

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 XVI.

1926

The Berean Publishing Trust,
52A, Wilson Street, London EC2A 2ER.

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

The contemplation of sixteen years' testimony brings mingled feelings, and we are increasingly conscious of two facts, viz., (i.) *We have this treasure*, (ii.) *In earthen vessel*.

It is good for us to remember both facts together at all times. A perusal of the subject matter of *The Berean Expositor* covering these sixteen years must convince the most prejudiced that "we have a *treasure*". The selfsame perusal will reveal to the most generous of critics the presence of an "*earthen vessel*". The elimination of error will not remove the evidence of the earthen vessel, for the context of II Cor. iv. 7 deals with the mortality as the honoured medium of resurrection life:--

*"That the excellency of the power may be of God,
and not of ourselves."*

Through good report and evil report this witness has been sustained without elaborate organization. To all lovers of the Word of truth, "rightly divided", we earnestly commend this testimony.

Yours in the Unity of the Spirit,

CHARLES H. WELCH
FREDK. P. BRININGER

December, 1926.

INDEX

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS	4-7
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
Saul and Agag; Mordecai and Haman (I Sam. xiv. and Esther)	8
A parenthesis and its lesson (Exod. xviii.)	10
The covenant of Sinai (Exod. xx.-xxiv.)	13
The application of the ten commandments as shewn in the judgments of Exod. xxi.-xxiii.	21
The tabernacle. A general survey (Exod. xxv. 1-9)	26
HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
The principal thing. A seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary (vii. - ix. 20)	31
One sacrifice for sins for ever (ix. 23 - x. 18)	38
Perdition, or the saving of the soul (x. 19-39)	50
Let us draw near not draw back (x. 19-39)	57
LANGUAGE OF DOCTRINAL DEFINITION, THE	64
MINISTRY OF CONSOLATION, THE--	
The God of patience, consolation, and hope (Rom. xv. 5, 13)	66
The grace of waiting. Watching and waiting (Isa. lxiv. 4; Hab. ii. 1-4)	67
Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee (Psa. lv. 22)	69
MYSTERY, STUDIES IN EPISTLES OF--	
Christ and the church in home and business (Eph. v. 22 - vi. 9)	71
The power of His might (Eph. vi. 10)	78
The whole armour (Eph. vi. 11-18)	82
The threefold conflict (Eph. vi. 12)	86
The mystery of the gospel, and its ambassador (Eph. vi. 18-24)	90
PERFECTING HOLINESS	98
REDEMPTION (NEW SERIES)--	
The Cherubim, their pledge	103
The Jubilee	104
Sin	107
ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
Introduction to the study	115
The salutation (Rom. i. 1-7)	119
Paul—the man and the message (Rom. i. 8-17)	127
The righteousness of God (Rom. i. 17)	136
UNITY OF THE SPIRIT, THE	138
WORDS IN SEASON--	
Faith; a few sidelights	141
Head versus heart	143
Repentance	145
Faith as a fruit, a gift, and inwrought	147
Can “before the foundation of the world” refer to the future?	149

Answers to Correspondents. pp. 107 - 109

A.L. (Australia) writes:--

(A).—"In one issue of *The Berean Expositor* you speak of 'an (1) election within an (2) election', and in *The Companion Bible*, App. 196(4) it says:--

'Christ's death upon the cross linked up again the connection with God. (1) For all who are the *chosen* subjects of His grace (Eph. i. 4), and (2) For all who will believe and consequently *become* subjects of His grace (Rom. x. 11-13).'

I presume both statements marked (1) refer to the mystery dispensation, while both marked (2) refer to the mystery form of the kingdom; if the latter statement is not correct, please enlighten us as to where the mysteries of the kingdom are fulfilled, and what is the position of organized Christianity as existing to-day, if it is not the mystery form of the kingdom."

The phrase, "an election within an election", is explained more fully than anywhere else in *Dispensational Truth*, page 271, particularly in its chapter sub-title, "Is membership of the one body co-extensive with salvation?" (*see also* pages 24-26 of our Pamphlet, "*Tested Truth*"). Our conclusion then and our present belief is that membership of the one body is not co-extensive with salvation. We believe that salvation is wider than either *kingdom*, *bride* or *body*, each of these being a peculiar calling within the larger one.

We cannot see how the words quoted can be compared with the note of *The Companion Bible*, for that confessedly deals with two classes, one elect, the other not elect, whereas we deal with two classes, one elect, and a narrowed circle within it. Class No.1 of *The Companion Bible* contains both (1) and (2) of our own. We do not believe the "whosoever will" period is yet in force, but that only those who are elect are at present being saved. Our question has not to do with those who come under the wider circle, but to consider whether at the present moment every saved man is *ipso facto* a member of the body. We do not believe that he is.

Organised Christianity is a term that means more or less according to the user. Disorganized Christianity is not ideal, nor is it necessarily spiritual. We believe, however, that you use the term to mean Christendom. If so, that is much like the world, a field in which tares and wheat both grow together until the harvest. The mysteries of the kingdom cover the entire field from the rejection of Christ until His second coming and so in some measure include both the good and the bad that fill the interval.

We are not quite happy about the expression "the mystery form of the kingdom", for these phrases may be fixing in the mind unscriptural conclusions. The Lord speaks of the

“mysteries of the kingdom”, and so should we. Personally, we have given up trying to place the outside church, feeling that our time is better employed in dealing with positive and present truth. We must avoid Peter’s attitude, “Lord, what shall this man do?” (John xxi. 21). We agree with you that there is no Scriptural warrant to look for a collective corporate testimony to the truth of the mystery, but that it remains largely a matter of individual faith and love, with or without fellowship.

(B).—“Referring to Phil. iii. 11 *exanastasis ek ton nekron*, will this apply to the one body? If it only applies to the apostle Paul and those like him, where does the unity of the body come in?”

The difficulty lies in confusing “hope” with “prize”. All the redeemed whatever their calling, will receive “life”, but all will not “reign in life”. We might repeat your question and say:--

“If some only will receive the award of the inheritance where does the unity of the body come in?” (Col. iii. 24).

Ephesians is an exposition of “the hope of the calling”; Philippians is for those who seek to go on unto perfection, and expounds “the prize of the high calling”. Even the human body itself is a unity of inequalities. Some members are far more precious or useful than others, yet all are needed to make the complete whole. Moreover we are not sure that the title the “body” is to be carried forward into the day of glory, it expresses the present relationship both of one to another and all to the Lord, but we believe when all is complete and in glory it will then be the “fullness”, but that is another feature.

You raise another question also as to whether Paul himself believed that he was a member of the body, and whether he did not have a difficulty in adjusting his mind to the new teaching. His noble attitude to all past advantages when compared with “the excellency of the knowledge of Christ” (Phil. iii. 8) leaves no room for doubt, and the intense personal conviction that what he had received was a *revelation* could not live side by side with doubts and fears on the very same question.

You also ask why whether your expression “nothing the flesh could lay hold on” is justified when differentiating between the kingdom and the body. It is not. Before ever the church was called into being the Lord Himself said “the flesh profiteth nothing”. Christendom, not the kingdom or the church, is the fleshly misinterpretation of spiritual things. There is nothing for the flesh to lay hold on in baptism or the Lord’s supper as Scripturally taught. The church founded at Pentecost, at Antioch, or at Ephesus, are alike in one sense, they are not fleshly.

Your question as to what gospel may be preached to-day is answered, more fully than is possible here, in our pamphlet entitled, “*Roman Stones for the Ephesian Temple*”.

Do not hesitate to send further enquiries. You but voice the difficulties of others, and the answers meet a general need. If at any time we do not know the answer to any question we shall not mind admitting the fact.

pp. 126, 127

B.F.C.A. (Cambridge) writes:--

“Paul, in Col. i. 5 writes ‘the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof *ye heard before* in the word of the truth of the gospel’. This is parallel to I Pet. i. 4, 5, ‘An inheritance reserved in heaven for you’. The word in Col. i. 5 is not *epouraniois*. It looks very much as if Paul here takes the old hope and definitely brings it over the Acts xxviii. boundary into the mystery dispensation.”

Two features in the passage quoted from Col. i. 5 cause the difficulty expressed by our correspondent, the one, the use of *ouranos* and not *epouraniois*, the other, the words “ye heard before”, which in another part of the letter our correspondent links with Col. i. 23. Our first concern must be to ascertain the way in which Paul uses *ouranos* = “heaven” in the prison epistles:--

- “All things in heaven in earth” (Eph. i. 10).
- “Every family in heaven and earth” (Eph. iii. 15).
- “Far above all heavens” (Eph. iv. 10).
- “Your Master also is in heaven” (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 1).
- “Our citizenship is in heaven” (Phil. iii. 20).
- “The hope laid up in heaven” (Col. i. 5).
- “All things in heaven” (Col. i. 16-20).
- “Every creature under heaven” (Col. i. 23).

By comparing the passages together that use the words “in heaven in earth” we may settle the question as to whether *ouranos* = “heaven” includes *epouraniois* = “super heavens”. Eph. iii. 10 definitely says that the principalities and powers are “in the super-heavens”, while Col. i. 16 simply says that they are “in heaven”. Like the term “the kingdom of God”, the word “heaven” is all-embrasive, and therefore we are under no necessity to think that Col. i. 5 refers to anything other than that previously set forth with such exactness in Ephesians. To introduce the hope entertained before Acts xxviii. is to introduce “*the hope of Israel*” (see Acts xxviii. 20). There is no possibility of holding more than “one hope”, for that is stated without reserve in Eph. iv. 4. Moreover, the hope of Ephesians needed “the spirit of wisdom and revelation” for its unfolding (Eph. i. 17, 18), which is hardly necessary if it be something already known and revealed.

The second feature, “ye heard before”, may now be considered. How had they heard before? “in the word of the truth of the gospel”. This is so parallel to Eph. i. 13 that the

reference is clearly to the same thing. There, in Eph. i. 12, 13, “the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation” is essentially associated with the peculiar word translated “first trusted”, and which is literally “fore hoped”, marking off this hope from that of the Acts period. “As I wrote before” (Eph. iii. 3) evidently refers no further back than to that crowning revelation of the mystery of Christ revealed in Eph. i. 20-23. “As ye heard before”, need not refer back further than to that special ministry given “for the perfecting of the saints” that followed the making known of the mystery, of whom Epaphras appears to be one (Col. i. 7). Taking all things together the truth revealed in Ephesians concerning the unique calling and hope of the church of the mystery remains unaltered by the use of the wider term, or the reference back, of Col. i. 5.

“Secondly, Paul explains (in Col. i. 27) ‘the hope of the glory’ as being CHRIST. He was of course the hope of all dispensations.”

We hardly feel that this is sufficiently close to what Paul actually says in Col. i. 27 to leave it without comparing. What he says is:--

“To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ among you, the hope of the glory.”

It is not simply “Christ”, but “Christ among you”, the “you” of course being Gentiles. As the A.V. translates *en* followed by a plural “among” in one part of the verse, we are at liberty to repeat the translation in the corresponding part of the verse:--

A | The riches of the glory of this mystery.
B | Among the Gentiles.
B | Christ among you.
A | The hope of the glory.

The fact that now, independently of Israel or promises made unto the fathers, Christ was preached “among the Gentiles” was sure proof both of the riches of the glory of the mystery, and the hope of that glory. There is no word in this verse that can in any way bring over any part of the hope of Israel, or fuse the two revelations together.

We have not dealt with other features of your letter, as they only arise if what we have set forth should be proved unscriptural. We count it both a privilege and a responsibility to consider all possible objections to the position we have sought to maintain for the last seventeen years. So far we have but added proof and confirmation to the one great fact in the interpretation of the N.T., namely, that Acts xxviii. is the dispensational boundary, and that the prison epistles contain a unique revelation never before made known, and exactly suited to the present time, and known as “the dispensation of the mystery” (Eph. iii. 9, R.V.).

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth.

#53. Saul and Agag. Mordecai and Haman. (I Sam. xiv. & Esther).

pp. 1 - 4

(Concluded from Volume XV, page 180).

We have seen that because Amalek's hand was laid upon the throne of the Lord war was declared from generation to generation. Let us pursue this vital subject further. It will be remembered that after Saul had been king for some time, we read:--

“So Saul took possession of the kingdom over Israel, and made war round about against all his enemies, against Moab, and against the sons of Ammon, and against Edom and smote the Amalekites” (I Sam. xiv. 47, 48).

Following this general deliverance of Israel from their hereditary foes comes the more explicit command to:--

“Smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not” (I Sam. xv. 3).

The story is well-known to us. Saul smote the Amalekites, but he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive. Saul and the people also refused to destroy the best of the sheep and the oxen, and “all that was good”.

The flesh, the old man, typified by Amalek, is too often spared to-day. In the sight of God there is “no good thing” in the flesh, but it is rare to find that believer who is so taught of God that he has reached the height of Phil. iii. and, making no comparison between the flesh cultured and the flesh manifestly depraved, repudiates it entirely and rejoices to stand beneath the Banner of the cross. Many who condemn Saul would be found sharing this “good” thing of the flesh. Too often we add to our sin by hypocrisy. Saul said:--

“The people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, TO SACRIFICE UNTO THE LORD thy God in Gilgal” (I Sam. xv. 21).

“In Gilgal”! The place where the reproach of Egypt was rolled away (Josh. v. 9), where the rite of circumcision which sets forth the repudiation of the flesh (Col. ii. 11) was solemnly carried out by all Israel before they set foot in the land of promise, there above all places would Saul offer the sacrifice of the flesh and dishonour the Lord. This was to go in the way of Cain. The very next thing that Samuel is instructed to do after this is to anoint David king (I Sam. xvi.). That the throne of the kings of Israel could be spoken of as “the throne of the Lord” I Chron. xxix. 23 makes clear:--

“Then Solomon sat on the *throne of the Lord* as king instead of David his father.”

The purpose of God foreshadowed in the earthly kingdom of Israel will be brought to a glorious conclusion by the Lord Jesus Christ. When He takes to Himself His great power and reigns, He will not rest until *all* enemies are abolished. There will be no sparing of Amalek then. Those readers who have grasped the significance of the two seeds (*see* Volume XIII, page 52 and the pamphlet "*The Reconciliation of All Things*") will perceive it in operation here, for Amalek though descended from Abraham was not counted as the seed, for that line came through Isaac and Jacob, whereas Amalek descended from Esau.

Mordecai and Haman.

One other occasion is given in Scripture to show the character of Amalek and to foreshadow the end. The book of Esther records that Haman was advanced by the king above all the princes that were with him, and that all the king's servants bowed down before him. It further says that "Mordecai bowed not, nor did him reverence" (Esther iii. 2). Why was this?

"Haman was the son of Hammedatha the AGAGITE" (Esther iii. 1).

Haman was the descendant of one of the Amalekite kings, and Josephus (Ant. Xi. 6, 5) calls him an Amalekite. What was this man's attitude towards Israel?

"Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus" (Esther iii. 6).

As a result of Esther's noble intervention, Haman the Agagite is first compelled to do honour to Mordecai, and then to suffer the fate upon his own gallows that he had planned for the Jew. We cannot say that Haman was a descendant of that Agag who was spared by Saul, but typically we can see that in the sparing of one Amalekite in the early days of Israel's kingdom, Saul jeopardized the whole nation under the reign of Ahasuerus. So must it be with the flesh.

"He that soweth to his flesh shall of his flesh reap corruption" (Gal. vi. 8).

"Because the minding of the flesh is enmity against God" (Rom. viii. 7).

It certainly is extremely suggestive to read the genealogy of Mordecai in Esther ii. 5:--

"Now in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew, whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjaminite."

Saul, who so signally failed concerning Agag, is of the same line as Mordecai who so signally succeeded. Both were of the line of Kish, a Benjaminite. Saul loses his kingdom, and David is sought out and anointed immediately after the failure of Saul concerning Agag. Mordecai, however, dispossess the Amalekite, and succeeds to his office:--

“For Mordecai the Jew was next unto king Ahasuerus, and great among the Jews, and accepted of the multitude of his brethren, seeking the wealth of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed” (Esther x. 3).

This foreshadows the purpose of the Lord and the happy results that will follow the casting down of all opposition and the introduction of that perfect day when God will be all in all. The throne of God and the purposes connected therewith have been assailed. Satan is the arch rebel, and the principalities and powers directly under him are the Amalekities of the church of the one body. Just as Amalek barred the way towards the land of promise, so in the heavenly places are the opposing principalities and powers. There our conflict lies.

This conflict of the age is figured throughout Scripture under various titles. The Canaanites were to be utterly destroyed by the conquering Israelites. Each one may see in these ancient foes the sketch of his own. Each dispensation, too, has somewhat parallel marks. Blessed be God, Satan is to be overcome, and the words of Zech. xiv. 21 are to be understood in their fullest and highest sense:--

“In that day there shall be no more Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts.”

#54. A parenthesis and its lesson (Exod. xviii.). pp. 26 - 29

The Companion Bible puts chapter xviii. into a parenthesis saying that the actual event occurred later, and quoting Deut. i. 7-14 says that Jethro's counsel was given and taken when Israel was ready to depart from Sinai. If this be true, then we must seek the lesson intended by the introduction of Jethro's coming and advice immediately following the conflict with Amalek. By nature we are apt to be extremists. Written in the fly-leaf of our Bible we have the following extract from the writings of Adolph Saphir:--

“Men undertake to be spiritual, and they become ascetic; or endeavouring to hold a liberal view of the comforts and pleasures of society, they are soon buried in the world, and slaves to its fashions: or holding a scrupulous watch to keep out every particular sin, they become legal and fall out of liberty; or charmed with the noble and heavenly liberty, they run to negligible and irresponsible living; so the earnest become violent, the fervent fanatical and censorious, the gentle waver, the firm turn bigots, the liberal grow lax, the benevolent ostentatious.”

The flesh profiteth nothing. It can find no place in the service of God. We should repudiate it and all its works. Let us, however, not fall into the error of confounding the flesh with the physical, or of believing that God's service entirely suspends all creature co-operation. We find in Exod. xvii. and xviii., much as they differ, that they have one item in common, viz., the overtaxed servant Moses, and the provision for his support and relief.

A seat and a stay.

Israel's victory hinged upon the uplifted hands of Moses:--

“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).

We read, however, that “Moses' hands were heavy”. The hands of Moses, under God, were hands of power. The rod he held aloft commanded the very forces of nature, yet what miracle was wrought to sustain the weary servant of God upon whose continued intercession so much depended? *Some one gave him a seat!:*--

“And they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon” (Exod. xvii. 12).

What Divine provision was there made to keep Moses' hands upheld?:--

“And Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun” (Exod. xvii. 12).

While these three together may represent the perfect intercession of *prophet* (Moses), *priest* (Aaron), and *king* (Hur), for Hur was of Judah (I Chron. ii.), the lesson for us is rather the humbler one of the place of fellowship in the service of God. It is this truth that reappears in chapter xviii.:--

“And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses sat to judge the people: and the people stood by Moses from morning until evening” (“even until evening” some MSS read) (verse 13).

It was bad for both Moses and the people; it was bad for the ministry of the truth, and it was an unnecessary martyrdom. Jethro saw this, and said:--

“Why sittest thou thyself alone Thou wilt surely *wear away*, both thou, and this people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone” (verses 14 and 18). (The LXX reads, “thou wilt wear away with intolerable weariness”).

Now it may be that the time will come when we shall have to face the same conditions as closed round the last years of Paul, and if so, grace will be given to yield, no, not for an hour, that strength will be given to finish the course and fight the good fight. We are not, however, called upon to invite persecution or to invent a martyr's conditions, otherwise the service we have in heart and hand will suffer, for “thou art not able to perform it”, and those to whom we minister will suffer too, “both thou and this people with thee”. Moses, great leader as he was, was a meek man: the counsel of Jethro commended itself to him:--

“Be thou for the people to Godward teach them shew them the way and the work” (Exod. xviii. 19, 20).

The lesser duties that could be undertaken by other men should be undertaken, or the work would otherwise suffer, and so Jethro counseled that Moses should provide able men who feared God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and that these should be placed over thousands, fifties and tens, thus simplifying the labour and preventing trifles from interfering with the main work.

The warfare and the warfare of God's people necessitates fellowship. It would have been a display of the flesh had Moses refused the stone as a seat or the loving support of Aaron and Hur. It would have been the work of the flesh had Moses chosen rather to wreck the ministry he had received for the apparently high quality of independence. There were circumstances wherein Paul was justified in saying, "it were better for me to die" than to receive fellowship (I Cor. ix. 15), but to take this as a general rule would be harmful and foolish. The church at Philippi were ever in close touch with the apostle and his needs:--

"In as much as both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace" (Phil. i. 7).

This he called their "fellowship in the gospel from the first day" (i. 5). We see how practical this fellowship was by turning to Phil. iv. 15:--

"Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel (as i. 5) no church communicated *koinoo* (in i. 5 it is *koinonia*) with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only."

The burden and the blessing.

We are joyfully to expect our duties to increase, and be ready to respond to the growing need. Moses did not for one moment regret the multiplying of Israel which added to his burden; he rejoiced in it, but he accepted Jethro's counsel to meet the situation:--

"And I spake unto you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone. The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude (The Lord God of your fathers make you a thousand times so many more as ye are, and bless you, as He hath promised you!) How can I myself bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife?" (Deut. i. 9-12).

There came a moment in the early church when the apostles had to decide whether they were justified in leaving the ministry of the word of God and prayer, or whether, following the lines of Exod. xviii., the time had not come to look out men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom they could appoint over the business that was intruding into the time and strength of the apostles (Acts vi. 1-4).

It is not the will of God that either His servants or their ministry should suffer through false sense of independence, neither is it His will that there should be any leaning upon the arm of the flesh or warring with its weapons. It is most certainly for our guidance and warning that the lesson of Exod. xvii. should be restated in Exod. xviii.

It may be that some will be called upon to spend and be spent in the service of the truth, but there is no merit in “wearing out with intolerable weariness” through missing the wise counsel of Jethro, or the simple sense of that unnamed child of Israel who provided a seat for the great mediator—Moses.

#56. The Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xx. - xxiv.)
pp. 97 - 107

NOTE.—This article should have preceded No.55 in June issue.

We have traced the Lord’s dealings with Israel from their call in Abraham, and their deliverance from Egypt, to their arrival at the wilderness of Sinai (Exod. xix. 1). Sinai marks a crisis in the history of this people, and is of fundamental importance in their typical story. Israel are to show once and for all the utter inability of the flesh to enter into blessing by a covenant of works. This necessitates the new covenant with its better promises and its better sacrifices, which is the theme of the epistle to the Hebrews. “The law made nothing perfect.”

In Exod. xix. 3, 8, and 20 we have three ascents of Sinai by Moses, culminating in the giving of the law. Three more ascents are recorded in Exod. xxiv. 9 - xxxii. 14, xxxii. 31-33 and xxxiv. 4-28, culminating in the building of the tabernacle, the ark receiving the tables of stone written the second time, and so bearing witness to Israel’s failure and their need of Christ. There is therefore a distinct connection between the old and the new covenants as Jer. xxxi. 31-34 reveals.

The Old and the New Covenants.

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah” (Jer. xxxi. 31).

Let us observe how definite the Scripture is with regard to the covenanting parties. “The Lord” on the one hand, and “The house of Israel and the house of Judah” on the other. It is a covenant properly drawn up, and not one who is not of the house of Israel or Judah, or who cannot show full Scriptural warrant for being reckoned with such, can have part or lot in it. Rom. xi. reveals the method whereby some believing Gentiles came within the bounds of the new covenant. They are spoken of as wild olive branches grafted into the true olive, and, with the branches that remained unbroken, “partaking of the root and fatness of the olive tree” (Rom. xi. 17). Such is the widest extension of the bounds of this covenant. The moment Israel as a nation passed off the scene, that moment the new covenant and all pertaining to it was withdrawn, to be reserved until the day when:--

“All Israel shall be saved For this is MY COVENANT UNTO THEM”
(Rom. xi. 26, 27).

We now proceed with the statement of Jer. xxxi.:--

“Not according to 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” (verse 32).

Here we see the close connection between the old covenant made at Sinai, and the new covenant to be made in the future. The reference to the Exodus from Egypt is important. Every year this deliverance was remembered by the observance of the feast of the passover. Israel remembered that old covenant in the very year that our Lord was crucified. It was at the passover that Christ instituted the memorial of another and greater exodus, by another and greater passover lamb, and established another and better covenant:--

“They made ready the passover and He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, DRINK YE ALL of it; for this is My blood of the NEW COVENANT, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matt. xxvi. 19-30).

