“Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord, are these” (Jer. vii. 4).

And in the first chapter of Isaiah:

“Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto Me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts My soul hateth: they are a trouble unto Me; I am weary to bear them” (Isa. i. 13, 14).

And yet every item mentioned—temple, oblation, offering and feast—was Divinely appointed. Why then this revulsion? The answer is found in the chapters referred to. Israel had departed from the truth, and so in the eyes of the Lord, their clinging to the externals of religion was but empty mummery. False gods did not demand purity and spirituality from their worshippers, and so *their* worship and *their* service could be named together; but with the true God, even a Divinely appointed ritual was all in vain apart from uprightness of heart.

Even when the Apostle acknowledges that to Israel pertained “the service of God”, this is limited to things “according to the flesh” (Rom. ix. 3, 4), and the epistle to the Hebrews, when speaking of “ordinances of divine service” under the Old Covenant adds the words “and a worldly sanctuary” (Heb. ix. 1). These things signified that the way

into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest. They were figures, shadows of good things to come:

“That could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience, which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers baptisms, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 9, 10).

The mere observance of “days, months, weeks and years”, even though offered to the true God, is not far removed from the “weak and beggarly elements” of pagan worship (Gal. iv. 8-10). And the epistle to the Colossians associates “the worshipping of angels” and “will-worship” with ordinances that were cancelled at the Cross, such as “meats, drink, holy days, new moons, and sabbath days”.

Returning to Galatians, it is impossible to understand the Apostle’s teaching in this mighty episode, without a realization of the fact that the believer now is *free*. Jerusalem on earth with its children is in bondage, but Jerusalem which is above is free.

Perhaps we are at last drawing near to the solution of our problem. The word “serve” (*abad*) gives us the word “bondage” (Exod. i. 14), “bondmen” (Gen. xliii. 18), “bondservice” (I Kings ix. 21), “servitude” (II Chron. x. 4), and “servile” (Lev. xxiii. 7). The reader will remember that in the observing of the feasts of the Lord, and the sabbaths, it is reiterated that “ye shall do no *servile* work therein” (Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36). “Servility” and “worship” cannot be thought of together; servility is only fit service for the darkened heathen. So when the Lord demanded the release of His people that they might serve Him, He speaks of them as His “son”. This service of a Son was hidden under a mass of observances, in connection with a covenant with which the Lord Himself “found fault”—a covenant which was “imposed” until the time of reformation, and destined then to pass away for ever. “Is Israel a servant? is he a homeborn slave?” asks Jeremiah (Jer. ii. 14). Alas, he was, and is, and will be, until the veil is taken away. Worship, therefore, as practiced by such a people cannot be the full thing.

The secret of true worship is revealed in the words of Christ. It will be neither in Samaria, with its mixed motives, nor in Jerusalem, with its Divinely appointed ritual. The true worshipper worships the FATHER. He worships “in spirit, and in truth”, and the Father seeketh such to worship Him. It is entirely foreign to the thought of reverencing a Father that the sons should be cumbered with ceremonials and ordinances. Tabernacles, temples, sacrifices, priests, vestments, holy days, and the like all indicate that the worshippers are at a distance. Those that have access to the Father can need none of these things.

We are grateful to have seen at least this amount of light upon the nature of true worship, even though much may still be hidden from our eyes.