The Lord’s supper is a memorial feast exactly similar to the passover, but differing in this, that the Passover was a typical memorial connected with the old covenant, whereas the Lord’s supper is connected with the new covenant. For Gentile believers to partake of this new covenant memorial while *unassociated with Israel* appears to us to be an unwarranted intrusion. Jer. xxxi. continues regarding the first covenant:--

“Which My covenant they break, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord” (verse 32).

The LXX reads “I regarded them not” instead of “I was an husband unto them”. This reading is followed by the N.T. quotation in Heb. viii. 9, which proves that this is the true interpretation. The Hebrew *ba’al* has two meanings (1) to be lord, master, or husband; (2) to disdain, reject, or disregard. The A.V. of Jer. xxxi. chose the wrong meaning. The inspired writer of “Hebrews” gives the true meaning. Israel broke the old covenant, and they were disdained, disregarded, all hope being henceforth centred in the Messiah:--

“But this shall be the covenant that I shall make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts: and will be their God, and they shall be My people” (Jer. xxxi. 33)

It is impossible to read these words without remembering Paul’s argument in II Cor. iii. and iv.:--

“Written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of *stones*, but in the fleshly tables of the *heart* God has made us able ministers of the NEW COVENANT” (II Cor. iii. 3-6).

The Corinthians were already instructed regarding their connection with the new covenant, as I Cor. xi. 25 will show. Here in the second epistle the apostle feels under

the necessity to warn his children concerning Judaism that would lead them back to bondage. Therefore he institutes a comparison which it will be helpful to observe.

II Corinthians iii. & iv.	
<i>The old covenant.</i>	<i>The new covenant.</i>
The letter that killeth (iii. 6).	The spirit that quickeneth (iii. 6).
The ministration of death (iii. 7, 8).	The ministration of the spirit (iii. 7, 8).
The ministration of condemnation (iii. 9).	The ministration of righteousness (iii. 9).
That which is done away (iii. 11).	That which remaineth (iii. 11).
Moses and Israel veiled (iii. 13-15).	The veil done away in Christ (iii. 13-15).
When Israel turn veil removed (iii. 16-18).	We all with unveiled face (iii. 16-18).
The glory of God in the face of Moses	The light of the knowledge of the glory of
“done away” (iii. 7).	God in the face of Jesus Christ (iii. 6).

II Cor. iv. 3 needs a fuller explanation than we can give in this tabular form:--

“But if indeed our gospel be veiled, by those things which are perishing they have been veiled.”

The “perishing” things are the things of the old covenant which are said to be “done away” and “abolished”. The god of this age uses the old covenant and ministration of death to veil the light of the glory of the gospel that shone in the face of Christ. One further word from Jer. xxxi. and then we must return to Exod. xix.:--

“If these ordinances (see verse 35) depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a NATION before Me all the days” (Jer. xxxi. 36).

It is not possible to hold to the inspiration of Scripture and deny the *national* character of the new covenant. We do not wish to be aggressive or controversial, but in an article purporting to deal with fundamentals of dispensational truth we must perforce “use great plainness of speech”, and we must state that we have no hesitation or diffidence with regard to our attitude concerning the observance of the Lord’s supper as a member of that elect company called into favour during the time of Israel’s rejection. Let us now turn to Exod. xix. and read the terms of the first covenant.

The terms of the First Covenant.

“Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto Myself. Now therefore IF ye obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, THEN ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people; for all the earth is Mine: And ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words that thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel” (Exod. xix. 3-6).

Moses descended from the mount, called for the elders of the people, and laid before them the words commanded him. There was an unanimous acceptance of the conditions. “And all the people answered together, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do” (Exod. xix. 8). From this point on to chapter xxiii. 33 we have the preparation of the people, the descent of the Lord to Sinai, the giving of the ten commandments, and the

judgments. Then Moses came once more to the people and told them all the words of the Lord and all the judgments, and once more all the people answered with one voice, "All the words which the Lord hath said will we do" (Exod. xxiv. 3).

The people having re-asserted their agreement, Moses next put the words of the Lord unto writing (Exod. xxiv. 4). He then built an altar on twelve pillars, one for each tribe, and caused sacrifices to be made. Half of the blood shed Moses reserved in basins. He then took the book of the covenant, and read it over in the audience of the people: and they again replied, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient" (Exod. xxiv. 7). Moses then took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, saying:--

"Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words" (Exod. xxiv. 8).

A covenant instituted with such solemnity, framed with words of such weight and far reaching effect, demands a respectful study. We cannot hope to do more than point the way in articles such as these, but we earnestly trust that the reader will be stirred up to see something of the heights and depths of this revelation of the righteousness of God.

The Ten Words (Exod. xxxiv. 28 margin).

The ten commandments are pre-eminently the basis of the covenant:--

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words; for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments" (Exod. xxxiv. 27, 28).

"He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even ten commandments, and He wrote them upon two tables of stone" (Deut. iv. 13).

Let us summarize these ten commandments. There are quite a variety of ways in which the commandments have been divided and numbered, for it must be remembered that there is no numeration in the original. Some think that numbers I.-IV. belong to the first table and relate to God, and numbers V.-X. belong to the second table and relate to man. This would place number V. as "the first commandment with promise" at the head of the list, and remove the difficulty created by the apparent promise found in Exod. xx. 6. On the other hand "that thy days may be long upon the land" (verse 12) is the first definite promise in the covenant.

The Companion Bible draws attention to the fact that the first five commandments contain the title "The Lord thy God", but that no title or name of God appears in the second set. This seems to fall under the natural division of two sets of five, the one dealing with love to God, the other with love to neighbour. If this be accepted, the honouring of parents is placed upon the table devoted to the honouring of God, and demands serious thought.

The Covenant and the Commandments.

Each of the commandments are vital parts of the covenant, and in many cases passages may be found where this connection is definitely stated. On others it is clearly implied. We will not occupy space in printing the commandments, but the reader with Exod. xx. open before him may find some help by noting the following facts and particulars.

I. “*No other God.*”—It is implied in the expressions, “Thy God”, “I will be their God”, “The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob”, that there is a covenant relationship between the two parties named. This is established by such a passage as:--

“Behold, I make *a covenant* thou shalt worship no other god lest thou make *a covenant* with the inhabitants of the land” (Exod. xxiv. 10, 14, 15).

II. “*No graven image.*”—Had this command been observed by Israel, it alone would have made them a separate people on the earth, for idolatry and image worship was practically universal:--

“Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget *the covenant* of the Lord your God, which He made with you, and make a graven image, or the likeness of anything” (Deut. iv. 23, 24).

“Wherefore hath the Lord done this unto the land? because they have forsaken *the covenant* of the Lord God of their fathers FOR THEY WENT and served OTHER GODS” (Deut. xxix. 9-28).

III. *The covenant Name.*—When the Lord bade Moses hew two tables of stone in order that the words of the covenant might be written thereon, we read:--

“And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the NAME of the Lord and He said, Behold, I make *a covenant*” (Exod. xxxiv. 1-10).

The name here proclaimed is “The Lord God”, and the title “The Lord thy God” occurs in each of the commandments on the first table. It is the covenant name, and therefore sacred and central.

IV. *The sabbath.*—The sabbath was a sign of the covenant:--

“Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath for a perpetual *covenant*. It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel” (Exod. xxxi. 16, 17).

V. *The honouring of parents.*—The honour due to father and mother is a marked feature of the Old Testament, and it gains in importance when we see that this command finished the first table that deals with Israel’s relation to God. We may the better understand the Lord’s words in Matt. xv. 4-6 when we see the place of this fifth commandment. The Pharisees transgressed this commandment by their tradition. They taught that if a man declared that all his possessions were given to God, saying, “It is

Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, he shall be free” (Mark vii. 11).

This the Lord condemned as transgressing the commandment of God. It is not possible to honour God by the dishonour of parents. Let us now notice the relation of the commandments the one to the other:--

- A | I. No other gods before Me. “The land of Egypt.”
- B | II. No image or likeness. “Heaven”, “earth”, “water”.
- C | III. The Name.
- B | IV. The Sabbath. “Heaven”, “earth”, “sea”.
- A | V. Father and mother. “The land the Lord giveth.”

This arrangement not only shows the relation of the first and the fifth, but also shows how an intelligent observance of the sabbath was a preservative from idolatry. It would not be possible to bow down to images of things in heaven or earth if one remembered that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is.

The Second Table.

VI. *Thou shalt not kill.*—Although the name of God is not mentioned in the second table, it becomes abundantly clear upon examination that a right conduct towards our neighbour is governed by, and is a reflection of, our conduct toward the Lord. “Thou shalt not kill” takes our mind back to Gen. ix. 6, “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the *image of God* made He man”. Murder aims at the heart of the purpose of creation, the destruction of the image of God on earth. Murder links man with Satan, who was a murderer from the beginning (John viii. 44), and with Cain, who was of that wicked one (I John iii. 12).

VII. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.*—If murder aims at destroying the image of God, adultery is calculated to corrupt the seed:--

“Judah hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which He loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god. The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously, yet she is thy consort, and the wife of thy *covenant*. Truly did He not make (the twain) one (flesh)? Yet had He the residue of the Spirit (and so could have made more than one wife for Adam). And wherefore one (emphatic)? Because He desired a SEED OF GOD” (Mal. ii. 11-15).

The discerning reader will perceive Gen. iii. and iv. in a clearer light by remembering the comment of Malachi. The universal association between immorality and idolatry throughout the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation, the story of Gen. vi., the two attacks upon Sarah before Isaac’s birth, the downfall of Solomon, the vehement protest of Nehemiah, these and similar examples reveal the place that adultery takes in the attack upon the purpose of the ages.

So vital is this relationship, that the Lord uses it as the most fitting figure of His covenant relationship with Israel. Their very land is to be called Beulah or “married”, and the climax of revelation, apart from the mystery, is “the marriage of the Lamb”, with its Satanic counterpart, “the whore” of Rev. xvii. and xviii. Even the members of the church of the one body may manifest the love of Christ and the church in their own married relationship (Eph. v.). Idolatry and adultery are convertible terms in the Scriptures.

If holiness is involved in the sin of adultery, righteousness is involved in the sin of stealing.

VIII. *Thou shalt not steal.*—Satan was a murderer from the beginning. Satan has sought down the ages to corrupt the true seed. Satan entered into Judas, who betrayed his Lord, and Scripture says Judas “was a thief” (John xii. 6). Malachi whose words we have quoted above says, “Will a man rob God?” (Mal. iii. 8).

The weights and measures of Israel were not beneath Divine legislation, for in them were set forth the equity and righteousness of the Lord. “Just balances, just weights, a just ephah and a just hin, shall ye have” (Lev. xix. 36), and this command is immediately followed by a reference to the Lord Who brought them “out of the land of Egypt”. Deut. xxv. 15 puts the same truth in connection with the land of promise:--

“Thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have, that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.”

Righteousness is the foundation of the throne of God, the basis of the covenant with Israel, the bed rock of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, the lasting character of the new heavens and earth, “wherein *dwelleth* righteousness”, when “the tabernacle of God will be with men and He will *dwell* with them”. Any system of interpretation that juggles with good and evil, until at last their distinct difference is bedimmed, must stand condemned before the simple example of “the just weight and balance”.

IX. *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.*—Satan, the breaker of the commandments already cited, is also the arch-false witness. “He is a liar, and abode not in the truth.” Eph. iv. 25 and 28 bring together two of the commands of this table:--

“Wherefore putting away the lie, speak every man truth with his neighbour Let him that stole steal no more.”

Stealing transgresses righteousness, false witness transgresses truth. The new man of Eph. iv. created in righteousness and holiness of truth. If Satan entered into Judas the thief, he inspired Ananias; “Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie?” (Acts v. 3). It appears from Zech. v. 3 that among the last phases of the curses of Babylon to the earth is the condoning of stealing and false swearing. The Hebrew word *naked* should be translated declare innocent or let off:--

“For every one that stealeth hath been let off (is written) on the one side according to it (the curse or the scroll), and everyone that sweareth (falsely) hath been let off (is written) on the other side according to it.”

X. *Thou shalt not covet.*—It has been said that covetousness breaks all the commandments. It certainly breaks the first, for Mammon is its god. It breaks the second, for Col. iii. 5 calls a covetous man an idolator. We can well see how many if not all of the others can be sacrificed upon the altar of this idol. “This love of money is a root of all evil” (I Tim. vi. 10).

This brief survey enables us to perceive something of the depth of the terms of the covenant made by God, and entered into by Israel. Israel broke that covenant even before Moses could reach them with the two tables of stone. It is a feature of the utmost importance to remember that those broken tables of stone were *re-written*, and placed in the ark. This ark is called the ark of the covenant (Deut. x. 8), and the ark of the testimony (Exod. xxx. 6). Exod. xxxi. 18 tells us that the two tables of stone were the tables of testimony. Exod. xxxiv. 28 and 29 calls them both the “tables of the covenant”, the “two tables of the testimony” and the “ten words”.

The ark and the mercy seat together represent the perfect redemption of Christ. The new covenant does not set aside the ten commandments, but fulfils them. As we look through the epistles we find practically every one of the commandments re-stated with one exception, namely, the sabbath.

I.	No other God.	“To us there is but one God” (I Cor. viii. 6).
II.	Idolatry.	“Ye turned to God from idols” (I Thess. i. 9).
III.	The Name.	“That the name of the Lord be not blasphemed” (I Tim. vi. 1).
V.	Honour parents.	“The first commandment with promise” (Eph. vi. 2).
VI.	Not kill.	“Love . . . not as Cain who . . . slew his brother” (I John iii. 11, 12).
VII.	No adultery.	“Adulterers God will judge” (Heb. xiii. 4).
VIII.	Not steal.	“Let him that stole steal no more” (Eph. iv. 28).
IX.	Not false witness.	“Speak every man truth” (Eph. iv. 25).
X.	Not covet.	“No covetous man hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God” (Eph. v. 5).

The IVth commandment is the exception. During the Acts period Paul wrote to the Galatians, “Ye observe days I am afraid of you” (Gal. iv. 10, 11). To the Romans he wrote, “One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind” (Rom. xiv. 5). After the Acts period Paul wrote to the Colossians, “Let no man judge you in respect of the sabbath days, which are a shadow” (Col. ii. 16, 17). These words could not have been written had the sabbath observance continued.

Exod. xxxi. 13 tells us that the sabbath is a sign between Israel and the Lord. Like the other sign, namely, circumcision (Rom. iv. 11), and the signs, namely, the miracles wrought during the earthly life of the Lord, and the Acts of the Apostles (I Cor. i. 22; xiv. 22), these together with the sabbath belonged to Israel, and cease with the setting aside of that nation. Let us conclude this survey of the ten commandments with the apostle’s comment in Rom. xiii.:--

“Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, viz., Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Rom. xiii. 8, 9).

and with the Lord’s words in Matt. xxii.:-

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets” (Matt. xxii. 37, 40).

#55. The application of the Ten Commandments as shown in the judgments of Exod. xxi. - xxiii. pp. 86 - 92

We have seen in the “ten words” the great basis of the covenant made with Israel, and we are yet to see how the whole tabernacle and its services revolve around the ark, in which rested the tables of testimony, and the mercy seat which covered it. Before we turn our attention to the tabernacle it seems fitting that we should acquaint ourselves with the judgments that were added to the “ten words”. It will be found upon examination that they unfold and apply the law given in the tables of stone. It will be remembered that the ten commandments divide the duties of Israel into two sets, five dealing with God and five dealing with man. The N.T. sums up the law and the prophets as love to God and love to neighbour.

The ten-fold exposition.

In Exod. xx. the covenant is given, and in Exod. xxiv. the covenant is ratified, and it will be seen that this covenant is concerned with:-

1. All the words of the Lord, i.e., the “ten words” of xx. 1-17.
2. All the judgments, i.e., those of xxi.-xxiii.

“And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do” (Exod. xxiv. 3).

These “judgments” follow the arrangement of the ten commandments, namely, five sections are devoted to Israel’s attitude to God, and five sections deal with Israel, or the Lord’s attitude to man, one to another or to strangers.

Let us take a broad view of the whole section xx. 21 – xxiii. 33.

The ten-fold judgments.

- A1 | xx. 21-26. GOD. His worship and idolatry.
B1 | xxi.-xxii. 17. MAN. Servitude, murder, stealing, negligence.
A2 | xxii. 18-20. GOD. Witchcraft, confusion and sacrifice.
B2 | xxii. 21-28. MAN. Vexing, afflicting, strangers, widows, etc.
A3 | xxii. 29-31. GOD. Offerings, fruits and firstborn.
B3 | xxiii. 1-9. MAN. False witness, bribery, oppression.
A4 | xxiii. 10-19-. GOD. Sabbaths and Feasts.
B4 | xxiii. -19. MAN. Humane treatment of animals.
A5 | xxiii. 20-25-. GOD. The angel, My name, gods.
B5 | xxiii. -25-33. MAN. Food, land, health, length of days.

Here we have a five-fold alternation, corresponding to the two tables of stone. This amplification is not confined to Exodus. Psa. cxix. 122 reads, “Be surety for Thy servant for good, let not the proud oppress me”. This verse is the subject of a Massoretic note* which draws attention to the fact that every verse in Psa. cxix. with the exception of verse 122 contains one of *ten words*, all of which refer to the commandments of God. These ten words are way, testimonies, precepts, commandment, word (*'imrah*), law, judgment, righteousness, statute, word (*dabar*). The one exception uses the word “surety” instead and points to the fact that the tabernacle with its offerings was appointed when Israel failed, and looks forward to the new covenant of which Christ Himself is “the surety for good”.

The Judgments.

The word judgment (*mishpat*) is often translated “the manner of” as in xxi. 9, “He shall deal with her after *the manner of* daughters”. The relation of the word to the service of God may be gathered from II Kings xvii. 26, “The nations which Thou hast removed, and placed in the cities of Samaria, know not *the manner of* the God of the land”. The king of Assyria commands that one of the captive priests shall be sent to teach the new arrivals, and we read that he taught them “how they should fear the Lord” (verse 28). It was a sorry business however, for in verse 33 we read that “they feared the Lord, and served their own gods”, which broke the very first words of the covenant (verses 34-41). These judgments therefore, given to supplement and expand the “ten words”, show “the manner of the Lord”, and His manner is “right”:-

“Shall not the Judge (*Shaphat*) of all the earth do right?” (*mishpat*, Gen. xviii. 25).

Let us now see a little more in detail this righteous dealing between God and man.

[NOTE: * - These notes occur in the margin of the Hebrew Bible and have reference to the sacred text, with the intention that such information shall guard against any alteration or corruption of the original. For illustration see page 82 of Appendix to *The Companion Bible*.]

I. Servitude and freedom (Exod. xxi. 1-11).

In the case of the Hebrew male servant six years was the limit of his servitude, “in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing”, the only exception being that in the event of the servant marrying a wife given by his master, and having children and not wishing to leave them, then he could voluntarily devote himself “for ever” to that master’s service. That such servitude was not “slavery” can be gathered from the words, “If the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free”. The question of the connection between the boring of the ear with the readings of Psalm xl. 6 and Heb. x. 5 has been dealt with at some length on pages 59-61 of this Volume.

In the case of the Hebrew maid servant particular regard is paid to the liability of abuse that awaits a lonely woman, and it is clearly stated that “she shall not go out as the menservants do”. This kindly fatherly element in God’s judgment, given in a day when woman were reckoned as cattle or household chattels, gives the lie to those who would bring down the law of Sinai to an imitation of that of Khammurabi or Babylon: “To sell her unto a strange master he shall have no power.” This has reference to a betrothal made, but rejected. In the case of adding another wife, the feelings and status of the first wife are preserved:--

“Her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish If he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.”

II. Death penalty and refuge (Exod. xxi. 12-17).

Murder, the cursing of parents, and man-stealing were to be punished with death, without the option of sacrifice or fine. Manslaughter was provided with “a place to flee”.

III. Recompense (Exod. xxi. 18-36).

In cases of striving, smiting and negligence a variety of instances of sinful acts done to another that could be put right by a payment for the loss of time, money, limb, etc., are given. For hurting an equal: “He shall pay for the loss of his time, and shall cause him to be thoroughly healed.” For hurting a servant: “He is his money.” Causing an abortion, without mischief following, must be paid for as the judges determine and the husband lays upon him. If mischief follow, then there must be “eye for eye, tooth for tooth”, etc. This is further enforced in the setting free of a servant as a recompense for the loss of eye, or tooth.

Negligence to keep under control an ox that gores a person to death is compensated by the loss of the ox. If, however, the negligence be culpable, both ox and owner must be put to death. This also applies with modification to negligence that causes the death of ox or ass.

IV. Full restoration and a fine in addition (Exod. xxii. 1-17).

For stealing one ox he shall restore five. If a thief be smitten to death when caught in the act, it is quits. If he survives and have nothing, he shall be sold. If the theft be found, he shall restore double. Feeding cattle in another man's field and destroying crops through careless fire-lighting demands restitution. Those entrusted with goods must be responsible unto double the value. To entice a maid that is not betrothed must be recompensed either by marriage or dowry.

Such is a very imperfect summary of the first section xxi. 1 - xxii. 17. This is followed by a brief section (Exod. xxii. 18-20) dealing with the Godward side. 1. The witch. 2. The confusion of seed. 3. The sacrifice to any other god save the Lord. In each case the penalty is death. The section following (xxii. 21-28) is devoted to the question of vexing and afflicting strangers, widows, fatherless, and borrowers. Verses 29-31 emphasize the claims of God upon the first-fruits, first-born sons, and first-born of cattle; also that in the question of their food Israel were to be "holy men unto Me".

Exod. xxiii. 1-9 deals with false witness, unkindness, bribery, and oppression. Exod. xxiii. 10-19 with God's command concerning the sabbatical year, the sabbath day, and the three feasts in the year, namely, the feast of unleavened bread, the feast of harvest, and the feast of ingathering. Also that no leaven must be offered with the blood of sacrifice, neither must the fat remain till the morning. The following one little clause stands out alone:--

"Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk" (Exod. xxiii. 19).

This humane stipulation was intended to restrain the more brutal instincts of man, much in the same way that the command concerning the bird and its young in Deut. xxii. 6, and the cow and its calf in Lev. xxii. 28.

Exod. xxiii. 20-25- promises the leadership and protection of the angel in whom is the name of the Lord upon the condition of obedience, and the angel is said to go before them and to bring them into the land of the Canaanites. A final warning is given concerning idolatry and an exhortation to serve the Lord. Then comes the last man-ward section, viz., Exod. xxiii. -25-33. This contains promises concerning bread and water, sickness, fruitfulness, and length of days. The clearing of the land of promise of the Canaanites, and of the beasts of the field, the boundaries of the land of promise, and the man-ward effect of any covenant made with either the Canaanites or their gods, such was the tenor of the covenant made with Israel. This is by no means all, for in subsequent books Moses reveals further expansions of the principles here set forth.

Judgment and mercy.

A superficial view of these laws has led to a great deal of misrepresentation. The God Who could think of the little kid, Who legislated for slaves, for fatherless, for strangers, cannot be either harsh or merciless. Many have objected to the severity of the

law, “eye for eye, tooth for tooth”, when a closer acquaintance would lead them to magnify God for His mercy. The laws that were in force at the time when God gave the law to Moses reveal what a merciful advance is here made. Instead of an eye for an eye it would be a vendetta and perhaps many lives. This can be tested by reading what is called the Code of Khammurabi (the Amraphel of Gen. xiv. 1), and comparing the offences and penalties under the two legislations.

In the Sermon on the Mount the Lord reveals the deeper spirituality of the law. Moses does not only teach an eye for an eye, but he teaches (by implication and comparison with other laws) not *many* eyes for *one*, that is, Moses taught that justice should be tempered with mercy. The Lord Jesus does not contradict the law of Moses, but shows its legitimate “fulfillment”. The same is true regarding the murder that is incipient in heart hatred. We can well believe that had Israel been able to fulfil their promise to obey all the commandments of the Lord, they would have fulfilled their calling, and have been a great outstanding witness for truth in the earth.

Deuteronomy.

The title of the fifth book of Moses in the LXX is Deuteronomy, meaning “Second Law”, being taken from the LXX version of Deut. xvii. 18 where we read, “Then shall he write for himself this repetition of the law” (*kai grapsee hautou deuteronion touto*). This book of thirty-three chapters cannot be a mere repetition of the law given in Exodus, unless we mean “vain repetition”, for in very bulk it is eight times as large. It means therefore that just as the ten commandments were expanded in Exod. xxi.-xxiii., so they are more completely expanded as the times arrives for Israel to enter into the land. This is more easily seen when we realize that the whole book of Deuteronomy is occupied with a ten-fold address given by Moses, giving expansions, expositions, blessings and cursings of the Ten Words of Exod. xx.:--

“And it came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month, that Moses spake unto the children of Israel, according unto all that the Lord had given him in commandment unto them” (Deut. i. 3).

The Ten Addresses in Deuteronomy.

Introduction.—A resume of Israel’s history from the time they commenced their journeyings unto the eve of the entry into Canaan (i.-iii.).

- (I.) Deut. iv.—Baal Peor. No similitude or graven image.
Reference to *the land* in last verse.
- (II.) Deut. v.—The Ten Words of the Covenant. Reference to *the land* in last verse.
- (III.) Deut. vi. 1 - x. 11.—One God (vi. 4). No other gods (vi. 14).
The table of stone (x. 1-5). Reference to *the land* in last verse.
- (IV.) Deut. x. 12 - xxvi. 19.—Blessing and cursing (xi. 26).
Laws governing all classes.
Reference in last verses to *the land* (15), and “*holy people*” (19).
- (V.) Deut. xxvii., xxviii.—Cursing and blessing.
- (VI.) Deut. xxix., xxx.—The covenant beside that of Horeb.
- (VII.) Deut. xxxi. 2-6.—Joshua the leader. The Lord goes before and with them.

- (VIII.) Deut. xxxii. 1-43.—The song, a witness against Israel if they break the covenant (xxxii. 19-21).
- (IX.) Deut. xxxii. 46, 47.—“It is your life.” Reference to *the land* in last verse.
- (X.) Deut. xxxiii. 2-29.—Sinai, the law, the blessing of the twelve tribes.
Reference to *the land* in last verse.

Throughout this repetition the terms of the original covenant are continually in mind, together with the effect upon Israel consequent upon obedience. A peculiar treasure, above all people, a kingdom of priests, a holy nation, the possession and enjoyment of the land.

The book of Revelation, to say nothing of the testimony of the Prophets, testifies to the fact that although Israel can never enter into their peculiar blessings upon the basis of the old covenant, by virtue of the new covenant all these blessings shall be theirs. This fact raises the question as to what is the position of the law. Is it set aside? Is it fulfilled vicariously? Will it be fulfilled? The true answer to the question, if it is to be established from Scripture, must of necessity take more space than a closing paragraph, and we therefore leave it until time and space afford the necessary opportunity. Meanwhile we trust that the fullness of those ten words which form the basis of the covenant with Israel have been the better appreciated by our study together, and the inability of man to keep them will but magnify that great justification which has been made ours freely by the grace of God through the redemption and propitiation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

#57. The Tabernacle. A general survey (Exod. xxv. 1-9). pp. 177 - 182

In tracing the history of Israel as a nation we start with redemption, the Passover deliverance from Egypt, where a fresh start was made. The Passover month became “a beginning of months” unto them. We have followed them through the waters of the Red Sea, which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned. None but the redeemed of the Lord can reach the other side alive. We have seen their trials and temptations, their first great battle with Amalek, and its spiritual teaching. We have seen them enter into covenant relationship with God, both book and people being sprinkled with blood; we have heard the words of the covenant given in solemn grandeur from Sinai, and we have reached that point in the development of their typical history that demands the tabernacle and its ritual.

In the articles under the heading of *Redemption* we have discussed the difference between redemption as the *exodus*, and the atonement as the *eisodus*, the one leading out and giving deliverance, the other leading in and giving acceptance and access. Therefore we will not stay over that phase now.

The present creation is described in Gen. i. & ii., and the record of that mighty work comprises 34 verses. The tabernacle is described in Exod. xxv.-xxxv. & xxxv.-xl., and the record comprises 457 verses. This disproportion can be explained only in the light of their relative importance, the understanding of the way into the presence of God being far more important than the understanding of the way in which He created heaven and earth. The new creation is so much greater than the present, as the finished temple the scaffolding erected for its building.

The shadow of heavenly things.

In Exod. xxv. 9, 10, xxvi. 30, xxvii. 8, and Numb. viii. 4 Moses is commanded to see that all things in the tabernacle are made after the pattern that was shown him in the mount, and this is repeated in Heb. viii. 5. In the latter passage the reason for this exactness is given:--

“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 shewed to thee in the mount.”

Again, in Heb. ix. 23 the tabernacle is spoken of as “The pattern of things in the heavens”. The holiest of all in the tabernacle was evidently a symbol of heaven, for we read:--

“We have an high priest in the heavens, a minister of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man” (Heb. viii. 1, 2).

It is called “a greater and more perfect tabernacle” in ix. 11, and the holy places made with hands are called “figures of the true”, and the true is further defined as “heaven itself” in ix. 24. It is therefore a matter beyond controversy that the tabernacle and its offerings, its priests and its furniture, are intensely typical, and speak of heaven itself where Christ as the great high priest has for us entered.

“Of Thine own have we given Thee.”

The whole of the material necessary for the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture was given willingly by the people of Israel:--

“Every man that giveth it willingly with his heart” (Exod. xxv. 2).

“And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whose spirit made him willing” (Exod. xxxv. 21, 29)

The same element of wholehearted willingness entered into the preparation for the temple in David’s day:--

“Who then is willing to consecrate his service?”

“Then the people rejoiced, for that day they offered willingly, because with perfect heart they offered willingly to the Lord” (I Chron. xxix. 5, 9).

The chapter also reveals the secret of this willing offering:--

“All things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee.”

“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” (I Chron. xxix. 14, 16).

These material things, such as silver and gold, were but the evident types of unseen realities that pertain to God. David’s ascription of praise (I Chron. xxix. 11-13), punctuated by 14 “ands” (including “now” of verse 13, and so making 15 items), may be compared with the “pattern of things in the heavens” given in Exod. xxv. 3-7:--

The fifteen patterns. (Exod. xxv. 3-7).	The things themselves. (I Chron. xxix. 11-13).
1. Gold.	1. Greatness.
2. Silver.	2. Power.
3. Brass.	3. Glory.
4. Blue.	4. Victory.
5. Purple.	5. Majesty.
6. Scarlet.	6. All in H. and E. is Thine.
7. Linen.	7. Kingdom and headship.
8. Goats’ hair.	8. Riches and honour.
9. Rams’ skins.	9. Reign over all.
10. Badgers’ skins.	10. Power.
11. Shittim wood.	11. Might.
12. Oil.	12. To make great.
13. Spices.	13. To give strength.
14. Onyx stones.	14. Thanks.
15. Stones (various).	15. Praise.

We do not intend to teach by these parallels that (1) gold represents greatness, or (8) goats’ hair represents riches and honour. All we intend is to emphasize the spiritual value of these typical materials, and to take advantage of that characteristic of inspiration where even words are weighed and numbered. The same element of symbolism is discernible in the gifts brought by the wise men to the infant Christ “born Kings of the Jews”, viz., “gold and frankincense and myrrh” (Matt. ii. 11).

The fifteen items enumerated in Exod. xxv. 3-7 retain the special number (5) that pervades the tabernacle. The outer court was 100 cubits wide, covering an area of 5,000 square cubits. The 60 pillars of this court multiply the tabernacle number (5) by the number of tribes (12). The pillars that held the curtains were 5 cubits apart and 5 cubits high; the whole of the outer curtain was divided into squares of 25 cubits. We will not pursue this further, but as we come to individual details we shall find five (5) dominating the whole structure. We are distinctly told in Psa. cv. that the offerings made by Israel for the tabernacle were brought from Egypt at the Exodus:--

“He brought them forth also with silver and gold” (Psa. cv. 37).

“They asked of the Egyptians jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment” (Exod. xii. 35).

This was provided for in the covenant made with Abraham:--

“And also that nation, whom they serve, will I judge, and afterward they shall come out with great substance” (Gen. xv. 14).

It practically amounted to deferred pay, the taskmaster being compelled at the end to disgorge the wage withheld. The same principle is seen in Isa. lx. 5, 11, 16, lxi. 6. That service and honour due to God, and which sin has diverted to itself, shall by virtue of redemption be taken from the usurper and willingly offered to the rightful Lord. The same may be said of the various ascriptions of praise found in the book of the Revelation, they are all so much of the Lord’s due held back for a time by sin. When the day of glory arrives:--

“The kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it” (Rev. xxi. 24).

“Thy people shall offer themselves willingly in the day of Thy power” (Psa. cx. 3).

The first article of the tabernacle to be specified is the ark. This we will examine later, but first we had better obtain a general survey. The tabernacle itself was an oblong, 30 cubits in length, and 10 in the height and breadth. This was divided by a veil into two parts; the holy place being 20 cubits long, and the most holy, the holy of holies, being a perfect cube of 10 cubits length, breadth and depth. These are referred to in Heb. ix. 2, 6, 7 as the first and second tabernacle, respectively. In the first tabernacle stood the lampstand, the table of shewbread, and the altar of incense. In the holiest of all stood the ark and the mercy seat. None but the high priest was allowed to enter into the holiest of all.

The tabernacle itself was constructed of planks of shittim wood overlaid with gold, which planks were placed upon silver sockets and fastened together by long rods. Inside the tabernacle were woven tapestries containing embroidered cherubim, and outside the tabernacle were successive layers of curtains of goats’ hair, rams’ skins dyed red, and badgers’ skins. Before the door of the tabernacle stood the brazen altar and the laver, and the whole was surrounded by the white curtained court. Disposed around this tabernacle were the priests, the tents, and the tribes. Rabbinical tradition has it that each tribe carried as a sign one of the twelve constellations of the Zodiac. These twelve signs, beginning with the sign of the virgin (Genesis), and ending with the sign of the lion (Revelation), depict the whole story of redemption.

The twelve tribes were distributed according to the four points of the compass, the whole forming a wondrous picture—all Israel grouped around the ark, the mercy seat, and the pillar of cloud or fire, setting forth the day when God shall be all in all. The order here referred to is given in full detail in Numb. ii. and *The Companion Bible, Dispensational Truth* (page 106), and Newberry’s Supplement to *The Englishman’s Bible* set the whole before the eye in a diagram. It is of interest to note that the tribes that occupied east, west, south, and north had as their signs the lion, ox, man, and eagle (*scorpio*), so that both at the centre (the mercy seat) and at the circumference (the standards) the cherubic pledge of restoration was remembered.

The primary purpose of the tabernacle.

In Exod. xxv. 8, immediately following the enumeration of the materials necessary for the building of the tabernacle, God gives the primary purpose of its construction, "Let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them". "The tents of Shem" were from the days of Noah destined to be the dwelling place of God (Gen. ix. 27), and it is the purpose of redemption and atonement to make the sons of men fit for God to dwell among them. The climax of the book of Revelation is expressed in the words:--

"Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God" (Rev. xxi. 3),

and when this takes place tears, death, sorrow, crying, and pain, the close attendants upon sin ever since paradise was lost, shall for ever pass away. This blessed time of restoration is expressed in the typical tabernacle of Israel.

Why a tabernacle?

A tabernacle is a tent, a dwelling place that belongs to pilgrims. It speaks of the wilderness and its wanderings rather than the kingdom and its peace. Consequently it has an application all down the age to all companies of the redeemed who are pressing on to the hope laid up for them:--

"By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac, and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise" (Heb. xi. 9).

Not only so, it represents the willingness of God in His grace to have no settled place upon this earth until sin is removed, and His pilgrim people are at home in peace. Since Gen. iii. the sabbath rest of creation has been broken by the activities of redemption. The date upon which the tabernacle was set up is also of a typical nature, "on the first day of the month". Moses records one other important typical event that took place upon this same date, namely, the day when the waters were dried up from off the earth at the time of the flood, and when Noah removed the covering of the ark (Gen. viii. 13). Both events have restoration in view, both have an ark as the central feature (two words in the Hebrew O.T., but one in the Greek N.T.).

Noah's ark had no cherubim, for man, lion, ox, and eagle were there in reality; the ark of the covenant had golden cherubim. Noah's ark was covered with *pitch*, the first occurrence of the Hebrew word atonement in the O.T. The mercy seat is in Hebrew *kapporeth*, *pitch* being *kopher*, and to pitch, *kaphar*.

We are now ready to give closer attention to the detailed description given in Exodus of the various parts of the tabernacle, and we pray that the exhibition of these rich types may be a means of blessing not only to the young believers among our readers for whom they are primarily intended, but to the most advanced also.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

#42. The principal thing.

A seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary. (vii. 26 - ix. 20).

pp. 5 - 14

Returning to chapter ix. we learn that the way into the holiest was not made manifest because of the character of the sacrifice and the service connected with that period. It is stimulating to observe the sturdy faith of the apostle in Holy Scripture—“*The Holy Ghost* this signifying.” However varied and strange “the sundry times and divers manners” may have been, the teaching of Heb. i. 1 is that “*God* spake”. So in Heb. iii. 7, where Psa. xcvi. is quoted, the apostle says, “As the Holy Ghost saith”.

To come now to the peculiar character of the earlier dispensation. Before the coming of Christ all were “shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed” (Gal. iii. 23). The service of the priests is called “the example and shadow of heavenly things” (viii. 5). The law is said to have “shadow of good things to come, and not the very image” (x. 1). So here the tabernacle and its services are said to be “a figure” (ix. 9).

The word is literally a “parable”. A reference to Ezek. xx. 49, Psa. xlix. 4, lxxviii. 2, Matt. xiii. 10-13 and John xvi. 28, 29 will show that an element of obscurity is connected with a parable. Heb. ix. 9 tells us that this particular parable remained “unto the present time” (which we believe to be the true rendering of this passage). Now that Christ has come the shadows vanish. All the offerings, sacrifices and services of the tabernacle, while most wonderfully adapted to their purpose, could never lead to the goal of Hebrews:--

“They could not make him that did the service PERFECT as pertaining to the conscience” (Heb. ix. 9).

The purpose of the parable.

The dispensational truth related to the use of the parable is too important to pass over without a fuller note. A type sets forth with more or less clearness the reality which it foreshadows. A parable veils truth. It will be remembered that the parables of Matt. xiii. are closely associated with the Lord’s rejection (Matt. xii.), and with the “mysteries” of the kingdom of the heavens.

We have shown elsewhere (“*The Reconciliation of All Things*”) that the word “mystery” is introduced as a result of failure, and must be kept distinct from the original plan and will of God. When Israel came out of Egypt, they were led by Moses to Sinai. There they were assembled to enter into solemn covenant with the Lord. Here are the terms of that covenant:--

“Now therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people, though all the earth is Mine. And ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation” (Exod. xix. 5, 6).

When Moses descended from the smoking mountain he spake no word concerning tabernacle, ark or mercy seat, but solemnly sprinkled the people with the blood of the covenant saying:--

“Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words” (Exod. xxiv. 8).

After this Moses re-ascended the mountain in order to receive the tables of stone. During Moses’ absence the people headed by Aaron broke the solemn covenant into which they had entered by worshipping the golden calf, for among the “words” which constituted the covenant were “Thou shalt have no other gods before Me”. The covenant was broken, and Moses manifested it by breaking the tables of stone (Exod. xxxii. 15-19). When the duplicates were given they were placed in the ark of the covenant, which ark was the nucleus and centre of the whole tabernacle ritual. Israel’s destiny is to be a kingdom of priests.

The attaining of that destined end is the meaning of “perfect”, *teleios*, which is allied with *telos*, “end”. Israel can never be a kingdom of priests under the old covenant that was broken, neither can they reach their goal by the typical ritual of the tabernacle. “The law made nothing perfect.” Israel’s “perfection”, the attaining unto that for which they had been laid hold of by the Lord (*see* Phil. iii. 12), can only be accomplished under the new covenant of which Christ, not Moses, is the Mediator. This new covenant, it will be observed, is immediately introduced after the comparison between the priesthood of Christ and that of Levi has been made. The Levitical priesthood and sacrifices:--

“Could not make him that did the service PERFECT as pertaining to the conscience” (Heb. ix. 9).

Carnal ordinances.

The apostle reduces the ceremonial and typical ordinances to two heads, viz., (1) Meats and drinks; (2) Diverse baptisms. A reading of Lev. xi.-xv. will give some idea of the apostle’s meaning. Writing to Gentile Believers in another connection he says:--

“Touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using” (Col. ii. 21, 22).

and shows this man-made prohibition is vain, and he turns the believer’s attention away from the “shadows”, for, says he, “the body is of Christ”, and directs their hearts and minds to where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

It will be observed that we do not follow the A.V. and translate “diverse washings”, but “baptisms”. This brings the apostle’s argument into line with that of Heb. v., vi., where, in urging the reader to “go on unto *perfection*”, he says, “leave not lay again

. . . . the doctrine of baptisms”. The one great reason for leaving these gifts and sacrifices, this tabernacle service, these distinctions between meats and drinks, these washings, dippings and sprinklings, is that they were all “carnal ordinances”, and these ordinances can no more lead on unto perfection than could the “carnal commandment” of Heb. vii. 16 “perfect the Son” (vii. 28) in His office as high priest after the order of Melchisedec.

Until the time of reformation.

Not only were these ordinances “carnal”, they were temporal, they were “imposed until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 10). The word “imposed” suggests a burden. In Luke v. 1 it is “to press upon” as a crowd, or “to lay on” as a stone on a grave (John xi. 38). Peter expresses this conception when he speaks of the law as “a yoke which neither our forefathers nor we have been able to bear” (Acts xv. 10). This burden was but for a time “until the time of reformation”:-

“The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did” (Heb. vii. 19).

“The law was our pedagogue unto Christ” (Gal. iii. 24).

Reformation.—This word bears two meanings:-

1. The idea of getting back to some primitive simplicity that had become obscured, and
2. The idea of a radical change that reforms the subject.

The Greek word *diorthosis* (reformation) does not occur elsewhere in the Scriptures, but *diorthoo* comes in Jer. vii. 3 in the command, “amend your ways”. The time of reformation dawned when “grace and truth” came by Jesus Christ, in contrast with the “law that was given by Moses” (John i. 17). The reformation introduced better promises, a better hope, and had as its basis a better covenant, ministered by Christ the Mediator of the better covenant. The argument is designed to lead the Hebrew believer to see the temporary character of these laws, which according to the teaching of their Rabbis were eternal and unchanging (*see* Acts vi. 13, 14). The abiding priest, the once offered sacrifice, the unchanging covenant, the sure and stedfast hope, these touched the conscience, led on to perfection and were found only in Christ.

Heb. ix. 9, 10.

No perfection by carnal ordinances.

- A | 9-. The present season.
B | -9. | a | Gifts and sacrifices.
 b | No perfection, not touch conscience.
B | 10-. | a | Meats, drinks, baptisms.
 b | Carnal ordinances.
A | -10. The season of reformation.

Rom. viii. 3 supplies the true comment, “weak because of the flesh”. But what the law could not do God has done by sending His Son. This is equally the teaching of Hebrews as it is of Romans. The law concerning the priesthood was weak because of the

flesh, and no perfection can come that way. God's answer is Christ, the priest in the power of an endless life. The sacrifices, both in their nature and by their repetition, failed to touch the conscience. God's answer is Christ. He said "Lo, I come", and, coming, set aside all types and shadows by the offering of Himself.

A blessed change.

The new section, commencing with verse 11, therefore opens with the words "*But Christ*". Dispensational and doctrinal changes are introduced by some such expression in other places. For example, in Acts xvii. 30:--

"And the times of their ignorance God winked at, BUT NOW commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

So, in Rom. iii. 21, when the apostle had brought the whole world in guilty before God, with no hope of righteousness in themselves, he then introduces the wondrous provision of grace with the word:--

"BUT NOW the righteousness of God without the law is manifested."

Both the doctrinal and dispensational portions of Eph. ii. are marked in the same way:--

"BUT GOD, Who is rich in mercy made us alive" (4, 5).
"BUT NOW in Christ Jesus made nigh" (13).

When the apostle had clearly shown both the weakness and unprofitableness of the dispensation of type and shadow, he swings the door of the new dispensation upon the same small hinges "BUT CHRIST":--

"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come" (Heb. ix. 11).

The good things to come must not be interpreted only of the new life and the glory yet to be, they include, and perhaps principally refer to, the dispensational change which set aside the types and shadows and provided the antitype, Christ. This may be seen by consulting Heb. x. 1:--

"For the law having a *shadow of good things to come*, and not the very image of the things."

We remember the opening words of chapter viii., and that the "principal thing" is a seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary. This important fact is again prominent. We have such a high priest of good things to come, in contrast with those priests whose ministry was confined to shadows. At ix. 11 we have the subject of ix. 1-5 resumed in the words, "By a greater and more perfect tabernacle". Not only is this tabernacle "greater and more perfect", it is "not of this creation", for so the word rendered "building" should be translated. The use of this word "creation" is noteworthy, for in II Cor. iii.-v. the

new covenant is linked with the *new creation*, and both with the reconciliation. Israel are a people of types, and in this they foreshadow the purpose of the ages.

The blood of Christ.

We noted, in Heb. ix. 6 and 7, that the high priest entered into the holiest of all once every year, “not without blood”. This therefore is the next item to be developed in the argument. Verse 12 continues:--

“Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once unto the holy place, having obtained *aionian* redemption for us.”

Negatively, Christ entered “NOT with the blood of goats and calves”. Positively, Christ entered “by His own blood”. As to time Christ entered “once”, in contrast with the type of verse 7, “once every year”. The “*aionian* redemption” finds expansion in the succeeding verses.

The importance of the ascension.

While many are aware of the essential character of the death and resurrection of Christ, all are not so impressed with the importance of His ascension. Eph. i. 19-23 stresses the ascension of Christ in connection with His present headship of the church which is His body, and Eph. iv. 8-10 sets forth the triumphant character of His ascension when He led captivity captive. The present dispensation with its fourfold ministry is also essentially related with the ascended Lord (Eph. iv. 11, 12). The high privilege of the believer who has been “made to sit together in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 6), and also the power to walk in newness of life, are related to the fact that Christ now “sitteth at the right hand of God” (Col. iii. 1).

Not only do the epistles of the mystery stress the fact of the Lord’s ascension, but the epistle of the Hebrews does also. Let us notice some of the references:--

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

“We have a great high priest, that is passed into the heaven, Jesus the Son of God” (Heb. iv. 14).

“We have such a high priest, Who is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens” (Heb. viii. 1).

“Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. ix. 24).

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

“Looking unto Jesus Who is set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (Heb. xii. 2).

These, and all passages which speak of the Lord’s heavenly ministry and intercession, necessitate the ascension. We shall understand our calling the better if we keep this fact before us.

Israel, the aionian people.

It is necessary to remember that the apostle makes pointed allusion to the great day of atonement in Heb. ix. To this solemn day refer the statements concerning the blood of bulls and goats, as also the entry into the holiest of the high priest alone once every year. The mediation of the high priest on the day of atonement accomplished a reconciliation for the year. In vivid contrast the effect of Christ's one offering is called an *aionian* redemption, and as it touched the conscience needs no repetition.

Israel are the *aionian* people (Isa. xlv. 7).

Christ is the author of *aionian* salvation (Heb. v. 9).

With His blood He obtained *aionian* redemption (Heb. ix. 12).

This blood of the new covenant ensures the *aionian* inheritance (Heb. ix. 15).

This new covenant itself is called the *aionian* covenant (Heb. xiii. 20).

Israel are a typical people, and foreshadow in their calling and history the wider dealings of God with man during the course of the ages.

It now becomes necessary to the argument of the apostle that he should establish the superiority of the offering of Christ, and this he does by a series of comparisons. The first comparison is drawn between the offerings that were provided by the law to sanctify those who had become unclean, and the cleansing power of the blood of Christ.

Heb. ix. 13, 14.

- A | 13-. For if. The fact assumed.
- B | -13-. The blood, and ashes of heifer.
- C | -13. Sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh.
- A | 14-. How much more. Superiority assumed.
- B | -14-. The blood of Christ.
- C | -14. Purge conscience from dead works.

The argument cannot be appreciated fully without a knowledge of Num. xix. There the Lord commands Israel to bring:--

1. A red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish and upon which never yoke came.
2. The heifer was slain, and the blood sprinkled before the tabernacle.
3. The remaining carcass, together with cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet, was burned, and the ashes gathered and laid up without the camp, with which the water of separation was made.
4. The defilement which necessitated the application of this water of separation is particularly connected with death.
5. A person was rendered unclean by touching a dead body, being in a tent wherein a man died, touching a bone or a grave.

It will be seen that some defilement was unavoidable. God would not have been pleased with that man who for the avoidance of ceremonial defilement withdrew himself from the dead or the dying. Yet this presses upon us the absolute necessity for the

provision for uncleanness, for at times our very duties carry with them defilement, and though “not of the world” we are nevertheless still “in the world”, and though we are cleansed completely in one sense, we shall, till our pilgrimage is over, be under the necessity to “wash the feet” continually (John xiii. 10). The emphasis upon death and the dead in Num. xix. provides the argument of Heb. ix. 14.

Covenant or Testament?

While it is a truth worthy of the fullest emphasis that the cleansing power of the blood of Christ excelled the types and shadows as conscience is greater than ceremony and dead works more defiling than dead bodies, yet this truth is placed here to lead on to another which is vital to the argument of the epistle:--

“And because of this, He is the mediator of a new covenant, so that death having taken place for a redemption of the transgressions against the first covenant, those having been called might receive the promise of *aionian* inheritance. For where a covenant exists, it is necessary to bring in the death of the covenant victim, because a covenant is confirmed over dead victims, since it is never valid when the covenant victim is living” (Heb. ix. 15-17).

To introduce the word “testament” here, with its associated ideas of a “will” and the death of the “testator”, is foreign both to Hebrew thought and the design of this epistle.

Diatheke occurs in Hebrews 17 times, and in every occurrence other than those of ix. 15-18 it is used of either the old or the new covenant. Heb. ix. 20 reads “the blood of the *testament*”. The passage is a quotation from Exod. xxiv. 8, where the same version reads “the blood of the *covenant*”. The A.V. is obliged to introduce the word “men” into Heb. ix. 17; we translate instead “dead victims”, referring to the sacrifices that accompanied the making of the covenant. In Heb. vii. 22 we read:--

“By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better *covenant*”.

In viii. 6:--

“By how much also He is the mediator of a better *covenant*”.

In xii. 24, in contrast with Mount Sinai and the old covenant, is placed Mount Sion and the new covenant:--

“And to Jesus the mediator of the new *covenant*, and to *the blood of sprinkling*, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.”

It is clear from these passages that Heb. ix. 15 speaks not of a testament, but of a covenant in the Hebrew sense of the word. In Heb. viii. 8-12 we have a long quotation from Jer. xxxi. concerning the old and new covenants. In Heb. x. 15-17 this self-same chapter is quoted again. Heb. ix., which comes in between these two quotations, is written expressly to show that Christ is the mediator of that very covenant of prophecy, and the word “testament” therefore, instead of helping forward the apostle’s argument,

tends to hinder it. After speaking of the sprinkling of the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, the apostle adds:--

“And almost all things are by the law cleansed by blood; and apart from the shedding of blood is no forgiveness” (Heb. ix. 22).

Having come so far we shall now be able to appreciate the general structure of the chapter, which will be found to be chiefly concerned with

The old and the new covenants.
Heb. ix. 1-22.

- A | 1-. The First Covenant.
- B | -1-10. | a | -1-7. The Tabernacle. *Worldly.*
 - b | 8-10. Its significance. *No way in. Conscience untouched.*
- B | 11-14. | a | 11. Greater and more perfect tabernacle. *Not of this creation.*
 - b | 12-14. Its significance. *He entered in. Conscience purged.*
- A | 15-20. The New Covenant.

We shall have to extend this structure to include ix. 21 - x. 18, but this is a member too large and too important for rapid treatment. Here therefore we pause in our survey, and may the Lord Who is magnified in this epistle to the Hebrews be magnified also in the daily life and spiritual conception of those who are blessed under other terms than those of this new covenant, which forms so important a feature of our present study.

#43. One sacrifice for sins for ever (ix. 23 - x. 18).
pp. 49 - 63

The section of this epistle that lies before us is the last of the series that, step by step, sets aside the old covenant with its types and shadows, and leads on unto perfection. The next section opens with the words:--

“Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus and having a high priest over the house of God, let us draw near” (Heb. x. 19-22).

This reverses the order in which the subject has been dealt with. We have:--

1. The perfect priest (v.-viii.)
2. The heavenly sanctuary (ix. 1-24).
3. The once offered sacrifice (ix. 25 - x. 18).

We are, in this article, to review the teaching of the apostle on the last and perhaps most critical element of both old and new covenants, viz., the sacrifice. The section ix. 23 - x. 18 bases its teaching upon the contrast that exists between the

repeated sacrifices of the law and the once offered sacrifice of the new covenant, the one a shadow, the other the very image.

Heb. ix. 23 - x. 18.

- A | ix. 23, 24. Patterns and figures of heaven itself.
- B | ix. 25. The offering “often”, “annually”.
- C | ix. 26-28. The offering ONCE.
- A | x. 1-. A shadow.
- B | x. -1. The offering “annually”.
- C | x. 2-18. The offering ONCE.

The cleansing of heavenly things.

In what sense are we to understand that “it was necessary” that the “heavenly things themselves” should be purified? The difficulty arises from the fact that we are not Hebrews and have had no personal contact with the Mosaic economy. In verse 22 we read that “almost all things are by the law purified by blood”, and it will be observed in verses 19-21 that inanimate—and consequently un sinning—things as “the book”, “the tabernacle” and the “vessels of the ministry” were purified by the sprinkling of blood. The dedication to God likewise of the heavenly realities can only be by blood, but this time by the precious blood of Christ. The tabernacle needed purifying on account of the people (Lev. xvi. 16). So “heaven itself” needed to be cleansed, not only because of those who have heavenly destiny (Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20), but also because of those who by sin forfeited their heavenly abode (II Pet. ii. 4).

Better sacrifices.

Seeing that the apostle’s argument in this section finds its strength in the fact that Christ offered *one* sacrifice for sin, as contrasted with the repeated sacrifices of the law, why does he speak of Christ’s offering in the plural, “better sacrifices”? There is a recognized figure of speech in the Hebrew of the O.T. called *Heterosis* or “Exchange. It has a wide range into which we will not enter here, the section which includes our difficulty being the *Heterosis* of number. A few examples will suffice:--

- Gen. iv. 10.—“Bloods” = life’s blood.
- Gen. xix. 11.—“Blindnesses” = intense blindness.
- Psa. li. 17.—“Sacrifices” = the great sacrifice.
- Psa. xc. 10.—“Strengths” = great, unusual strength.

This last reference is practically identical with Heb. ix. 23. The apostle, using a recognized figure of speech must be understood to mean “the infinitely better sacrifice”. while we are dealing with this figure we might observe that in verse 24 “holy places” means “the most holy place”, as it is translated in ix. 8.

The end of the world.

In contrasting the offerings made under the law with the offering of Christ, the apostle makes much of the fact that the law offered sacrifices continually, but that Christ offered but one sacrifice, and one only. Otherwise, said the apostle, it would be necessary that Christ should suffer often since the foundation of the world. We know from Heb. ix. 15 that the sacrifice of Christ was retrospective, and was “for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant”, and also from Rom. iii. 25 we learn that the offering of Christ declared God’s righteousness in remitting the sins of the past. The reference to the foundation of the world is easy to understand. The apostle, however, makes another statement in Heb. ix. 26, “But now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself” (*epi sunteleia ton aionon*), “upon an ending together of the ages”. The LXX uses the word *sunteleia* in Exod. xxiii. 14-16 in a way which may help us. “Three times shalt thou keep a feast unto Me in the year”:-

1. The feast of unleavened bread.
2. The feast of the harvest.
3. The feast of the ingathering (*sunteleia*) which is in the end of the year.

Once again may we be permitted to say that those to whom the apostle wrote knew the law and much of its significance? The instructed Hebrew saw in the feasts of Israel, as set out in Lev. xxiii., the plan of the ages. He saw that Christ was the true Passover and the true Firstfruits. The feast of the seventh month, the *sunteleia*, would vividly bring to mind the *sunteleia* of the ages. It has been objected that “the consummation of the ages” has not arrived, and therefore this passage as it stands in the A.V. is not true. The same objection can be lodged against Heb. i. 1, for the period called “these last days” was over 1900 years ago.

When Christ was born Gal. iv. 4 declares that it was *fullness of time*. We must avoid the error of introducing truth that belongs to another dispensation to confuse the teaching of earlier revelations. Paul’s prison ministry is, so far as time is concerned, a parenthesis. During the Acts period the coming of the Lord was expected to take place during the lifetime of the believer then living. Peter had no “difficulties” when he joined together the “blood and fire and pillars of smoke” that have not yet come with the Pentecostal gifts that are long past. Moreover the objection to the application of the *sunteleia* of the ages to the time of the offering of Christ robs the passage of another vital connection, viz., the Day of Atonement.

The Day of Atonement, like the feast of the *sunteleia*, took place in the seventh month, after the interval that provides a typical anticipation of the parenthesis that has actually come. Yet at the time of writing the apostle finds no difficulty in speaking of Christ’s sacrifice in the terms of the Day of Atonement. The condition of things during the Acts is likened to the time when the high priest had entered into the holiest of all, during which time the people waited for His second appearing, when they were assured of forgiveness and acceptance. The fact that this second appearing did not take place, that Israel’s forgiveness and acceptance is deferred, that it was all anticipated in the plan

of the feasts somewhat similar expression occurs in I Cor. x. 11, "They are written for our admonition, unto whom the *ends of the ages* have reached" (*ta tele ton aionon*).

The typical happenings to Israel in the wilderness foreshadowed the state of things that would be true at the end, and the Corinthians were living at that time of the end, for so Scripture declares. The Jews divided all time into three great ages. 1. Before the law. 2. Under the law. 3. After the law. The age after the law they naturally thought of as the Millennium, not realizing that the elective period, when Gentiles were being called, was also to be reckoned with it.

To put away sin.

What are we to understand by this expression? It is usually taken to mean just what the A.V. says. The word "to put away" in the original is *athetesis* from *atheteo*. Let us examine the usage of these words; we shall then have positive evidence, and moreover be made independent of the opinion of others.

Atheteo.

Mark vi. 26.	"Reject her."
Mark vii. 9.	"Full well ye reject the commandment", margin "frustrate".
Luke vii. 30.	"Rejected the counsel of God", margin "frustrated".
Luke x. 16.	"He that despiseth" (four times).
John xii. 48.	"He that rejecteth Me."
I Cor. i. 19.	"I will bring to nothing the understanding."
Gal. ii. 21.	"I do not frustrate the grace of God."
Gal. iii. 15.	"No man disannulleth."
I Thess. iv. 8.	"He therefore that despiseth" (twice), margin "rejecteth".
I Tim. v. 12.	"Cast off their first faith."
Heb. x. 28.	"He that despised Moses' law."
Jude 8.	"These despise dominion."

We believe that no one after pondering this list of occurrences can avoid the conclusion that *atheteo* means "to set aside" or "to annul" as a covenant or a commandment. The word occurs 57 times in the LXX, and in order that no phase of the meaning should be left unconsidered we have consulted every reference. We cannot spare the space to give them here, but it is not necessary. Every occurrence deals either with rebellion, treachery or the setting aside of covenant obligations. Indeed, in one of the cases the word stand alone, the word covenant being implied. The same remarks are true also of *athetema* and *athetesis*.

Athetesis, the word actually occurring in Heb. ix. 26, occurs nowhere else but in Heb. vii. 18. There the passage is rendered:--

"For there is verily a DISANNULLING of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God."

Chapter vii. is dealing with the failure of Israel's *priesthood*, the law concerning priesthood "perfected nothing". Only in the virtue of a "better hope" can any draw nigh unto God. Chapter ix. 26-28 is dealing with the failure of Israel's sacrifices, the law concerning sacrifices was a shadow and could not "perfect" those who drew nigh. Only in the virtue of a "better sacrifice" can any draw nigh to God. The parallel is complete. Moreover both sections deal with the removal and failure of the old covenant:--

- A | vii. 18. The setting aside (*athetesis*) of the commandment concerning the priests.
- B | viii. 8. Finding fault with the first covenant.
- A | ix. 26. The setting aside (*athetesis*) of the sin offering.
- B | x. 9. Taking away the first covenant.

It may be objected that where we have inserted "sin-offering" the A.V. says "sin", but it is recognized by all students of Scripture that the word "sin" often stands for the "offering of sin", and consequently may be so understood here. Heb. ix. 26 is not dealing with the forgiveness or the putting away of sin, it deals with the *abrogation of the sin-offering*, a fact absolutely necessary if Israel were to believe on the Son of God, and leave the shadows of the old covenant. "He appeared to set aside the sin-offering by the sacrifice of Himself." The reader has only to read Heb. x. 4-9 to find abundant confirmation of this interpretation.

The idea that has been read into this verse that the offering of Christ was "for the repudiation of sin at the conclusion of the eons" does violence to the order of the words in the original and fails to give the true meaning of *athetesis*. There is not one single instance in either the N.T. or the LXX where the word is used in connection with "putting away sin", whereas the consistent usage compels us to see that here, in Heb. ix. as in Heb. vii., the disannulling of a weak and profitless symbol is entirely in harmony with the context and aim of the epistle. Verses 27 and 28 must be read together, as they are two members of one simile indicated by the words "as" and "so". Some intended likeness must be discovered, for if a contrast were intended we should get the expression used in Rom. v. 15.

Now what is the intention of the writer when he says, "and as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment"? The majority of commentators take it to refer to mankind in general, and that the offering of Christ "once" is set over against the dying "once" of verse 27. While this contains truth, we are not persuaded that it is the true meaning of the passage. For one thing there is hardly a deviation from the one great theme discernible in the whole of chapters vii., viii. and ix. Every effort and argument is brought to bear upon the one absorbing theme, the superiority of the priesthood and offering of Christ, and the typical teaching of the types and shadows of the law.

Who are "the men"?

"It is appointed to the men once to die." The priests of the order of Aaron are definitely called "*dying men*" (Heb. vii. 8), and "men having weakness" (Heb. vii. 28). So that, to say the least, we may admit the probability that in the context that speaks of

the typical tabernacle priesthood and offerings, “the men” may refer to these same dying priests.

It occurred to us at this point to consult the LXX for the usage of “judgment”, knowing that in many cases the word judgment is synonymous with salvation in the O.T. Turning up the word *krisis* we found the list too formidable for the time at our disposal, but believing that the key to Heb. ix. 27, 28 lies in the law concerning the cities of refuge, and knowing that Numb. xxxv. contains a full statement concerning these cities, we looked to see whether *krisis* occurs in that chapter. It does:--

“And they shall be unto you cities for refuge from the avenger; that the manslayer die not, until he stand before the congregation in judgment (*krisis*)” (Numb. xxxv. 12).

This statement is followed by a law making a distinction between a willful murder and a manslayer, and when these distinctions have been made the Scripture continues:--

“Then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the revenger of blood according to these judgments (*krimata*). And the congregation shall deliver the slayer out of the hand of the revenger of blood, and the congregation shall restore him to the city of refuge, whither he was fled (*katapheugo*), and he shall abide in it unto the DEATH of the high priest, which was anointed with the holy oil after the death of the high priest the slayer shall return into the land of his possession” (Numb. xxxv. 24-28).

This is the “judgment” equivalent to salvation that was to be pronounced by the congregation, and hinged upon the death of the anointed high priest. It will be seen that such an interpretation harmonizes with the simile here intended:--

- A | 27-. And as.
- B | -27-. The men die once.
- C | -27. Judgment.
- A | 28-. So also.
- B | -28-. Christ was offered once.
- C | -28. Salvation.

Judgment and Salvation.

In Judges ii. 16-19 we have the close connection established between the judge and deliverance:--

“And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and *saved* them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge when the judge was dead, they turned back”

The judges of Israel were first of all saviours. This is seen in the judgeship of Othniel and Ehud. “The Lord raised up a *saviour* to the children of Israel” (Judg. iii. 9-15). The reader will doubtless call to mind the many passages where the poor, the needy and the righteous call upon God to “judge” them, and such passages as Psa. i. 5 where the ungodly are excluded from “judgment”. It is this Old Testament conception of judgment

and the particular exercise of it seen in Numb. xxxv. that must be kept to the fore as we read Heb. ix. 27.

The Day of Atonement.

The type of the city of refuge is now dropped and the great Day of Atonement is in view. The return of the Lord “the second time” is to be understood in the light of the action of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. There in the holiest of all the high priest appeared in the presence of God for the people (Lev. xvi. 23, 24); then putting on his gorgeous robes he came out to bless the waiting congregation. The apostle could hardly find a grander and more impressive moment in the whole levitical ritual with which to impress a Jew than this. He however draws attention even here to the surpassing excellence of Christ. When the high priest came out from the presence of God, he made a fresh atonement for himself and for the people (Lev. xvi. 24). This shows once more the failure of the type, for when Christ, the true high priest appears the second time it will be “apart from a sin offering”—“Christ dieth no more.”

The second appearing of the Lord, in fulfillment of the type of Lev. xvi., will also be His second coming, and as we have already indicated, at the time of the writing of “Hebrews” that second coming was imminent. The Lord had ascended, had entered into the presence of God, and had Israel repented and “looked for Him”, He would have returned in His robes of glory and beauty without sin unto salvation. Israel however failed. The second coming is deferred. A parenthetical dispensation must now run its course before that typical seventh month is fulfilled, and before every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him.

Perfected for ever.

We have already had brought before us the solemn fact that “the law made nothing perfect”, and this statement was not allowed to remain merely as a general remark, it was particularized. The priesthood made nothing perfect, the tabernacle services made nothing perfect, and now we are to have the final argument to show that the sacrifices of the law made nothing perfect, but that the one offering of Christ did. Chapter x. 1-18 is devoted to this theme.

Heb. x. 1-18.

- A | 1-4. | a | The yearly offerings.
- b | Not able to *perfect for ever*.
- c | Those that draw nigh.
- d | Argument from cessation of offerings.
- e | Argument from remembrance of sins.
- B | 5-10. | f | The prepared *body*.
- g | No pleasure in sacrifices.
- h | I come to do Thy will.
- i | The first taken away.
- i | The second established.
- h | By the which will.

g | Sanctified through one offering.
 f | The *body* of Jesus Christ.
 B | 5-10. | f1 | The priest *standing*.
 g1 | The repeated sacrifice.
 h1 | Never take away sins.
 g1 | Christ's one sacrifice.
 h1 | For sins.
 f1 | He *sat down*.
 A | 1-4. | a | By one offering.
 b | *Perfect for ever*.
 c | Them that are sanctified.
 e | Argument from remembrance of sins.
 d | Argument from cessation of offerings.

“For the law having a shadow of good things to come and not the very image of the things” (x. 1).

The Syriac version interprets this clause, “For the law, a shadow was in it, not the substance itself”. Just as in Col. ii. 17 “the shadow” is in antithesis to the “body of Christ”, so here the “shadow” is in contrast with the “very image”, the reality itself. That which cast its shadow in the law is the real thing. Every sacrifice offered upon Israel’s altar was a foreshadowing of the one and only acceptable offering of Christ.

“Can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year” (x. 1).

The inability of the sacrifices of the law is associated with their repetition, a feature which is enlarged upon in the next verse. The feature that is most important in this verse and which shows up prominently in the structure, viz., A | b, is hidden in the A.V. word “continually”. The English reader sees in it but an extension of the words “year by year”. The Greek reads *eis to dienekes*, “unto the unbroken continuance”. The phrase does not occur outside the epistle to the Hebrews, and in that epistle it occurs four times:-

“Abideth a priest *continually*” (vii. 3).
 “They offered year by year *continually*” (x. 1).
 “One sacrifice for sins *for ever*” (x. 12).
 “For by one offering He hath perfected *for ever*” (x. 14).

It will be seen that the phrase is used in connection with the vital theme of the epistle. The Melchisedec priesthood is “for unbroken continuance”, unbroken by death, as was the case with every other priest. In connection with x. 1 a complete balance is discovered in verse 14, “perfected unto unbroken continuance”. The verse therefore reads thus:-

“For the law having a shadow of the good things about to be, not the very image of the things, can never with those annual sacrifices which they offer, *perfect unto unbroken continuance* those who draw near.”

The English word “continually” bears two distinct meanings. (1) Frequently, repeatedly; (2) Permanently. The translation given in the A.V. of x. 1 uses the word

“continually” in the sense of “repeatedly” year by year. This rendering has only to be used in the other passages to demonstrate its unsuitability. “Christ abideth a Priest *repeatedly*” is opposed to both sense and truth. “One sacrifice for sins *repeatedly*” has no meaning. We have been misled here in x. 1 by the twofold meaning of an English word, and this is not by any means an isolated case. Let us translate *eis to dienekes*, “unto perpetuity”, which phrase is less cumbersome than the more literal rendering given above. The next verse exposes the fatal failure of every sacrifice offered under the law. *The never touched the conscience.*

This feature has been enlarged upon in ix. 12-14, where the “blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of an heifer” are seen in their typical “purifying of the *flesh*”, and the blood of Christ Who offered Himself without spot to God is seen as the great antitype purging the conscience from dead works that those thus cleansed may serve the living God. Likewise in the same chapter the apostle, speaking of the gifts, sacrifices, meats, drinks and divers baptisms, says they were imposed until the time of reformation and could never make those who did the service “perfect as pertaining to the conscience”. Further in x. 22, when the controversy is over, the apostle exhorts his readers to:--

“Draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.”

Had the sacrifice once perfected the offerer as pertaining to the conscience, no further offering would have been necessary or tolerated. The law was a shadow, it purified the flesh, and its repeated offerings testify to its insufficiency. Further, the very repetition is a continual remembrance of sin, whereas when the new covenant is in force God says, “Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more”.

The final setting aside of the sacrifices of the law is made in verse 4:--

“For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins.”

The argument now rests upon the very nature of things. Nothing more can be said. Can a shadow save us? Will a ceremonial, an external cleansing, satisfy us? Can the blood of an animal make reconciliation for a man? The answer is *No*, and that Scripture has already anticipated this answer in the fortieth Psalm.

The prepared body.

In brushing aside the last remaining hope of Israel under the law, and in shutting down any future argument by the word “impossible”, the apostle was but reaching forward to the glorious fact that “what the law could not do, God did by sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh” (Rom. viii. 3). The quotation from Psa. xl. is prefaced by the words, “Wherefore when He cometh into the world”. This can only refer to His first coming in the flesh. He is yet to be brought into the world again, when all the angels of God shall worship Him (Heb. i. 6). We are permitted (let us remember what holy ground is here) to learn the words that the Son of God breathed when the moment came for His

birth at Bethlehem. His name was then called Jesus, for He was to save His people from their sins by the sacrifice of Himself:--

“Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me.”

When we turn to the Psalm quoted we read:--

“Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire: mine ears hast Thou opened.”

It is a fact unquestioned that Psalm xl. gives a translation of the Hebrew, yet the LXX which purports to translate the Hebrew reads as the Greek N.T. It is too wide a subject to discuss here as to how the LXX came by its present rendering; what we may do is to realize that the twofold statement of Psa. xl. and Heb. x. present two versions of one truth. Just as Matthew and Luke, both recording one utterance of the Lord, use slightly different words to express their phase of the utterance, yet without fully exhausting it, so we must take both O.T. and N.T. records as supplying a full quotation of the utterance of the Word, immediately before He became flesh and tabernacled among us. The Hebrew word “opened” is *karah* and is usually translated “dig”, as a grave, a pit, or a well. The feminine form of the noun, however, *mekurah*, is translated “birth” in Ezek. xvi. 3, and “nativity” in Exek. xxi. 30. Compare the two references following:--

“Thy birth (margin *cutting out* or *habitation*) and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan; Thy Father was an Amorite, and Thy Mother an Hittite” (Ezek. xvi. 3).
“The place where thou wast created in the land of thy *nativity*” (Ezek. xxi. 30).

This use of the word *to dig* for birth or nativity is parallel with the words of Isa. li. 1, 2:--

“Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged. Look unto Abraham your Father, and to Sarah that bare you.”

This strange (to us) use of the word makes the meaning of Psa. xl. clearer. “The ear” being “digged” is by an easy transition “the body” that was “prepared”. The ear standing as it does for obedience, as in Isa. l. 5, 6:--

“The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away my back. I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting.”

Some expositors see in this expression “mine ears hast thou opened” a reference to Exod. xxi. 6, where the willing servant is taken and his ear bored with an awl as a sign of obedience “for ever”, an act largely the result of love for wife and children who would otherwise be left behind had the man gone free. The word “bore” is entirely different from the word “dig” or “open”, nevertheless the type is too beautiful to ignore, and aptly sets forth that One Who voluntarily laid aside His glory, “and took upon Him the form of a slave and became obedient unto death” (Phil. ii. 7, 8). This body prepared for the Lord set aside all sacrifice and offering, gathering into one their varied phases and aspects of sacrifice and obedience as it is written in the volume of the book:--

“Lo I come to do Thy Will, O God.”

The four kinds of sacrifice which were ordained by the law, and which were shadows of the one offering of Christ, are divided into two groups—burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin. The former are a sweet savour to God, the latter for the sins of His people. Both aspects combine in the one offering of Christ.

By the which will.

It is important to the Scriptural meaning of sacrifice that we bear in mind the teaching of this passage. “Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God” is equivalent to “Lo, I come to do all that burnt offering and sacrifice for sins typified”. By so doing the first covenant was taken away and the second established (x. 9):--

“For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the second” (viii. 7).

The first covenant was faulty because it was a shadow, it was weak because of the flesh, it was impossible because its sacrifices were bulls and goats, it was a failure because it did not touch the conscience. All this has found rectification in Christ. His blood has ratified the new covenant, His offering touches the conscience and makes a way into the true holiest of all:--

“By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. x. 10).

It will help us if we carefully analyse the statements of this verse:--

1. What is the will of God intended by—“The which will”?
2. What is the purpose of God by this will?—“We are sanctified.”
3. What means were used to accomplish this will?—“The offering of the body.”
4. What constitutes its eternal efficacy?—“Once for all.”

The strange expression “by the *which* will” must mean the “done will” accomplished by Christ. This will done by Christ cannot be confined to the earthly life and perfect obedience of those sinless years, for the very accomplishment of that will is found in “the offering of the body of Jesus Christ” and that as a sacrifice which involved:--

1. Suffering (Heb. ix. 26; xiii. 12).
2. Crucifixion (Heb. vi. 6; xii. 2)
3. Shedding of blood (Heb. ix. 14; x. 19).
4. Death (Heb. ii. 9; ix. 15).
5. An Altar (Heb. xiii. 10).
6. A Priest (Heb. viii. 1; ix. 11).
7. A Sanctuary (Heb. ix. 24; x. 19).

It is utterly impossible to avoid the sacrificial character of the work of Christ when thinking of His accomplishment of the Divine will. *That* was the will of God in its

essence. The purpose of this will is “sanctification”. This sanctification involves all that the types set forth but failed in its fullness to achieve. Sanctification involves a complete heart dedication to God and His service, set forth typically by the sprinkling of the blood of the covenant, the people and the vessels of ministry (Heb. ix. 18-22). Sanctification involves cleansing from both external and internal defilement, set forth typically in the “diverse washings”, “the ashes of the heifer sprinkling the unclean” (Heb. ix. 10, 13). Sanctification is the will of God for all His children irrespective of the differences of dispensations under which they have been called.

“Will of God.”

This is seen in Eph. i. 4:--

“According as He hath chosen us that we should be holy and without blame.”

And it is accomplished, as in Heb. x., by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, for in Eph. v. 26, 27 and Col. i. 22 we read:--

“That He might sanctify that it should be holy and without blemish.”

“In the body of His flesh (nothing could be more definite) through death, to present you holy and unblameable and irreproachable in His sight.”

The eternal efficacy of the offering of Christ is expressed in the fact that it was offered “once for all”. Over and over again, first from this angle, then from that, the apostle brings to view the repeated offerings of the law and the once offered sacrifice of Christ. Where there is remission of sin no more offering is necessary. It may be of service to remark that the words “once for all” mean “once for all time” and have no reference to the number for whom the sacrifice was made.

We now come to the close of the long argument that has gathered around the Lord as high priest and sacrifice supreme. By way of recapitulation the apostle reminds us that the typical priest “standeth daily offering oftentimes the same sacrifices”, whereas Christ “sat down on the right hand of God”. The sacrifices repeatedly offered were such that they:--

“Can never take away sins” (x. 11).

“But this man offered one sacrifice for sins unto perpetuity” (x. 12).

His sacrifice is finished, He now awaits the end, “expecting, till His enemies be made His footstool”. Then emerges the last word of the argument, embodying in itself the essence of chapters vii.-ix.:--

“For by one offering He hath perfected unto perpetuity them that are sanctified” (x. 14).

This while being in absolute contrast with the old covenant (*see* x. 1-3 and structure) is in entire conformity with the new covenant, as set forth in verses 15-18.

The effect of sanctification is seen in the laws written in the heart and mind. The fullness of the sanctification is seen in the fact that “their sins and iniquities will I remember no more”. The completeness, the “perfecting unto perpetuity” of the sanctified, is expressed in the words, “there is no more offering for sins”.

“The comers” have been made perfect.
The conscience has been purged.
There is no more remembrance.
There is no need for annual or daily repetition. (x. 1, 2).

We now stand at the opening of a new, a practical section, which urges us to draw near, to endure, to live by faith, to run with patience. This we must reserve for a future article. The condensed nature of *The Berean Expositor* prevents us from writing articles that apply the doctrines of Scripture, touch the affection or stir the spirit. Such is not our mission, but we do earnestly pray that none will contemplate either the great offering or its marvelous results without heartfelt thanksgiving and desire for fuller practical consecration.

#44. Perdition, or the saving of the soul (x. 19-39). pp. 129 - 138

Doctrine has held sway over the reader of this epistle for a long period, but however involved the argument may be, and however involved the proofs, it must certainly somewhere before the close give place to practical teaching and exhortation. To that we have arrived, and it is introduced by the words of verses 19-22, “Having therefore let us”. The exhortation “let us” is valueless without the “having therefore”, but so also is the having without the using. What does the apostle say these believers “have”?

Boldness to enter into the holiest.—Under the law this was restricted to the high priest, and to the day of atonement. “The high priest *alone once*” (ix. 7), “with the blood of others” (ix. 25). The case is now different. Boldness to enter is the privilege of all believers by the blood of Jesus.

By a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us.—The legal way was old. “Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away” (viii. 13). This way is new. *Prosphatos* means “newly-slain”; the legal way was dead. “Priests were not suffered to continue by reason of death” (vii. 23). The entrance is “by the blood of Jesus” (x. 19) and “His flesh” (x. 20).

The flesh is likened to the vail. Of all the many and wonderful suggestions that have been made by commentators as to the meaning here of the vail, none seem worth a second thought that have no place for that historic fact that “the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom” (Matt. xxvii. 51) when the Lord Jesus died. The second vail barred the entrance to the holiest of all, “the Holy Ghost thus signifying that

the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest". The newly-slain and living way means a rent veil.

And having an high priest over the house of God.—As chapter viii. puts it, we have a seated priest in a heavenly sanctuary. So far the summary of the doctrine—what we “have”. Now follows the summary of the practice “let us”.

Let us draw near with a true heart.—To draw near expresses the full privileges of those who are sanctified. It is a word used nowhere else in the epistles of Paul except I Tim. vi. 3, where “consent” translates the word, and shows an entirely different usage. So special a word we would expect to be stamped with its hall mark “seven”, for that is the number of its occurrences in Hebrews.

To draw near (*proserchomai*).

- A | iv. 14-16. Having a great high priest, let us hold fast our profession and *draw near* boldly.
- B | vii. 25. Saved unto all perfection those who *draw near*.
x. 1. Could not perfect unto perpetuity those who *draw near*.
- A | x. 19-23. Having an high priest, let us *draw near* with boldness, and let us hold fast our profession.
- B | xi. 6. Those who *draw near* to God must believe that He is.
xii. 18. Sinai \
xii. 22. Sion / Spirit of perfected righteous ones.

The true heart means the heart of the new covenant realities in contrast with the old covenant shadows. So the “true” tabernacle (viii. 2), the antitypes of the “true” (xi. 24).

In full assurance of faith.—Heb. vi. 11 speaks of a full assurance of hope, and both hope and faith find their anchor “within the veil” (Heb. vi. 19, x. 20).

Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.—The sprinkling here refers to the “ashes of the heifer sprinkling the unclean”, which set forth in type that cleansing of the conscience from dead works, which was only possible through the blood of Christ (ix. 13, 14). The washing of the bodies with pure water refers to the spiritual reality set forth in the typical “divers washings” of the law (ix. 10).

Let us let us let us. Three times over comes the beseeching command. Let us draw near, let us hold fast, let us consider one another. The first is Godward, the second is personal, the third is for others.

Let us hold fast the profession of our hope without wavering.—The word here (*elpis*) is hope, not faith, and refers to “that better hope whereby we draw near to God” (vii. 19). This must be held at all costs “without wavering”. This firm hold of the hope and its profession is in view in Heb. iii. 6 & 14, and to this all the exhortations to endure are directed. Without wavering (*aklines*) may be translated “without bending”. It is the exact opposite of *klino*, “turned to flight” (Heb. xi. 34).

For He is faithful that promised.—Much is made of the promises in this epistle, indeed *epaggelia* occurs therein 14 times. Much too is made of the faithfulness of the promiser, especially in Heb. vi. 13-19.

Let us consider one another.—There is a false piety that believes that God is well pleased with a monastic isolation, that God only wrote four commandments and not ten. This is a travesty of truth. “He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God Whom he hath not seen?” (I John iv. 20). The special “provoking” here is to “love and to good works”. The word “good” here is not *agathos*, but *kalos* as in Heb. v. 14; vi. 5.

Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is.—The interpretation of this passage revolves around the assembly and its fellowship, urging the need for regular attendance at the place of worship. The word “assembling” (*episunagoge*), and its cognate (*episunago*) are never used of an “assembly” in the sense of a church. *Episunago* is used in Matt. xxiii. 37 and the parallel passage for the Lord’s desire to gather the children of Jerusalem to Himself as a hen does her chickens. It is used in Matt. xxiv. 31 and the parallel passage of the gathering together of the elect by the angels. It is used in Mark i. 33, and Luke xii. 1, for the crowd who gathered for healing or interest. The only other place where *episunagoge* occurs is II Thess. ii. 1, “The coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our *gathering together* unto Him”.

The apostle by the use of the word “forsaking” evidently glances back to such passages as II Chron. xxiv. 18, where the “forsaking” of the house of the Lord meant apostasy, and was visited with wrath, and also to Neh. x. 39 and xiii. 11, where adherence to the house of God indicated loyalty. The “gathering together to ourselves” has value only as it foreshadows the hope of “our gathering together unto Him”. At the present time faithfulness to truth and to the blessed hope often cuts one off from the assemblies of the Lord’s people, and the use of this passage may under altered conditions be an abuse.

Hope, the author of the soul.

The added words, “so much the more, as ye see the day approaching”, confirms the thought that the hope is all the while in view. As *we* see the day approaching we must confess that it has cut off from assembling with the Lord’s people, simply because corporate testimony has gone the way of all the earth.

A further confirmation of this higher and fuller meaning is found in the argument that immediately follows. The forsaking of the assembly is called a “willful sin after the reception of the truth”, and for such “there is remaineth no more sacrifice for sins”. Under the law sins were placed under two heads:--

1. Sins of omission, ignorance, and inadvertence (Lev. iv. 2, etc.).
2. Sins of presumption, high hand, malice aforethought (Num. xv. 30, 31).

Apostasy from the profession of the hope had the character of presumptuous sin, for which the law made no provision. That David, for example, could be forgiven shows that a fuller sacrifice is found under the gospel than under the law, but the apostle does not bring this forward, neither does he mitigate the severity of the judgment that is pronounced against such. “Fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries”, “died without mercy”, “of how much sorer punishment”, “vengeance is Mine”, “it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God”, all stress the extreme severity of the penalty. “Trodden under foot the Son of God”, “counting the blood of the covenant unholy”, “doing despite to the spirit of grace”, these terms reveal the enormity of the sin of turning back to Judaism. In this light Heb. vi. 1-8 is to be read, to which the word “illuminated” of x. 32 evidently refers.

Things that accompany salvation.

Just as the apostle in Heb. vi., after speaking in severe terms of apostates, turns to the Hebrew believers saying, “But beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak” (vi. 9), so here in Heb. x. 32 the apostle continues:--

“But call to remembrance the former days, in which after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions.”

There is also blessed condescension to the frail and the weaker faith. Not only does he call to remembrance the conspicuous hero of the fight, but the more reticent and less observed partner in the fight. Some were made a “gazing stock”. Not so much is said of violence, or of actual sufferings, but the Lord enters into that shrinking which most of us have of being pilloried for our faith. Blessed truth, He knows, and weighs these things in the balance of the sanctuary. They might have gone free from observation. They might have remained quietly shielded, but they are remembered in that they became “companions” of them that were so used. Instead of the reading, “Ye had compassion of me in my bonds”, the text reads, “of those in bonds”. This epistle to the Hebrews does not teach that the writer (Paul as we believe) was a prisoner at the time of writing. They also took with joy the spoiling of their possessions, probably by “extortion” as the words are rendered in Matt. xxiii. 25.

“Knowing that you have for yourselves a better and enduring possession” (Heb. x. 34).

The text omits the words “in” and “in heaven”. Upon this basis the apostle rests his exhortation.

“Cast not away therefore your confidence (boldness, x. 19) which hath great recompense of reward” (x. 35).

What they did need was “patience”. Patience is essential for perfecting. The epistle of James is written around that thought. The first chapter opens with it (verses 3, 4 and 12), and the fifth chapter closes with it, “Ye have heard of the *patience* of Job, and have seen the *end* of the Lord” (James v. 11). “The day” is approaching. That day is the

coming of the Lord, “for yet a little, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry” (Heb. x. 37).

The quotation from Habakkuk.

This introduces the quotation from Habakkuk which figures prominently in the epistle to the Romans. The words “The just by faith shall live” are divisible under three heads, and the apostle has taken this course with the verse.

“*The just by faith shall live*” (Rom. i. 17). The argument of Rom. i. is concerning the provision of righteousness. “The just *by faith* shall live” (Gal. iii. 11). The argument of Gal. iii. revolves around works of law, and faith. “The just by faith *shall live*” (Heb. x. 38). The argument of Heb. x. and xi. is entirely devoted to “living by faith”. Here we have a splendid example of exhortation, where doctrine and practice are both given their place. Referring once again to Heb. vi. 22 we read of “faith and patience” inheriting the promises. Out of the thirty-two occurrences of *pistis* (“faith”) in Hebrews twenty-nine are found in this practical section x. 19 - xiii. 25.

The essence of Habakkuk (ii. 3, 4) seems to be found in the words “though it tarry, *wait*”, The long delay, the silence of God (Hab. i. 1-4) is solved by the assurance that “the vision is yet for an *appointed time*”. The long wait does not mean that God is indifferent. All the details of His purpose have an appointed time. This fact of itself should enable us to wait. Further, “at the end it shall speak and not lie”. When the time does come, nothing can prevent God from speaking, acting, delivering, or doing whatever is particularly required. Yet further, the feeling of delay is merely human. “Though it tarry it will surely come, it will not tarry.” It is here that the prophet writes the words which are repeated with such fullness by the apostle, “the just shall live by faith”.

The Hebrew believers had suffered the spoiling of their goods, and a reference to Hab. iii. 17, with its sixfold failure of fig, vine, olive, field, fold and stall, places them in the goodly fellowship of the prophets. The better and enduring possessions that they had are found in Hab. iii. 19, “The Lord God is my strength, and He will make my feet like hinds’ feet, and He will make me to walk upon mine high places”. Living by faith is placed in contrast with “drawing back unto perdition”, and this drawing back is in its turn contrasted with “believing unto the acquiring of the soul”.

Perfection and perdition.

We are here confronted with a group of problems which will repay the time devoted to their solution. The two words that provide the key to the difficulty are *perdition* and *saving*.

What is perdition?—Does this passage teach that a believer who does not hold fast the profession of his hope can draw back and finally be cast into *hell*? However we may object to the phrasing, that, bluntly, is the difficulty before us. In searching for an answer which would satisfy the demands of all scripture, we discovered that there are three sets

of passages in which *perdition* is used as the alternative to *perfection*. The first scripture is this epistle to the Hebrews. It hardly needs demonstrating that the epistle is summed up in the words of chapter vi. 1, "Let us go on unto perfection", and that x. 39 provides the alternative, "draw back to perdition". It may be objected that as this emphasizes the very verse we seek to understand, our use of it is biased and unfair. We therefore turn to the second passage (Phil. iii.), where "Let us go on unto perfection" is expressed by the words, "Not as though I were already perfect, but I follow after" (Phil. iii. 12).

"As many as would be perfect" (Phil. iii. 15) are exhorted *positively* to follow the example of Paul; and *negatively* to avoid the example of those whose end is *perdition*. Now it does not seem possible that a church that had reached such a height of spiritual experience as that attained by the Philippians should need to be solemnly warned not to follow the example of the ungodly. Those who were more likely to cause a slip and possibly a forfeiture were those believers who were following the policy expressed in the words, "making the best of both worlds". These caused the apostle to weep as he spoke of their walk, and summarized it as the walk of those who were:--

"The enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is *perdition*, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things" (Phil. iii. 18, 19).

The last statement proves that those enemies are not the unsaved, for how can an unsaved man mind anything else but earthly things? To believers the apostle can write, "Set your mind on things above, not on things on the earth" (Col. iii. 2). Such a believers as those Philippians referred to constitute themselves the enemies of the *cross* of Christ, for that cross speaks of separation from the things of the flesh and the world.

Keeping this passage in mind we look at the third, viz., The Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v.-vii.). The exhortation to endure, to suffer with the reward of the kingdom in view, has only to be mentioned to be accepted as the main theme of this sermon. Its goal is expressed in Matt. v. 48, "Be ye therefore *perfect*, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect". The word *perdition* comes later in Matt. vii., "Broad is the way, that leadeth to *perdition*". The passage immediately goes on to say, "by their fruits ye shall know them" (verse 20).

Here we have three occasions where these words occur as the two poles of their respective contexts. Still the question remains, What is intended by the word *perdition*? Perdition, as some of its contexts indicate, can mean utter destruction, as of the Man of Sin, but if we could only find a passage where the word is used without any doctrinal or theological meaning we could then understand how such a word could be used of so vastly different subjects. In the providence of God such a passage exists, and moreover is used by Matthew who has provided one of the sets already:--

"There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment To what purpose is this WASTE (*perdition*)?" (Matt. xxvi. 7, 8).

Before proceeding, let us be sure we understand the meaning of perfection. *Teleios* is a cognate with *telos*, and *telos* means the end, the goal. To go on unto perfection is to

reach one's goal. That this is innate in the word two passages will show. In Phil. iii. 12 the apostle explains what he means by being perfect, by adding, "That I may apprehend that for which I am also apprehended to Christ Jesus", and in Gal. iii. 3 he places "perfected" in antithesis to "begin": "Having *begun* in the spirit, are ye now *made perfect* (ended, as it were, finished off) by the flesh?" Perdition set over against perfectness then means to end in *waste*. Therein lies the tragedy of drawing back. The foundation is laid, the builder will be saved, but he may be saved "so as by fire". He may not himself be *lost*, but he may "suffer loss", and see his life's work turn to smoke (I Cor. iii.). This was the dreadful possibility before the Hebrews.

If Phil. iii. speaks of "enemies", Heb. x. speaks of "adversaries". If Phil. iii. speaks of "enemies of the cross of Christ", Heb. x. speaks of "treading under foot the Son of God". If Phil. iii. speaks of a "prize" to be won, Heb. x. speaks of a "reward". If Phil. iv. says "the Lord is near" (*eggus*), Heb. x. says "the day is drawing near" (*eggizo*). In Volume XIII (pages 139-142) we give nine items where the Sermon on the Mount runs parallel with Philipians, not of course confusing their distinctive teaching. This article we will not repeat here, but mention it as confirming the fact that these three sets of Scripture, each using *perfection* over against *perdition*, express a scriptural principle. As we gain knowledge of the meaning of perdition in Heb. x. we begin to sense the meaning of "saving the soul" also.

Purchasing the soul.

Peripoiesis occurs but five times in the N.T., viz.:-

"The redemption of the *purchased* possession" (Eph. i. 14).

"To *obtain* salvation" (I Thess. v. 9).

"To the *obtaining* of the glory" (II Thess. ii. 14).

"The *saving* of the soul" (Heb. x. 39).

"A *peculiar* people" (I Pet. ii. 9).

Peripoieomai is translated "purchased" in Acts xx. 23, and "purchase" in I Tim. iii. 13.

Not only must we have the true conception of the word "saving", but we must also be sure that we have no traditional warp regarding the expression "saving the souls". It is used in evangelical preaching and literature as though it expressed the goal of the gospel of grace, but the striking thing is that Paul has no use for the expression. Peter uses the words "the salvation (*soterian*, not *peripoiesis*) of your souls", but not in the sense it is usually employed, for he speaks of "salvation ready to be revealed at the last time at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (I Pet. i. 5-9). So far as the present is concerned, believers are exhorted rather to *lose their souls*, which is not a popular expression to-day. The moment we see this we are on the track of the truth of Heb. x. Matt. xvi. supplies the key:-

"If any man will come after Me, let him *deny* himself, and take up his *cross*, and follow Me. For whoever will *save his soul* shall *lose it*, and whoever will lose his soul for my sake shall *find* it. For what is a man profited, if he shall *gain* the whole world, and

lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father with His angels: and *then* He shall *reward* every man according to his works” (Matt. xvi. 24-27).

The man who denies himself, and takes up his cross, loses his souls in this life. If he turns back to the good things that he has relinquished, making his belly his god, and finding his glory in his shame, he saves his soul in this life, but becomes an enemy of the cross, for he will not bear it. The one who is willing to lose his soul for Christ’s sake finds it when the Lord gives *reward* at His coming. All this is meant in the words of Heb. x. 39. Here, as in Heb. vi., hope is the anchor of the soul, is connected with the obtaining of the promises, enters within the veil, and belongs to those once “enlightened”. Heb. xi. which immediately follows contains a list of O.T. saints who *lost their souls* for Christ’s sake, to find them in the resurrection.

As this chapter is so important, and we have one special feature to make clear, we conclude this paper at this point. We trust that the close parallel that is observable between Philippians and Hebrews (a parallel insisted on many times in the articles entitled “*The Hope and the Prize*”) will not be without salutary effect upon us all. Let us go on unto perfection, let us remember the awful *waste* of precious opportunities that will be ours if we “neglect so great salvation”, if we neglect to “work out our own salvation”. The body of our humiliation is soon to be fashioned like unto the body of His glory. A little while and the time will come, “the appointed time” for which we wait. Let us then take heart. We have need of patience. Let patience have her *perfect* work, that ye may be perfect and entire, *lacking nothing*.

**#45. “Let us draw near not draw back” (x. 19-39).
pp. 161 - 167**

The whole of the epistle to the Hebrews may be summed up under two phrases:--

1. Let us go on unto perfection, or
2. Draw back unto perdition.

How it is possible for believers to draw back to “perdition” will be manifest when we have enquired into the meaning of the word used at the close of the chapter x. Everything in this epistle contributes its quota to this dual theme. Christ is set forth as better than angels, Moses, Joshua, Aaron, and all typical sacrifices, in order that the Hebrew believer, in pressing on to perfection, may have no qualms in leaving behind the types and shadows that never made those under them “perfect as pertaining to the conscience”. The land of Canaan is shown to be but a shadow of the heavenly city and true rest that remaineth unto the people of God. Joshua never led into that rest. In fact there is a series of contrasts in this epistle, all put forward with the one object of rendering “perfection” a desirable goal, and “perdition” one to be shunned.

The examples of those that draw back to perdition are those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness (Heb. iii.), those who are “dull of hearing” and never advance from being “babes” (Heb. v.), or who like Esau despise their birthright (Heb. xii.), or prefer Sinai to Sion (Heb. xiii.). Here we find such alternatives as:--

SHADOW and VERY IMAGE.
 FIGURE and TRUE.
 WORLDLY SANCTUARY and HEAVENLY HOLIEST OF ALL.
 OLD COVENANT and NEW COVENANT.
 FLESH CLEANSED and CONSCIENCE CLEANSED.
 MOUNT SINAI and MOUNT SION.
 VANISHING and REMAINING,

all set forth, with earnest instruction and entreaty, to urge along the upward path to perfection, and to shun apostasy and perdition. Heb. x. 19-39, the passage before us, takes up this double exhortation. Doctrine has reached its zenith at verse 18, and from verse 19 to the end of the epistle it is largely a matter of exhortation. The double theme sets the bounds of the section before us.

A 22.		Let us <i>draw near</i> .
		In full assurance of faith.
A 38, 39.		We are not of them who <i>draw back</i> .
		Believe to the saving of the soul.

Having let us.

No exhortation in Scripture stands alone. Beneath the feet of practice stands privilege. The fruit of good works derives its nourishment from the root of grace. If the apostle says, “Let us”, he will also say, “Having therefore”.

“Having therefore boldness high priest.”	/	Let us draw near.
	{	Let us hold fast.
	\	Let us consider one another (x. 19-24).
“Seeing we are encompassed.”	/	Let us lay aside.
	\	Let us run with patience (xii. 1, 2).
“Wherefore we receiving a kingdom.”	/	Let us have grace.
	\	Let brotherly love continue (xii. 28--xiii. 1).
“Wherefore Jesus suffered without the gate.”	/	Let us go forth therefore.
	\	Unto Him without the camp (xiii. 12, 13).

Here are four groups of teaching which space out the remainder of the epistle, and each group manifests the same feature. The strongest preventative against “drawing back” is evidently to “draw near”, and we have every reason to draw near seeing that we “have therefore” boldness of access, and a great High Priest.

The new and living way.

The old typical way into the holiest is not the way that one must pass who desires to go on unto perfection.

“The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the first time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service PERFECT, as pertaining to the conscience” (Heb. ix. 8, 9).

In place of the old and typical way stands the new and living way—“newly slain”, as the word means etymologically, although we cannot discover any example of its usage that will warrant the doctrine that appears to lie in these suggestive words. This new and living way has been consecrated, or dedicated, for us. Heb. ix. 18, using the word, reads, “Neither was the first covenant dedicated without blood”. Consecration or dedication here includes the idea of something “new”, or as we might say “initiation”. Consecration in Heb. vii. 28 has the entirely opposite thought of attaining an “end”.

Teleioo . . . Heb. vii. 28 . . . To perfect, bring to full *end*.
Egkainizo . . . Heb. x. 20 . . . To initiate, bring in *new*.

Here is the introduction of something new in its consecration, new in its constitution. A new way, newly dedicated.

Reconciliation by incarnation?

The way into the holiest of all is “through the veil, that is to say His flesh”. The connection between the incarnation and reconciliation is a theme that attracts many believers and teachers. The fact that Christ became man, and, as they express it, brought His Godhead down to our humanity that He might lift our humanity up to God, is not the Scriptural basis for reconciliation. Heb. ii. 14 most surely reveals the absolute necessity for the Lord to partake of flesh and blood, but it as surely declares the purpose to be:--

“That THROUGH DEATH He might destroy and deliver.”

Or again, in Heb. x., if we read in verse 5 of a “body prepared”, we read in verse 10 of that body “offered”. Not by His incarnation but by His one sacrifice are we saved and sanctified. Calvary and not Bethlehem is the place of redemption, and though the crib at Bethlehem was necessarily the first step, it is the cross of Calvary that is the consummation. There could be no access into the holiest of all until “the veil, that is to say His flesh” was rent in twain from top to bottom (Matt. xxvii. 50, 51).

The three-fold exhortation.

Let us *draw near*. Let us *hold fast*. Let us *consider*. The true heart with which we are exhorted to draw near is consonant with the fact that Christ is the minister of the *true* tabernacle (Heb. viii. 2; ix. 24). Instead of external washings this heart is sprinkled from an evil *conscience*. The bodies washed with pure water seems to be a reference to the washing of the high priest and the Levites (Lev. xvi. 4; Numb. viii. 7), which type is fulfilled in the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience.

Side by side with this threefold exhortation is seen the abiding three “Faith, hope and love” (Heb. x. 22-24). As we see these graces in their context we realize that to the

Hebrews, as to the Corinthians (I Cor. xiii.), and to the Thessalonians (I Thess. i. 3), “these three” are the true antidote to apostacy.

Drawing back unto perdition.

There is an evident parallel between Heb. ii.-iv. and Heb. x. 19 - xii. 3. In both passages we see the evil heart of unbelief that departs from the living God. In both the true antidote is “Let us draw near”. In both there is the holding fast of the “confession”. In chapter iii. we have stressed those who failed to enter in because of unbelief. In chapter xi. we have those who “through faith” obtained promises and triumphed. The twofold title of Christ, “The Apostle and High Priest of our profession” (Heb. iii. 1), is parallel with the twofold title of Heb. xii. 2, “The Captain and Perfecter of faith”. The key to the character of the apostacy that is in view is found in Heb. x. 30:--

“Vengeance belongeth unto Me, I will recompense, saith the Lord; And again, The Lord shall judge His people.”

These words are a quotation from Deut. xxxii., the great prophetic forecast of Israel’s history given by Moses just before his end. This song of forty-three verses traverses the whole of prophetic time. It reveals the failure of Israel and their setting aside, the period while they are *Lo-ammi*, “not My people”, and provoked to jealousy, and the mercy of the Lord that gathers them back again with rejoicing. Dr. Ginsburg reads Deut. xxxii. 34, 35, as follows:--

“Is not this laid up in store with Me,
Sealed up in My treasuries?
For the day of vengeance and recompense,
For the time when their foot shall slip,”

and this is evidently “the day approaching” of Heb. x. 25. The apostacy foretold by Moses is manifestly at hand in Heb. x., and explains Heb. vi. as well.

Ye have need of patience.

While Israel as a nation were fast slipping away, the apostle turns with renewed earnestness to the tried and tested remnant with words of encouragement and exhortation. He bids them to call to remembrance the former days, in which, after they were illuminated, they endured a great fight of afflictions. Among the elements of endurance that the apostle enumerate are:--

Being made a gazing stock.
Being a fellow-partaker of those so used.

There is something very gracious in this recognition. To be a “gazing stock”, a “spectacle”, may not seem half so heroic as some other forms of martyrdom, yet the Lord knows the intensity of mental suffering that some natures may endure. Then, further, the Lord takes note of those who simply stand by and share the sufferings of others. Whether we read as in the A.V., “For ye had compassion of me in my bonds”, or with

some texts, “For indeed you sympathized with the prisoners”, this Christlike “sympathy” (Heb. iv. 15) is noted. The suffering of “reproaches” associated them with Christ Himself (Heb. xiii. 13), and the “enduring possession” with the “enduring city” (xiii. 14). Early Christians were called by their enemies, atheists, their places of assembly were misrepresented as being convened for most immoral purposes, all of which misrepresentations would constitute a very real suffering of reproach for Christ.

The words “goods” and “substance” should be rendered by the same word, and perhaps “possession” is the most suitable. The words in the original being *huparchonta* and *huparxin*.

“And submitted to the seizure of your possessions with joy, knowing in yourselves that you have in heaven, a better and on enduring possession” (Heb. x. 34).

The case of Moses in Heb. xi. 24-26 supplies a very full example of the meaning of the apostle here. He esteemed this “reproach” as greater than all the treasures of Egypt. He too looked unto the recompense of the reward. So the apostle urges these Hebrew saints:--

“Therefore cast not away your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise” (Heb. x. 35, 36).

An article could well be devoted to the words, “Ye have need of patience”. It is the “patience of hope”, the patience that James speaks of when he says:--

“My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing, that the trying of your faith worketh patience. But let patience have her PERFECT work” (James i. 2-4).

It is evident that the words, “ye might receive the promise”, indicate a long wait and patient endurance, by the conclusion of the matter in Heb. xi. 39:--

“And all these, having received a good report through faith, received NOT the promise.”

What does the apostle bring forward to encourage these tried and tested believers?

The Coming of the Lord.

The relation of the coming of the Lord to the church of the mystery is dealt with in a separate article, but it is here brought forward as the crowning argument in the apostle’s testimony:--

“For yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them that draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul” (Heb. x. 37-39).

As space is limited we leave this passage without comment, except to touch upon the meaning here of the word perdition. In some contexts perdition may express the most awful punishment of the ungodly. In one context at least no element of punishment can possibly be allowed. The two foci of the epistle to the Hebrews may be expressed in the words:--

“Let us go on unto PERFECTION” (Heb. vi. 1).
“Not draw back unto PERDITION” (Heb. x. 39).

It may be questioned, however, whether “perdition” is a true antonym to “perfection”; some would think that salvation and perdition would be truer. Our only authority must be the Word, and if we can find other passages where perfection is used in contrast to perdition, the question will be answered. The first passage we turn to is Phil. iii. Readers will remember that on more than one occasion we have called attention to the parallel lines of teaching of Philippians and of Hebrews. Without quoting the passage in full, we give the context of the two words:--

“Let us therefore, as many be PERFECT, be thus *minded* *walk* for many *walk* whose end is PERDITION who *mind* earthly things” (Phil. iii. 15-19).

The relation of these two words is evident to all. The second passage is in “The Sermon on the Mount”:--

“Be ye therefore PERFECT Broad is the way, that leadeth to PERDITION” (Matt. v. 48, vii. 13).

It may be objected that in this case the two words are removed too far to constitute an argument. The word “perfect” is introduced with the argument:--

“That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good.”

The word “perdition” is introduced with the argument:--

“If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him.”

The distance between the two words is greater than in Phil. iii. by reason of the long chapter devoted to “reward”, either present or future, that comes in between. This, however, but connects it more strongly with Hebrews. While these two passages clearly demonstrate the fact that perdition is a true alternative to perfection, one other occurrence will reveal the reason why:--

“There came a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment To what purpose is this WASTE” (Matt. xxvi. 7, 8).

It would not be good sense to translate the word here “perdition”, but nevertheless it is the same. Its usage throws vivid light upon the danger that threatened the Hebrews.

Instead of going on to perfection they were in danger of drawing back unto sheer *waste*; “Nothing but leaves”; “Wood, hay and stubble”; “Saved, yet so as through fire”; “Nigh unto cursing”. Here we must stay, but shall have to take up the passage again as introductory to the great chapter on Faith, namely, Hebrews xi.

While we may not be Hebrews, the close parallel with Phil. iii. makes this passage one of solemn import to us all.

The Language of Doctrinal Definition. **pp. 14, 15**

A plea for the fuller recognition of the importance of the Hebrew words employed in the teaching of doctrinal truth.

In a recent discussion concerning the correct translation of a word, we turned from the Greek of the N.T. and based our argument upon the Hebrew equivalent in the O.T. This has appeared in the eyes of some as the result of a "policy"; instead it is the practice of a "principle". On page 98 of our July 1925 number (Volume XV) we said:--

"Without attempting to justify or explain the following statement, I have come to the conclusion that the language of revelation and of doctrine is not primarily N.T. Greek, but O.T. Hebrew, and that it is dangerous to build up a theory upon the etymology of Greek words without continually checking it by the Hebrew equivalent. We may look into this matter upon some future occasion."

Let us give the matter a consideration now.

Doctrine rooted in O.T.

When we speak of such subjects as Sin, Sacrifice, Sanctification, Justification, Grace, Forgiveness, Soul, Spirit, Life and Death, while we readily agree that the crown and climax of these doctrines is to be found in the N.T., we most surely perceive that each and every one of these doctrines has been practically defined once and for good by the words used in the Hebrew O.T. This we found in connection with the word "faith" (*see* pages 97-99 of Volume XV).

Seeing that the Greek N.T. is largely taken up with the fulfillment of O.T. promises, it is impossible, if connected thought and sane argument is to rule, that doctrines should suddenly take on characteristics that are derived merely from the meaning and usage of the Greek word employed to translate the Hebrew equivalent.

When we read of sacrifice in the N.T., *nothing* pertaining to the Greek word must be allowed to overrule or minimize the established meaning of the word in the O.T. It is impossible to fix upon the Greek word translated "sin" and build up a doctrine that ignores or treats merely as supplemental that Hebrew teaching which should rather be looked upon as fundamental.

God and Lord.

Perhaps two rather extreme examples may help us to appreciate the position of affairs. The Hebrew words *El* and *Elohim* are translated into Greek by *Theos* and into English by *God*. These translations are quite correct so long as we leave them as translations, but the

moment we attempt to seek the truth concerning "God" by looking into the derivation and connotation of either the Greek or English word, we leave the true foundation.

God has revealed Himself under the name of *El* or *Elohim*, words which include the idea of "strength", possibly "secret" and having affinity with words meaning a species of "oak", a "ram", or other horned animal, and portions of a "building". Now these are Divinely inspired associations and lead on in the understanding of what *El*, "God", means. *Theos* is merely the Greek translation, a convenient word, but not to be looked upon in the same light as *El* and *Elohim*.

The O.T. name "Jehovah" is translated in the Greek by *kurios*, which means "Lord". We cannot get a glimpse of the actual meaning of "Jehovah" by looking at the word *kurios*. The Greek word implies authority, property, possession, and can be used of men as well as of God, for it is translated in the A.V. sometimes "Lord" and sometimes "sir". Now whatever we may believe as to the meaning of the Hebrew "Jehovah", it is agreed that it is formed from a part of the verb "to be", and that it is given in the paraphrase of Rev. i. 4, "He Who is, and Which was, and Who is to come". While therefore the word *kurios* "Lord" is quite good as a Greek translation, it is hopeless to attempt to discover the real meaning of the name Jehovah except by reference to the Hebrew.

There are of course some subjects of revelation which are peculiar to the N.T. Of these we do not speak, but "sin" is most certainly not one of them. We shall find the principle suggested here of service when seeking to understand the teaching of Romans on "Justification". We will not elaborate the theme further here, believing that enough has been said to make the matter clear to any interested reader.

The Ministry of Consolation.

#19. The God of patience, consolation, and hope. pp. 94, 95

“Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be likeminded Now the God of hope fill you with all joy” (Rom. xv. 5 and 13).

It is not our intention at the moment to show the relation of these titles with the practical and the dispensational teaching in which they are set. Our present purpose is simpler. In II Thess. ii. 16 we have an *aionian* consolation connected with good hope. Here, in Rom. xv., God is called the God of patience, consolation and hope. We have seen the close association of consolation and hope, here we see the link between them—patience, “the patience of hope”. What work is to faith, what labour is to love, that patience is to hope. Work perfects faith.

“Seest thou how faith wrought with his (Abraham’s) works, and by works was faith made perfect?” (James ii. 22).

Patience has a perfect work to perform. It is not sufficient to hold the teaching of the pre-millennial coming of the Lord. It is not sufficient to be a “Second Adventist”. Scripture speaks of those who “love” His appearing, who because they have this hope, “purify” themselves. So, to entertain the blessed hope scripturally we shall realize its calming influence in the midst of life’s alarms, we shall be saved from murmuring in the face of life’s disappointments, we shall be saved from despair when we face life’s frailties. As patience flows from hope, so consolation flows from both, and each re-act upon the other to their mutual strengthening:--

“Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh” (James v. 8).

As we look at the context of Rom. xv. 5 there are two items that contribute further to our understanding of this ministry of consolation. In verse 5 we have the title, “the God of patience and consolation”, but in verse 4 that title is made very clear, for there we read:--

“That we through *the patience and consolation of the Scriptures* might have hope.”

This reference to the Scriptures prevents us from flying off into the realm of imagination or mere *experiences*, for God Himself here condescends to limit His titles and their scope to what is “written for our learning”.

The outcome of this patience and consolation of the Scriptures with which God Himself is so intimately related, is to be manifested in the unity of His believing people. There were two grounds for disunity in the church at Rome as chapter xiv. clearly

shows, but the *patience* of God was to regulate the inter-relation of Jewish and Gentile saints in order that they may

“Receive one another, even as Christ also received us to the glory of God” (Rom. xv. 7).

#20. The Grace of Waiting Watching and Waiting. pp. 110, 111

The R.V. of Isa. lxiv. 4 speaks of God as One “Who worketh for him that waiteth for Him”, while Rotherham’s translation says:--

“Although from age-past times it was never heard, it was not perceived by the ear, neither did the eye ever see, that a God beside Thee could work for the man who waited for Him.”

The context speaks of the misery and desolation that had befallen Israel, and their hope is expressed in the words “Look down”, “Come down” (Isa. lxiii. 15, lxiv. 1). All that man can do is to wait. The peculiar character of God is brought forward, in that unlike anything that had been heard or seen He worketh for him that waiteth for Him.

Is there no word of peace and assurance here for the child of God in the present day? Is it no encouragement to believe that while he perforce must wait, God can work? So important is this attitude of waiting, that Isaiah elsewhere tells us that God waits until we are led to wait: “And therefore will the Lord wait, that He may be gracious unto you blessed are all they that wait for Him” (Isa. xxx. 18). He waits that He may be gracious. We wait and are blessed.

Waiting without murmuring and without anxiety is the essence of the life of faith: “The vision is yet for an appointed time wait for it the just shall live by his faith” (Hab. ii. 3, 4). Moses must wait the appointed time, 80 years, before he is ready to lead Israel out of Egypt. Joseph must wait, and endure false charges and prison, until the appointed moment places him upon the throne. God Himself waits, that He may be gracious. The long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. The very creation itself is waiting the day of deliverance. Let us then with patience wait, knowing that in the silent years, while we must wait, God is working.

The verse quoted above from Isa. lxiv. is quoted in I Cor. ii. 9 but with a slight change of wording: “the things that God hath prepared for them that love Him.” “To wait” then in the scriptural sense is “to love”, or rather we wait confidently and uncomplainingly because we love. Here, instead of Israel’s restoration, we have that which God ordained before the ages unto our glory (I Cor. ii. 7-9).

To wait not only fulfils the idea of “faith” (Hab. ii.), and “love” (I Cor. ii.), but also “hope”. “But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it”

(Rom. viii. 25). It is a comforting thought that a quiet uncomplaining waiting for God may express in simple fashion the sublime grace of faith, hope, and love.

Waiting and waiting.

He who manifested the grace of waiting, and expressed by patience the truth of living by faith, found strength for *waiting* in the exercise of *watching*: “I will *watch* to see what He will say to me and the Lord answered *wait*” (Hab. ii. 1-4). To wait unintelligently may be mere inertia; to wait because one knows the will of the Lord may be the most active service: “When I meditate on Thee in the night watches. Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice” (Psa. lxxiii. 6, 7). “Watch therefore”, said the Lord to His disciples, and proceeded to tell of the servant who failing to watch failed to wait, and said, “My Lord delayeth His coming” (Matt. xxiv. 42-51).

Watching and waiting merge in experience:--

“I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in His word do I hope. My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning: I say, more than they that watch for the morning” (Psa. cxxx. 5, 6).

My soul *waiteth*, my soul *watcheth*, the two are constant companions. One of the characteristics of the Thessalonian believers was that they waited for the Son of God from heaven. This is found in the first chapter. In the last chapter, continuing the subject of the coming of the Lord commenced in chapter iv., we find waiting translated into terms of watching: “Let us watch and be sober” (I Thess. i. 10; v. 6).

“Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night” (Isa. xxi. 11, 12).

Let us watch and wait, for joy cometh in the morning.

**#21. “Cast thy burden upon the Lord,
and He shall sustain thee” (Psa. lv. 22).
pp. 157 - 159**

Here we have a very gracious word, which knows no bounds of dispensational distinction, but remains “present truth”, until the “former things pass away”. Let us pass it in review, and as we do so may the Spirit of all truth minister the rich fulness of Christ to our hearts and minds. What are you invited to do?

“Cast thy burden upon the Lord.”

There is something very vigorous about the word “cast”. It is used of the casting down of the fallen cherub (Ezek. xxviii. 17), of the casting of sins behind the Lord’s back (Isa. xxxviii. 17). We are not invited to share the burden with the Lord, He rather bids us get rid of it, not in part, but as a whole.

“*Thy burden.*”—If we would speak truth it is impossible to avoid being personal. Sin is so personal, aye, death is so personal too, with its forerunners, sorrow and vanity and vexation of spirit. The Lord does not speak of burdens generally, but of “thy” burden in particular. Now we will grant at once that “thy burden” is peculiar. It is connected so intimately with yourself. It concerns you private life, it is involved with your tears and your griefs, with your hopes and your disappointments; you feel that it is hardly the thing to cast *that* upon the Lord, yet *that* is what he says. “Cast **THY** burden upon the Lord.”

Then this word *burden* is rather a peculiar one. It is not the usual word for burden in the O.T. The margin shows that the word is “gift”, and the literal meaning is, “which He hath given thee, i.e., thy lot”. He therefore knows all about it, and has given it to thee, so that having tasted of its bitterness, and felt its sting, having realized its sorrow, you may be led to the Lord Himself to find your all in Him.

To contemplate the idea that the “burden” which we carry has been “allotted” by the Lord may cause us either to rebel or to bow according as the truth holds sway over our hearts. Look at a portion of the burden that the Psalmist was bearing:--

“The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart.”
“His words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords. Cast thy burden upon
the Lord” (Psa. lv. 21, 22).

This surely is a grievous trial. Nothing seems so base as betrayal, yet as we think of that word we think of Judas, and we think of Christ, and all His gracious forbearance and longsuffering. Is there no echo of Psa. lv. 22 in the words of that betrayed One? When facing the rejection that had come, He said:--

“Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.”
“Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart”
(Matt. xi. 28-30).

What is the Lord's promise? "He shall sustain thee."

Sustain.—He shall "feed" thee as the word is translated in I Kings xvii. 4, "I have commanded the ravens to *feed* thee". He shall sustain, as the word is translated in I King xvii. 9, "I have commanded a widow to *sustain* thee". Elijah's allotted portion of trial was sustained by the Lord, Who was behind the ravens and the widow.

Yet more than feeding and nourishing the word means "contain" (I Kings vii. 26) as well as sustain, "comprehend" (Isa. xl. 12), and "make provision for" (I Kings iv. 7). The Lord Who appointed the wilderness wandering also "sustain" His people in it (Neh. ix. 21). The Lord Who suffered Jacob to be grieved at the loss of Joseph appointed also that Joseph should "nourish" his father in the hour of need (Gen. xlvii. 12).

As we think of Job, of Joseph, of Jacob, of Elijah, of Israel, the invitation of Psa. lv. becomes more insistent, more attractive, more real.

"Cast THY burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain THEE."

Further, is there not a real connection between this "thy" and "thee"? Can we hope for this sustaining apart from this casting? He Who bore our sins in His Own body on the tree can surely bear our burdens. You who have been made free from sin; can you not believe that He can make you free from care? "Care" or "anxiety" is the LXX translation of Psa. lv. 22, and brings Phil. iv. 6, 7 forward as a N.T. parallel and explanation. "Be careful for nothing" (care is the burden of the Psalm), "but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving" (this is how the burden is "cast"), "and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding", this shall be the sustenance, the nourishment, the provision throughout the pathway of faith.

Peter's words, "Casting all your care upon Him; for He careth for you" (I Pet. v. 7) bring Psa. lv. 22 over bodily into the N.T., placing it in an epistle the theme of which is "suffering in view of glory", and which warns us, in spite of the peculiarity of our allotted portion, to:--

"Think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you" (I Pet. iv. 12).

May the contemplation of these words mean the losing of burdens for many of the Lord's tried ones, for "*He is faithful that promised*".

Studies in the Epistles of the Mystery.

#77. Christ and the church in home and business (Eph. v. 22 - vi. 9). pp. 17 - 25

The last words of Eph. v. 21 are:--

"Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God."

The opening words of the new section are:--

"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord."

We are evidently embarking upon an application of teaching of verse 21, and therefore must remember that while the wives are here told specifically to submit to their own husbands, it is only a working out of that spirit that reverences Christ and submits to whatever He shall lay upon us. Further, the submission of the wife to the husband is "as unto the Lord", and this spirit runs throughout the sixfold command. Before tracing this through the section before us, let us seek an understanding of the word "submit", for unless we understand a command our obedience will not be of a very high order.

The meaning of submission.

The word translated "submit" is *hupotasso*, and is used in Ephesians as follows:--

"And hath put all things under His feet" (i. 22).
"Submitting yourselves one to another" (v. 21).
"Wives submit yourselves" (v. 22).
"As the church is subject unto Christ" (v. 24).

Tasso properly means to set in order, as in Luke vii. 8. In the passive it carries the idea of "being disposed" as opposed to "judging oneself not worthy", as in Acts xiii. 48.

Taxis indicates order, arrangement (I Cor. xiv. 40; Col. ii. 5). Without multiplying examples, it will be seen that the idea of "submission" in Eph. v. is not of a humiliating or servile description, but of so recognizing the Lordship of Christ as to be willing or the lowest *or the highest* place as He shall will. It will be seen that the husband who acts in his position as "head of the wife" is as submissive to the will of the Lord as is the wife who sets forth the relative position of the church.

When we remember that the first occurrence of the word is Luke ii. 51, "and came to Nazareth and was *subject* unto them", surely the last shred of rebellion must vanish as we realize what the submission involved.

Submission "as unto Christ".

- A1 | Eph. v. 22-24. Wives *submit*, as the church to Christ.
- B1 | Eph. v. 25-33. Husbands *love*, as Christ the church.
- A2 | Eph. vi. 1-3. Children *obey* in the Lord.
- B2 | Eph. vi. 4. Fathers *train* in nurture of the Lord.
- A3 | Eph. vi. 5-8. Slaves *obey*, as unto the Christ.
- B3 | Eph. vi. 9. Masters *do the same*, for Master in heaven.

A great deal of harmful discussion has revolved around the question, "Should the bride say *obey* at the marriage service?" When Paul treats of the social fabric and its inter-relation, he reserves the word "obey" to children and slaves, with their correlatives "bring up" and "forbear threatening", using the higher word "submit" of the wife. This word "submit" is wrongly translated "*obedient* to their own husbands" in Titus ii. 5. The only passage where wives are said to obey is I Pet. iii. 6, which grows out of the submission of verses 1-5. A wife who has submitted to the Divine arrangement will of necessity "obey" when obedience is demanded, but it is the result of a willing compliance with the Lord's will, a grateful seizing of the opportunity to typify the church's relation to the Lord, a very different thing from that obedience of the child, which is "right", and according to commandment.

The relation of wives and husbands.

"Wives submit as the church unto Christ."
"Husbands love as Christ the church."

It will be seen that we are upon higher ground than that of I Cor. xi. & xiv. and I Tim. ii. There the apostle goes back to

Nature and Creation.

"For man is not of the woman, but woman of the man, neither was man created for the woman; but the woman for the man Doth not even nature itself teach you" (I Cor. xi. 1-16).

Law.

"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be submissive, as also saith the law" (I Cor. xiv. 34).

Creation and Sin.

"For Adam was first formed, then Eve, and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived has come to be in transgression" (I Tim. ii. 9-15).

The apostle had all these courses open before him to enforce his point, but he passes them all by for the greater and higher motive used in Eph. v. To the wife the apostle says, "The husband is the head of the wife", but to the husband he says, "Love your

wives". He feels under no necessity to say, "Husbands *rule* your wives". To each is the word given tempered with much graciousness. Because the husband is head that does not mean ruthless rule and rough shod methods. The husband in Christ is "submitted" to an obligation that cannot be computed. He is to love his wife, "even as Christ also loved the church and *gave Himself* for it".

Perhaps when wives are loved with that kind of love, all argument as to submission and obedience will become unnecessary. The love of the husband moreover is to be all in the direction of blessing, not for selfish ends:--

"That he might sanctify, cleanse, present a church in glory, not having spot, or wrinkle or any such thing: but that it may be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v. 26, 27).

Take one item, perhaps the lowliest, "not having wrinkle". The word "wrinkle" in the original means exactly the same as the English word, viz., "a corrugation of the skin", and is allied with *rhusa* (old age, the time of wrinkles). Care and anxiety, worry of any description are the chief causes of wrinkles; how this reveals the character of the husband's love, that shields the wife from as many anxieties as is possible.

The physical and the spiritual.

Throughout this passage the physical interchanges with the spiritual as type with antitype.

- A1 | Physical. Wives submit.
- B1 | Spiritual. As the church.
- A2 | Physical. Husbands. So ought men.
- B2 | Spiritual. Even as the Lord the church.
- A3 | Physical. Wives and husbands. One flesh.
- B3 | Spiritual. The mystery. Christ and His church.

The union of husband and wife is looked upon in Scripture as something deeper than a civil or religious joining together of two persons in marriage. Every true marriage harks back to Eden:--

"For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh" (Eph. v. 31).

The same apostle says in I Cor. vi. 17, "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit", which shows the antitype to be mentally supplied in Eph. v. 31, 32. Moreover the argument concerning a man nourishing and cherishing his own body finds its alternative in that sin which is against his own body (I Cor. vi. 18). If I Cor. vi. 15-20 be carefully weighed with Eph. v. 28-32, a great deal of irrelevant matter need never have been written.

It is an established truth that the church of Ephesians is "the body" and "the new man". Now the Scriptures uses figures with discretion. The bridal relationship to Christ

belongs to another calling; in Ephesians we are dealing with the bridegroom if such a figure is allowable at all. The passage before us is not discussing the title of the church of the dispensation of the mystery, it is dealing with the relationship of husbands and wives who belong to this dispensation. If Eph. v. teaches that the church is "the bride", Eph. vi. teaches that the church is "a child" and "a slave", neither of which titles are true. The last two may be true of course of individuals.

The great mystery.

When the apostle draws to the conclusion of his exhortation to wives and husbands he says, "This is the great mystery, but I speak with a view to Christ and His church" (Eph. v. 32). That there is a mystery in marriage let anyone decide after reading Matt. xix. 5, 6, "And they twain shall be one flesh". Such is the quotation from Gen. ii. "Wherefore they are *no more twain*, but one flesh", is the comment of the Lord Himself. But, says the apostle, granting the sanctity and the mystery of marriage under the thought of "one flesh", the great mystery I have in mind is that union with the Lord which makes "one spirit". Nevertheless, turning back to the typical union of man and wife:--

"Nevertheless let each one of you individually so love his wife as himself: and the wife see that she reverence her husband" (Eph. v. 33).

We have not felt called upon to enter into a detailed examination of the idea that the church of the body is also the bride, not wishing to spend time disproving an obvious failure to discern things that differ. If, however, we have misjudged our readers and there are those who have misgivings on this point, we may prepare an article upon the subject later.

Children and their parents.

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord" (Eph. vi. 1).

How are we to understand the clause "in the Lord"? Does it imply disobedience to parents if they are not "in the Lord"? Does it mean only obey your parents in those things that you recognize are "in the Lord"? The first suggestion seems to be quite apart from the spirit of the Scriptures, the second presupposes too advanced a stage of spiritual perception. Col. iii. 20 supplies an answer:--

"Children, obey your parents with respect to all things: for this is well pleasing in the Lord."

While the children here addressed would probably be connected with the church (for otherwise they would not hear this passage read at all), they are not placed upon so high a platform as that of husband and wife. The first reason given in Eph. vi. 1 is the primitive one, "for it is right".

In the training of our children, while grace and love and even an appeal to their profession of faith are all legitimate, there is a sense in which it differs from that of the

more adult believer. Not only is such obedience "right", but the apostle even goes back to the fifth commandment with promise.

We are not to reason from this that an obedient child of parents who are members of the body is assured a long life on the earth, but to gather from the quotation the marked approval of the Lord upon the obedience of children to parents, even though "the promise" now may be expressed in some other way than "long life upon the earth". On the other hand it is morally certain that seeds are sown in childhood by disobedience that materially influence their well-being in after years. As we have already indicated, children and slaves are addressed differently from wives, and this may be better seen by noticing the recurring features:--

A		vi. 1-3.	a		Ye children.
			b		Be obedient.
			c		To parents.
			d		"Right." "Promise."
B		vi. 4.	e		And ye fathers.
			f		Provoke not.
			g		Your children.
			h		Bring them up.
A		vi. 5-8.	a		Ye slaves.
			b		Be obedient.
			c		To masters.
			d		"As unto Christ." "Reward."
B		vi. 9.	e		And ye masters.
			f		Threaten not.
			g		Them.
			h		Your Master is in heaven.

Promise and reward figure more prominently here. While "parents" are spoken of in Eph. vi. 1, and "father and mother" separately mentioned in verse 2, "fathers" are specially addressed in verse 4.

One of the results of modern civilization has been the transference of this responsibility from the father to the mother. To thousands of young children the father is someone who appears on the scene at week-ends, whose name is held up as a kind of bogey as a last recourse, but who does not come into every-day living contact with the growing child. The mother's duties connected with the material and physical well-being of the child often prevent the exercise of those other elements of training that are so necessary.

Mother-love is protective. Father-love is corrective as well. Mother-love shields the child from the dire results of its own wrong-doing, whereas father-love looks ahead and sees the dire results in the future. As neither parent can be a substitute for the other, the child needs both, but in "discipline and instruction" (*en paideia kai nouthesia*) the father is the true agent. Heb. xii. 5-11 should be read in this connection. The apostle

explains fairly clearly what he conceives to be the functions of the mother and the father in I Thess. ii. 7-11:--

"We were gentle in the midst of you, as a nursing mother cherisheth her own children."

This motherliness is further expanded in such words as "being affectionately desirous", "willing to impart our very lives", "ye were endeared to us", "labouring night and day so as not be burdensome". Who that knows mother-love cannot sense it here? The apostle, however, was a father to these saints as well as a mother. So the language changes. He speaks of his deportment as "pious", "righteous", "blameless", and that he "exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you as a father doth his own children, that ye should walk worthy". Such is the necessary combination for true child welfare. Before the apostle says one word as to how the children were to be disciplined, he gives a caution to the fathers, "and ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath". Col. iii. 21 says, "Father, provoke not your children, lest they be discouraged". Rom. x. 19 uses the expression "provoke to wrath" in the words, "by a foolish nation I will anger you". The lesser word in Col. iii. means "to exasperate".

Have we never entered a home and felt the baneful effects of this "exasperation" and "discouragement"? Children have a keen sense of justice and will take punishment for offences without resentment when they know that they are being dealt with rightly. They have no words oftentimes to explain the motives for their actions, and often that which seems a peculiarly flagrant case of disobedience or malice may prove to be the result of some childish misconstruction or misunderstanding. We appeal to all fathers who may read these words to weigh these passages over before the Lord, seeking to avoid the discouraging attitude and gladly assuming the responsibility of disciplining and instructing those who are dependent upon them.

These things have a serious meaning moreover when considered in the light of ministry, for although none would now speak of themselves as bishops or deacons, yet the principle of I Tim. iii. 1-12 still holds good:--

"One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all dignity. For if a man knows not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?"

Slaves and masters.

The question of "Christianity and slavery" is never raised in the N.T. These things were left for the working of the truth to accomplish in time. The slave of the apostle's day and the servant of to-day may differ in many things, even to great extremes, but the principle of their service remains unaltered. The child of God then or the child of God now is compelled to serve an earthly master is provided with no lower a standard than:--

"In singleness of your heart, as unto Christ. Not with eye service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. With good will doing service as to the Lord and not to men" (Eph. vi. 5-7).

These words were once read by a reader of *The Berean Expositor* to an extremist in social matters who explained passionately, "The man who wrote that was a devil". The brother said, "Well, what do you say of the man who wrote this?" and read verse 9, "and, ye masters, *do the same things unto them*". We do not know his reply, but it is obvious that the apostle was no champion of class warfare. That there are crying evils among servants and masters no one can deny, but the child of God is not left here to reform or to patch up, but to witness for the truth, to endure what may come as a result and to leave his case with the Lord:--

"Knowing that whatsoever good things any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free" (Eph. vi. 8).

We have had a very unscriptural idea based upon this verse presented to us. It is this. Only the good we do will be dealt with by the Lord in that day, for this verse says nothing about any bad thing we may have done. The good will be recognized, the evil will have been forgiven. That is a very "comfortable" doctrine no doubt, but as Col. iii. 24, 25 writes upon the same theme and to the same people dispensationally it cannot hold:--

"Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons."

Masters are exhorted in Ephesians to "do the same things" which in Colossians becomes "give that which is just and equal", which is not incipient communism, but refers to the relation of wages to service, that it must be *equitable*. Further, the master is exhorted to "forbear threatening", a matter of even greater difficulty than to-day, when the slaves were the personal property of their masters and without redress.

Behold, the dreamer!

Those of us who have received the truth of the mystery and who have sought to carry out as far as possible its teaching have to submit to the misunderstandings of our fellows, and among the charges made against us is that we have exchanged realities for dreams, that we are no longer a practical force, etc. We wonder how many husbands and wives when faced with Eph. v. would dare to speak of our teaching as unpractical and only stuff for dreamers? We wonder how many fathers, surveying their children's progress, would deny the practical teaching of Eph. vi., to say nothing of the servants and the masters that are forming into hostile camps even though professing the same faith?

The world has a proverb, "*Charity begins at home*", and if home life and business life were permeated with the spirit of Eph. v. and vi. the church life and gospel testimony would look after itself. God is not served by multiplying meetings and neglecting the claims of home. God is not served at the expense of faithful daily service or at the expense of faithful recognition. In many things we offend all. Let us for the remainder

of our time seek grace to live in harmony with the practical outcome of being members of that church of which Christ is the Head, and the church His body.

**#78. The power of His might (Eph. vi. 10).
pp. 81 - 86**

"*Finally.*"—At length this wondrous epistle nears its close. In height, depth, length and breadth it stands without a peer in the whole range of inspired Scripture. Readers of *The Berean Expositor* must have sense that our conception of truth makes this epistle to us something akin to what the epistle to the Galatians was to Luther. It has given us a liberty beyond the dreams of man. It reveals a Christ raised far above all, Who fills all in all, Who ascended and descended that He might fill all things, Whose love surpasses knowledge, Whose riches are unsearchable. It has given us a sacred trust: a "good deposit" to guard, a unity to keep. It has brought its blessedness into every department of life. It takes us back before the overthrow of the world, and on to the ages yet to come. Its grace abounds. What then shall be the "Finally" of the apostle?

He reminds us that we are not actually seated in the heavenlies, but beset by foes who at present hold to these very spheres. Though fellow-citizens with the saints, we are yet walking in the wilderness. Though sealed unto the day of redemption, we have to remember that we actually live in an evil day. Hence the apostle concludes his letter with an exhortation to be strong, to put on the armour of God, to stand, to watch and to pray. The language of faith says, as we look at our inheritance in the heavenlies, "Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it" (Num. xiii. 30). Caleb, who said these words, tasted something of the strength that Paul refers to here, and knew something of the need for the armour and the sword:--

"And now, behold, the Lord hath kept me alive, as He said, these forty and five years as yet I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me for war" (Joshua xiv. 10, 11).

Before the armour, however, comes the strength, for without the necessary strength armour would be but a death-trap: "Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might" (Eph. vi. 10). Philosophers have said to men "Be strong". Psychologists tell us to say to ourselves "Be strong", but the only strength that will avail us in this conflict is the strength that is ours in the Lord.

The power of His resurrection.

No other writer in the N.T. uses the word which is here translated "be strong" except Luke, who in Acts ix. 22 uses it of Paul himself. The exception but proves the rule. The word is peculiar to the teaching of Paul and his own experience of the risen Lord.

The eight occurrences of the word *endunamao* speak of resurrection, and the seven occurrences in the epistles are worth a moment's attention.

Endunamao in Paul's epistles.

A		Rom. iv. 19, 20.	Strong, not weak, in faith.-- <i>O.T.</i>	
B		a Eph. vi. 10.	Strong in the Lord.--WAR.	\
		b Phil. iv. 13.	Strong in Christ.--ENDURANCE.	\
C		I Tim. i. 12.	Christ Jesus.--MINISTRY.	} <i>Acts</i>
B		a II Tim. ii. 1.	Strong in grace.--WAR.	/ <i>xxviii.</i>
		b II Tim. iv. 17.	Strong in the Lord.--ENDURANCE.	/
A		Heb. xi. 34.	Strong in faith, out of weakness.-- <i>O.T.</i>	

The first example, that of Abraham, is a strong witness for "the power of His resurrection", for it is said that "he believed God Who quickeneth the dead". The words of Eph. vi. 10 look back to Eph. i. 19. In vi. 10 we have *endunamao*, "be strong"; *kratos*, "power"; *ischus*, "might". In i. 19 we have *dunamis*, "power"; *ischus*, "mighty"; *kratos*, "power".

The believer is turned back to the risen and ascended Christ as the source of the power whereby he may stand the shock of battle. There is no other power at present either available or sufficient. All believers, whether conscious of it as an experimental fact or not, "have the sentence of death in themselves that they should not trust in themselves, *but in God which raiseth the dead*" (II Cor. i. 9).

The essential basis.

Before principalities and powers come into view as opponents in Eph. vi., a necessary fact is pre-supposed, and that is the teaching of Rom. v.-viii. This basic portion of Scripture is devoted to the exposition of two laws, viz.,:--

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. | \ | (Rom. viii. 2). |
| 2. The law of sin and death. | / | |

It is not for us to deal with Romans in this article; we simply trace the stream of this law of the spirit of life until it reaches the glorious climax of Rom. viii. 37-39:--

"In all these things we are MORE THAN CONQUERORS through Him that loved us. For I Am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor PRINCIPALITIES, nor POWERS . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Here is the essential basis of Eph. vi. 10. In Christ and by virtue of His resurrection we are already "more than conquerors" over "principalities and powers". We go forth to this unequal conflict in "the power of His resurrection". We go forth to achieve experimentally that victory already accomplished in Christ. So far as He is concerned, He has been raised far above all principality and power (Eph. i. 21, 23). So far as the Lord Himself is concerned, He "stripped off principalities and powers, and made a show

of them openly, *triumphing over them* in it" (Col. ii. 15). To attempt the conflict of Eph. vi. in any other power than that of the risen Christ is to seek defeat. To attempt it in that power is to make experimental proof of the fact that in Him we are "more than conquerors".

Are all the saved Soldiers?

If we allow the typical history of Israel to influence us, we may conclude that only those who have reached spiritual maturity are called upon to take up the armour:--

"From twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth *to war* in Israel" (Num. i. 3).

It was no light matter to be "chosen as a soldier" as both II Tim. ii. and Num. xiv. will show:--

"Your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness; and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from *twenty years old* and upward, which murmured against Me" (Num. xiv. 29).

The two exceptions to this statement are Caleb and Joshua. Of Caleb the Lord said:--

"He had another spirit with him, and hath followed Me fully, him will I bring into the land" (Num. xiv. 24).

Now the words "hath followed Me fully" are literally "hath filled after Me", and Col. i. 24 comes to mind as a close parallel:--

"And fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ."

To Joshua the Lord had said:--

"Moses is *dead* *arise* *be strong*" (Joshua i. 2-6).

Just as the inheritance of Israel was in possession of the "giants" who had to be overcome in the strength of the Lord, so the inheritance of the church in the heavenlies is held by spiritual foes of high rank and power. The soldier has something to win or to lose:--

"Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ" (II Tim. ii. 1-3).

A crown is in view and reigning with Christ (ii. 4-12). This recurs in chapter iv., where Paul speaking of himself says:--

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown" (II Tim. iv. 7, 8).

Yet, further, it is in the parallel epistle of the "Prize", namely Philippians, that Paul calls Epaphroditus a "fellow-soldier". We feel therefore with these passages before us that every believer is not necessarily numbered among the ranks of those able to go forth to war.

Stand and Withstand.

It is noteworthy that the actual word "fight" does not occur in Eph. vi. We are instructed that our "wrestling" is not towards (*pros*) flesh and blood, but spiritual foes. The word that is most prominent in the description of the conflict is the word "stand":--

"That ye may be able *to stand* against the wiles of the devil-- that ye may be able to *withstand* in the evil day, and having done all, *to stand*. STAND THEREFORE" (Eph. vi. 11-14).

There appears to be three phases of conflict suggested here:--

1. Standing against the wiles of the devil.
2. Withstanding in the evil day.
3. Having worked out all, to stand.

The wiles of the devil are in active operation at the present time; open warfare is not yet the order of the day. Wiles, stratagems, craft, cunning, snares, wolves in sheep's clothing, ministers of satan like ministers of righteousness, these are some of the devil's devices. Eph. iv. 14 uses the word *methodeia*, translated "lie in wait to deceive", which has been rendered a "systematic deception". We find the system at work in II Cor. iv. There Paul repudiates the "craftiness" and the "deceitful handling of the word of God" by his opponent, and appears clad in the armour of righteousness as he battles for the truth (II Cor. iv. 2-4; vi. 7). The days in which we live are evil (Eph. v. 16), evil is to increase (II Tim. iii. 13). We are at present training for the mighty battle that lies ahead. Some interpret the words "having done all" by "having overcome all the spiritual foes". While it certainly involves that thought, we shall come nearer to the truth by observing the actual word employed and its usage in other passages. *Katergazomai* means to thoroughly work, or to achieve. Two occurrences of the word in the epistles seem to give light upon its meaning in Eph. vi. The first is:--

"WORK OUT your own salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil. ii. 12).

Salvation was the blessed possession of the Philippians, but the object of that epistle is to urge these believers into practical realization of their position in Christ. It speaks of "striving", of running for a "prize", of "suffering", and of the "power of His resurrection". The other passage is II Cor. iv. 17:--

"For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, WORKETH for us a far more exceeding eternal weight of glory."

Once again we have suffering connected with glory. So in Eph. vi. 13, "Having *worked out* all, to stand".

We cannot help seeing in this a reference back to Rom. viii. 37-39. We have been saved, let us *work out* this salvation. We have been made more than conquerors in Christ, let us *work out* this victory in our own experience. This appears to be the essence of the passage. More than conquerors in the risen Christ, putting the whole armour of God, withstanding every assault in the "power of His might", and *standing* when all is finished, this is our portion. We must consider in subsequent papers:--

1. The whole armour of God, and
2. The three-fold nature of the conflict.

Meanwhile there is no more important word for the soldier of Christ to-day than "STAND THEREFORE".

#79. The whole armour of God (Eph. vi. 11-18). pp. 121 - 125

The familiar word "panoply" is made up of *pan*, "all", and *hoplon*, "arms". Here in Eph. vi. 11 it is called the whole armour of *God*. The word occurs in but one other place in the N.T., viz., Luke xi. 22, where it is used of the whole armour of *Satan* (verse 18). In Luke xi. 18-22 we have the following words of Eph. vi., viz., "strong", "panoply" and "stand". How is it possible to stand against the wiles of Satan, clad as he is in his whole armour in which he trusts, unless we put on the whole armour of God? Nothing less than this can avail in that conflict. There is reason therefore for the apostle's full title. "The whole armour of *God*."

This armour of God has two other descriptions given to it by the apostle in his epistles, and just as the armour of *God* is seen set over against the armour of the *Devil*, so in these other titles the Devil's armoury is suggested by antithesis.

"The armour of righteousness" (II Cor. vi. 7) suggests the unrighteousness that characterises Satan's warfare. This armour moreover is described as being "on the right hand and on the left" (II Cor. vi. 7). *Schleusner* sees in this a reference to the *amphidexios*, "right-handed on both sides", a Greek name for the soldier fully and completely armed, as we say, head to foot, *cap-a-pie*, or as Paul said to the good soldier Timothy, "thoroughly furnished" (II Tim. iii. 17).

"The armour of light" of Rom. xiii. 12 suggests the powers of darkness against whom the fight is directed. The negative is strongly stated in II Cor. x. 4, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God". What a panoply! The armour of *light*, of *right* and of *might*, the whole armour of God.

The sixfold armour.

The whole armour of God comprises six pieces. Why six? One would have thought that such perfection would have been given a sevenfold presentation. The reason seems to be that warfare belongs to the "evil day", and it is not carried over into "the rest that remaineth to the people of God". There are six, not seven, references to the "mystery" in Ephesians. The mystery deals with the present interval of Israel's rejection. Both the armour and the present dispensation are perfect in themselves, but they imply an imperfect period. It has been said that the proximity of the Roman soldiers during the writing of Ephesians suggested the description of the armour to Paul the prisoner. Most if not all of what Paul has said is found in the prophecy of Isaiah and in the Psalms:--

"Faithfulness shall be the girdle of His reins" (Isa. xi. 5).

The LXX translates faithfulness by *aletheia*, "truth", and reins by *pleuras*, "the sides" or loins. Here is the girdle of truth.

"He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon His head" (Isa. lix. 17).

Here is the breastplate of righteousness and the helmet of salvation.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that bringeth *good tidings*, that publisheth peace" (Isa. lii. 7).

Here are the feet shod with preparation of the good tidings of peace.

"He that made my mouth like a sharp sword" (Isa. xlix. 2).

Here is the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God.

"His truth shall be my shield and buckler" (Psa. xci. 4).

"Truth" in the O.T. often stands for God's faithfulness. Here is the shield of faith.

Satan did not commence operations in Eph. vi., neither did God wait until Eph. vi. before providing His people with the panoply of God. Eve must have laid aside the armour when attacked by the Devil. She tampered with truth; she entertained doubts of God's faithfulness; she failed to quench the fiery darts of the wicked, and she handled the sword of the Spirit deceitfully.

The sixfold armour.

- A | The GIRDLE. Truth or faithfulness.
- B | The BREASTPLATE. Righteousness.
- C | The SHOES. Gospel of peace.
- A | The SHIELD. Faith or faithfulness.

B | The HELMET. Salvation.
C | The SWORD. The Word of God.

Let us notice some features that come into prominence by this twofold arrangement.

The breastplate and the helmet (heart and head).—There is no more vital connection in either law or gospel than that of righteousness and salvation. A salvation that had not righteousness as its basis would be useless in the conflict with the evil one. This is why in II Cor. vi. 7 Paul calls the whole armour “the armour of righteousness”. The breastplate and the helmet are brought together in I Thess. v. 8, where the breastplate is “faith and love”, and the helmet “the hope of salvation”.

The shoes and the sword (feet and hands).—Both speak of a message. Once the gospel of peace, the other word of war. The idea conveyed by the word “preparation” seems to be that of a firm footing, the word being sometimes used for a “base” in the LXX. We must fully understand peace if we would succeed in war. The peace here appears to refer back to Eph. iv. 3 and ii. 15. Anything that breaks the unity of the spirit, or that introduces the first element of faction, will trip us up in the conflict, and well the evil one knows it.

The girdle and the shield (under and over all).—To an Eastern whose garments were loose and flowing, the girding of the loins was the initial act of preparation for service. We preserve the figure in our saying “buckle to” when we would urge anyone to diligence. The wiles of the devil can be met only by absolute sincerity. A secret doubt, a double heart, anything outside the single eye entertains a traitor within the camp who will betray us to the enemy. This feature has been brought forward in Eph. iv. 14, 15. The “wiles (*methodeia*) of the devil”, “whereby they lie in wait to deceive”, are met by “speaking the truth”, or as the margin reads, “being sincere”. The reference in Isa. xi. 5 speaks of righteousness and faithfulness in connection with the girdle, and we have observed before that practically every word translated faith and faithful in the O.T. is derived from the Hebrew *amen*, which also means truth. We have already alluded to the LXX translation, and there is no doubt that truth, sincerity and faithfulness are absolutely essential to the soldier of Christ.

The shield of faith.—Is this our faith or the Lord’s faithfulness? The reference to Psa. xci. not only indicates that our shield and buckler is the Lord’s faithfulness, but describes some of the “fiery darts”:-

“Thou shalt not be afraid of the terror by night; nor of the arrow that flieth by day.”

Proved armour.

We are exhorted to “put on” the armour of God, to “take” the armour, the shield, the helmet and the sword. Like the foolish virgins, it will be too late to start looking for armour in the evil day. How ridiculous young David must have looked with the armour of Saul upon his youthful limbs. David “assayed to go” for he had not proved them, and

wisely put them aside. Smooth stones taken from the brook he had proved, and with the help of God they were more than sufficient. David's example should urge us to realize that if we are going to "withstand in the evil day" we must "stand" now. How shall we quit ourselves in the day of battle if we are strangers to the sword of the Spirit? How can we hope to quench the fiery darts of that fight if we have never proved the efficacy of the shield of faith? Our Lord, when tempted by the Devil in the wilderness, proved for us the power of that sword and the reliability of that shield. We can only be more than conquerors "through Him that loved us".

The present contest, though not the final battle, is not by any means a mere spectacle. The word "wrestle" comes from *pallo*, "to shake", and the word wrestle itself means "dust of meal", "ashes", "fine powder", etc. It is a wearing, grinding endurance, rather than the brilliant charge. Patience and unquestioned sincerity are demanded and that continually.

Not flesh and blood, but spiritual wickedness.

Where our feet touch earth we are shod with peace, and while flesh and blood will often be bitterly opposed to us, we do not take up the armour of God against such. The only use of the armour against the flesh is found in Rom. xiii. 12-14:--

"Put on the armour of light put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof."

The foes against whom we wrestle are spiritual. The A.V. introduces the word "world" where the best texts omit it, this being the A.V. translation of *aion*, really "age", and it omits to translate the word "world" which does occur in composition. *Rotherham's* version seems to set the passage in its true light, giving each word its place:--

Against the principalities,\
Against the authorities, } of this darkness,
Against the world-holders,/

Against the spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenlies" (Eph. vi. 12).

The title "world-holder" is significant. *Kosmokrator* should be considered with the title of the Lord, *pantokrator*, "omnipotent" and "almighty". We may obtain a glimpse at the extent of the power and authority of these "world-holders of this darkness" by reading Dan. x. There we read of a messenger sent from heaven (5, 6), whose appearance was so glorious that at the sight Daniel's comeliness turned to corruption (8), yet this mighty messenger was successfully withstood for twenty-one days by "the prince of Persia", whose opposition was only overcome by the advent of Michael the archangel (13). Reference is made in verse 20 to another prince, "the prince of Grecia", and yet again in 21 to "Michael your prince". Now Dan. xii. 1 tells us that Michael is "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people (Israel)". It appears therefore that with the exception of Israel, the nations of the earth were under the authority of one of the "world-holders of this darkness", and these facts cast light upon the present conflict.

It is to be observed that the cause of the opposition in Dan. x. was that the heavenly messenger was sent to show Daniel what was noted in "the Scripture of truth". These principalities, powers and world-holders are summed up as "spiritual things (or forces) of wickedness in the heavenlies".

Were it not that we can say with the apostle that we are persuaded "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. viii. 38, 39), we should doubtless quail before these mighty opponents and sink lower than Daniel did, but Christ is risen and we are "more than conquerors through Him that loved us", and strong in the Lord and in the power of His might, we shall both stand and withstand, knowing that "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet shortly" (Rom. xvi. 20).

#80. The threefold conflict (Eph. vi. 12). pp. 138 - 143

The questions that we are about to consider are of such importance that we deal with them here rather than wait until we reach the typical teaching in the series entitled "*Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth*". The questions are these:--

1. How far are we warranted in speaking of "war" against principalities and powers in the heavenlies, *now*?
2. Are these several phases of this conflict?
3. Can we learn anything from O.T. typical history?

A threefold conflict.

We believe the answer is that the conflict is threefold:--

1. We look back to the cross, and there see that Christ triumphed over principalities and powers, thereby rendering us "more than conquerors" in His victory (Col. ii. 15).
2. Our present conflict is with the "world-holders of this darkness", it is described as a wrestling.
3. A conflict upon a more vast scale will take place in the heavenlies, when the church prepares to enter its inheritance in resurrection.

These three phases of conflict are found in the typical history of Israel.

The victory of the cross.

The first, which typifies the triumph over principalities and powers by the cross, and which lies at the basis of all victory (Rom. viii. 37-39), is set forth by the victory over Pharaoh, a victory in which Israel did nothing but "stand still, and see the salvation of the

Lord, for the Lord shall fight for you and ye shall hold your peace" (Exod. xiv. 14). This initial victory had far-reaching effects:--

"The people shall hear, and be afraid: sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestina all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away they shall be as still as a stone, till Thy people pass over, which Thou hast purchased" (Exod. xv. 14-16).

Rahab, of Jericho, said to the spies:--

"I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land have melted because of you. For we have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red Sea for you, when ye came out of Egypt" (Josh. ii. 9, 10).

Here it will be seen that the initial victory at Israel's redemption went before them, melting the opposition of their foes. By reading Joshua ii. 10, 11, and v. 1, we see that the second victory, namely, that of Israel over Amalek, Sihon and Og, all of which be it noted are on "this side of Jordan", likewise carried consternation into the ranks of the Canaanites.

The present conflict.

The present conflict with the "world-holders of this darkness" is typified in Israel's battles with Amalek, Sihon and Og. We must remember that the reason why Israel were led through the wilderness, instead of taking the shorter road through the land of the Philistines, was to prevent the people from being discouraged, "lest peradventure the people repent when they see *war*" (Exod. xiii. 17). Consequently, the battles of the wilderness are not to be reckoned as "war" in the full sense. Our present conflict is spoken of as "wrestling", the shock of battle may be yet future.

It will help us considerably to note a few features of this typical wilderness struggle. The first great victory was immediately subsequent to redemption. After Amalek's attack Israel do not meet Canaanite foes until they have met with God, been cleansed, sanctified, and made a covenant people. Readers are already acquainted with the difference that exists between *redemption* and *atonement*. Before Israel could meet either King Og of Bashan or King Sihon of Heshbon, even on this side of Jordan, they needed the instruction and the types of acceptance foreshadowed in the tabernacle. This order is observed in Ephesians.

1. Redemption (Eph. i. 7).
2. Atonement; "made nigh"; "access" (Eph. ii.).
3. The conflict (Eph. vi.).

To invert this order, or to omit one section, is to court dismal failure. Moreover, Joshua, who led the people on to victory, was a man of the Word (Josh. i. 8). He knew the value of the "sword of the Spirit", and of that weapon that was mighty through God to

the pulling down of the strongholds of Satan, as at Jericho. Let us now notice the foes of Israel's wilderness period.

Amalek.—Some think that it is an error to suppose that the Amalekites are descendants of Esau who had a grandson of that name (Gen. xxxvi. 10-16), for the country of the Amalekites is mentioned together with Canaanite nations, as that of the Rephaims and Amorites in Gen. xiv. 7, long before the birth of Esau, the grandfather of Amalek. Be this as it may, Amalek's attack is separated from the rest. So far as Israel were concerned Amalek's attack was a treacherous act:--

"He met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, even all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary" (Deut. xxv. 18).

His opportunity seems to have been provided by the murmuring and rebellious spirit of the people. Conquest no longer lay in "standing still and seeing the salvation of the Lord", but by active and prayerful co-operation. "*Go fight*" were the words of Joshua; "*Go pray*" the words to Moses. The opportunity afforded by murmuring and the power of prayer will not be lightly passed over by those to whom Eph. vi. comes as personal truth.

The essential character of Amalek's opposition, however, is found in the margin of Exod. xvii. 16, "Because the hand of Amalek is against the throne of the Lord". The "world-holders of this darkness" oppose the purpose of the ages, and that purpose involves the very *throne of the Lord*. The enthroned Christ and all His people are the great centre of Satanic attack. This is developed in full in the Book of the Revelation.

Saul, type of Antichrist as he was, the people's choice, the persecutor of the Lord's anointed (David) forfeits his throne through failure to blot out Amalek (I Sam. xxviii. 18). Haman the Agagite almost accomplished the destruction of Israel (Esther iii.). Balaam, however, foretold that Amalek, the first of the nations, should nevertheless end in destruction (Numb. xxiv. 20).

Sihon.—Israel sought no quarrel with Sihon. A request was sent asking Sihon to allow Israel "to pass through", their objective being the territory of Canaan but not of Sihon. Sihon, however, "would not suffer Israel to pass through his border". Our inheritance lies beyond the borders of this earth, even in the heavenlies, but the conflict started by Amalek is perpetuated by Sihon even here and now. Israel consequently smote Sihon and possessed his land "this side of Jordan" (Deut. iv. 47). In Numb. xxi. 1-3 we have one more encounter recorded:--

"And when King Arad the Canaanite, which dwelt in the south, heard tell that Israel came by way of the spies, then he fought against Israel, and took some of them prisoners."

By way of the spies.—We know that Moses sent the spies (Numb. xiii. 17) at the command of the Lord (xiii. 1, 2), but we must not forget the words of Ezek. xx. 6:--

"In the day that I lifted up mine hand unto them, to bring them forth of the land of Egypt into a land that I HAD ESPIED for them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands."

Was there any element of unbelief in this spying out of the land? Was it a concession to the weakness of the flesh, much like the law of Moses concerning divorce (Matt. xix. 3-8)? It appears to have made one more opponent, and led to the captivity of some of Israel. There is a lesson for us here. Let us so fully trust the goodness and the word of the Lord that we shall "walk by faith and not by sight", needing neither the evidence of the grapes of Eshcol to encourage us, nor the description of our giant foes to dishearten us, resting in the blessed victory already ours in Christ (Rom. viii. 37, 38), and recognizing that "as our day so shall our strength be". We are *more than* conquerors through Him that loved us.

King Og of Bashan.—This king was the only one left of the giants, thereby connecting him with the seed of the serpent, and fit type of the principalities and powers that war against the purpose of the Lord. The reader may know the book entitled *The Giant Cities of Bashan*, where the literal character of the word "giant" is demonstrated. The destruction of King Og of Bashan is recounted in Psa. cxxxvi. 20 and followed by the refrain, "for His *mercy* endureth for ever". The satanic character of the Canaanites justifies this somewhat strange use of the word mercy.

These opponents, Amalek, Sihon and Og set before us the character of the attack we may expect "this side of Jordan". The full triumph follows the crossing of the Jordan.

The third conquest.

Joshua reaches the banks of the Jordan and lodges there "three days" before passing over (Josh. iii. 1, 2). They were to go on a new journey, "For ye have not passed this way heretofore" (iii. 4). The passage of the ark and of the people through the Jordan was to be taken as a pledge that the Lord was among them, "and that He will not fail to drive out from before you the Canaanite" (iii. 10). Twelve men were chosen, one for each tribe, who took twelve stones from the firm bed of the river as a memorial. All Israel were involved in this crossing, the ark of the covenant also pledging God's word and power in the victory (iii., iv.). It is most suggestive to read that at the crossing of the Jordan the waters

"stood—rose up in one mound a great way off, by the city ADAM, which is beside Zarethan, and they which were going down to the sea of the waste plain, the salt sea, failed—were cut off, and the people passed over right against Jericho" (*Rotherham*, Josh. iii. 16).

Stanley translates the passage, "High up, far away in Adam, the city which is beside Zarethan". It seems too clear a type to be put down to mere coincidence that the waters that flowed down from Adam to the salt sea (called to-day *The Dead Sea*) should be so completely cut off. The stream of sin and death which started its course in Eden by one

man must be arrested before the people of the Lord can pass over Jordan into their inheritance. Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 is seen in type and shadow here.

Thus the Red Sea passage sets forth our union with Christ in His triumph over sin and death, and the Jordan passage our actual triumphant passage into literal resurrection glory. The reader may fill in many other parallels, for example, the Lord's baptism in Jordan followed by His genealogy back to Adam, and the calling of the twelve "from the baptism of John", as witnesses, but these details are somewhat apart from our theme.

It is noticeable that Israel pass the Jordan "right against Jericho". Just as the passage through the Red Sea spread consternation among the natives of Canaan, so also did the passage of the Jordan (Josh. v. 1). It is here that Joshua meets "The Captain of the Lord's host" (v. 13-15). This is the beginning of the conquest of Canaan. The first to fall is Jericho and its king, and in the Lord's mercy the initial victory of this third phase is seen to be all of faith. Now follows a series of battles, interspersed with events that we must consider together when we reach this book in *Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth*, until at the close of chapter xii. a halt is made and a list drawn up comprised of thirty-one kings that had been smitten.

The record of Caleb and Joshua given in Numbers and Joshua may throw light upon the position of those who, like these men of faith, press on to the goal and overcome. Sufficient, however, has been said to point the direction for the child of God that he may realize the past, the present and the future phases of this mighty conflict with principalities, and powers, who, like the Canaanites, are doomed to destruction, who shall be turned out of their possessions in the heavenlies, and who already, like Sihon and Og, seek to prevent us "passing through". Let us not forget the solemn lesson of "then came Amalek", nor the fact that Christ's triumph has traveled on ahead through all spheres, and is the basis of our ultimate victory. The power of His might in Eph. i. 19 and Eph. vi. 10 is both His triumph and our triumph, Both Rom. v.-viii. and I Cor. xv. link the doctrine of Adam, death, and resurrection victory together, a truth so blessedly set forth in the heaped up waters of Jordan near the city of Adam. "*Stand therefore.*"

**#81. The mystery of the gospel and its ambassador
(Eph. vi. 18-24).
pp. 145 - 153**

Immediately following the exhortation to put on the whole armour of God comes prayer. The statement with which this idea of prayer is introduced is somewhat involved:--

"With all prayer and supplication praying in every season in spirit, and thereunto watching with all perseverance and supplication, for all the saints" (Eph. vi. 18).

The two words "prayer and supplication" have been rendered "supplication and deprecation". That is *asking* for what is good and *deprecating* what is evil. At the root of the former word lies the idea of a *wish*, at the root of the latter a *fear*. The one is the pouring out of the heart's desire, the other the expression of a need.

"Praying in every season": like the preaching of the Word (II Tim. iv. 2), prayer is not to be limited to any one season or occasion. Paul when writing to the Romans could call God to witness that "without ceasing" he made mention of them in his prayers. The solemn appeal to God as a witness prevents any idea of exaggerated language here. Paul "never left off" praying. At the same time he was traversing sea and land preaching the gospel. He was earning his own living, sometimes labouring night and day with his own hands. His sufferings and trials were beyond measure, and upon him came the cares of all the churches. Yet he never left off praying!

The conventions of the faith are safeguards. It is good to kneel or to stand when we pray. It is good to close the eyes and fold the hands—the outside attitude should express the hidden spirit. It is good to turn aside from the things of daily life, withdraw to the quiet room alone in secret. But all these things may be dispensed with without touching the essence of prayer. Paul could pray as he walked, as he talked, as he worked. He could pray without closing the watchful eye, or folding the labouring hand. He could pray without ceasing, serve without ceasing, labour without ceasing. Let us not confound true prayer with mysticism. To kneel for a long time in silence may be the highest form of worship, it may but numb the sensibilities and lay the unguarded spirit open to invasion. In some cases it is a form of self deception and pride:--

"When Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation to speak with Him, then he heard THE VOICE OF ONE speaking *to him*" (Num. vii. 89).

It is never safe to omit the Word of God when we think of prayer. It is the connection seen here in Eph. vi. 17, 18, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, praying always".

What is prayer? Why do we pray? Can we by prayer cause God to alter one line of His purpose? Can we add or subtract one name from the book of life? Can we alter by one second the "appointed time"? Would the Lord come one moment sooner if all His people prayed that He would? God's purpose will go on to its glorious end whether we pray or whether we remain silent. He is not like the unjust judge who can be worried into action by sheer importunity. That which sometimes passes for great piety may prove to be sheer unbelief. We remember sometime ago that our little one had prayed in her childish fashion that on some particular day, weeks ahead, the weather might prove fine. Nothing more being mentioned, the mother reminded her saying, "You have not asked God any more about the fine day you want". "Oh no, mother", was the response, "I told Him once, *and He won't forget*".

Prayer does not mean arguing with God, or trying to get our own way. Prayer gives us access to God, fellowship with Himself. Gives us insight into His purposes, sends us out again into the turmoil of life with less anxiety, with greater patience, with more sympathy,

"With a heart at leisure from itself,
To soothe and sympathise."

Prayers are answered because God wishes His children to share His secrets, trust Himself, but prayers never alter God's plans. Prayer comes to God with his own Word and says, "*Do as Thou hast said*". Prayer is never answered that is not in accordance with the will of God. There are some things that God Himself has placed at our disposal upon the condition that we "ask", "seek", and "knock", but there is no more mystery about this than when the child asks its parent for bread, or knocks at the door for entrance.

Watching with all perseverance.

The Lord did not simply say, "Pray lead us not into temptation". He also said, "Watch and pray that ye enter into temptation". Is it right to pray the one prayer, and forget to watch? Will prayer alone avail us, if the Lord has said watch *and* pray? "What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch" (Mark xiii. 37). The word "watch" in Eph. vi. 18 means "sleeplessness". In II Cor. vi. 5 and xi. 27 we have the word in a setting of tumult, prison, weariness, cold and nakedness. It is of the Spirit of the Lord Himself. "Behold, He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep" (Psa. cxxi. 4). Luke xxi. 34-36 urges watchfulness by such words as "unawares", "snares", "escape".

What should we pray for? In one sense we must all confess with Rom. viii. 26, "we know not what we should pray for as we ought", "but that is not exactly our meaning in the question. There are some children of God whose integrity is beyond question, who feel that prayer must be confined to spiritual things only, and that such things as problems of daily business, home, etc. are not proper subjects for prayer. What then should we pray for? Surely the apostle has answered in Phil. iv. 6:--

"Be over-anxious for NOTHING, but in EVERYTHING by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your REQUESTS BE MADE KNOWN unto God."

Anxiety for *nothing*, prayer in *everything* seem to allow no neutral ground. When once we are saved, may we not believe that all our affairs are a part of the Lord's concern, that somehow or other where we live, where we work, the friends we have or lose, all the complex happenings of everyday are part and parcel of His purpose. If the everyday affairs of everyone are outside the scope of prayer, what is there left of human affairs as part of God's purpose? For our own part we want to be more simple, more like child and parent when we pray.

This watchful and prayerful spirit which the apostle enjoins was not to be spent upon self. It was "for all saints". If one member suffer, all suffer. It is true unselfishness to

pray for the rest of the body the church, for our own individual peace and blessing is largely connected with the blessing of the whole. Is there in all the epistles of the N.T. a more beautiful exhibition of unconscious modesty and humility than the words that follow, "and for me". It is Paul that speaks. Paul, to whom the dispensation of the mystery had been granted. Paul, who had been caught away to the third heaven. It is such a one that says "and for me". There is a precious mingling of the homely and the sublime in this concluding passage.

Eph. vi. 18-24.

A		Prayer.	For all the saints	(<i>panton ton hagion</i>).			
					/	a1	Utterance.
					/	b1	Boldness.
B		Paul.	Prayer for		/	c1	Make known.
					\	c1	Ambassador.
					\	b1	Boldly.
					\	a1	Speak.
					/	a2	My affairs.
					/	b2	Tychicus.
B		Paul.	Affairs for		/	c2	Shall make known.
					\	b2	Whom I have sent.
					\	c2	Ye might know.
					\	a2	Our affairs.
A		Benediction.	All who love	(<i>panton ton agaponton</i>).			

What is Ministry?

There is an intimate connection between the ministry for which Paul asks prayer, and his "affairs" which he makes known through Tychicus. We are apt to limit our conception of ministry too closely to the actual work of speaking or writing. Were not Paul's private affairs a part of his ministry? Had not his "prospects" been ruined for the truth's sake? When he sometimes laboured with his hands to provide the necessary things of life could he not render that humble service "as unto the Lord"? When the Philippians sent once and again unto his necessities did they feel any need to distinguish between the sacred and the secular? Was it not at the same time "fellowship in the gospel"? (Phil. i. 5; iv. 15, 16). Ministry is simply service, and this includes the whole manner of life, for often the demands of the ministry rendered seriously, deflect the whole current of daily affairs. So it is that Paul could link together the high ministry of the mystery and "how I do" without any feeling of incongruity.

Prayer expresses a sense of need.

His prayer is for "utterance", "boldness", the ability and the courage to speak freely as he "ought". Here is a man of like infirmity as ourselves. He knew what it was to feel a shrinking, and could sympathise with the timid spirit of Timothy (II Tim. i. 7). He knew what it was to despised (I Tim. iv. 12; II Cor. x. 10), and to have indifferent health (Gal. iv. 14). He knew that whenever there is an "open door" there will be "many adversaries" (I Cor. xvi. 9), and prayer was needed that the opposition may not be

allowed to turn him back from the appointed path. Did he never have moments of doubt when with aching limbs and tired brain he laboured and travailed at some lowly occupation for the bare necessities of life? Did no one whisper that he might have served the Lord better by staying in honour and influence at Tarsus? Did he never need the vision at night of the Lord saying:--

"Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace: For I am with thee, and *no man shall set on thee* to hurt thee, for I have much people in this city" (Acts xviii. 9, 10).

Unless we have made a most critical mistake in our understanding of Paul's temperament and circumstances, we believe he had the scholar's shrinking from the physical blow, the super-sensitiveness to criticism, the knowledge within of his own utter unworthiness, the consciousness that in following his calling he must ever appear in the eyes of many as a presumptuous boaster. Yet he turned not back. This man who shrank from the tumult of Corinth was ready to face the mob at Ephesus (Acts xix. 30), and the enraged Jews at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 40). He could write to the Philippians:--

"That with all boldness, as always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death" (Phil. i. 20).

He could speak of himself as a drink-offering poured out upon the sacrifice and service of faith (Phil. ii. 17). There is some compensation to the sensitive spirit, if he or she "suffer as a *Christian*", but Paul had to face the shame of "suffering as a *malefactor*" (II Tim. ii. 9; Luke xxiii. 32). He understood in measure what the Lord felt when He faced not only death and suffering, but the intense shame of being "numbered with the transgressors" (Luke xxii. 37). Compulsory association with the brutal company may be more torture than the stake. And so Paul said "and for me".

The mystery of the gospel.

The utterance and the boldness that Paul desired was that he might make known the mystery of the gospel. There are two sources of help available in seeking the meaning of this expression. We may observe its connection with the use of the word "mystery" in this epistle. We may read it in the light of the parallel passage in Colossians. Now the mystery is mentioned six times in Ephesians:--

- A | i. 9, 10. The dispensation.
- B | iii. 3. THE MYSTERY.
- C | iii. 4. The mystery of Christ.
- A | iii. 9. The dispensation (R.V.).
- B | v. 32. THE GREAT MYSTERY.
- C | vi. 19. The mystery of the gospel.

We have already learned to distinguish between the mystery itself which was revealed only to Paul, and the mystery of Christ which had been made known in measure down the age, but in its final and highest sphere, to Paul. It would appear therefore that the

mystery of the gospel was connected specially with the mystery of Christ. Let us now turn to Col. iv. The context is identical with that of Eph. vi.:--

"Withal praying for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the *mystery of Christ*, for which I am also in bonds, that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak" (Col. iv. 3, 4).

This passage confirms our finding. Why should the Apostle lay such stress upon this feature. The reason seems to be this. Every message sent by God in grace to man has been inseparably connected with Christ, and until His person and position were made clear no "good message" could be intelligible. If one would preach the gospel of the kingdom one must preach the advent of the King. If one would preach the gospel of grace, one must preach Christ crucified, dead, risen. If one would preach the good tidings of the Mystery which places the redeemed "far above all", it is essential that before that statement can be received, or even be intelligible, Christ must be preached "far above all" too. Where Paul surpassed all in the revelation he received, was that over and above the accumulated knowledge of the Mystery of Christ, that had grown ever since the first revelation given in the garden of Eden, he had received the climax of truth, viz., that the risen but rejected Messiah was now at the right hand of God, Head of both principalities and the church, and that the Mystery of the union of the church with the ascended Lord constituted the fullness of Him, Who in His turn was designated to fill all in all. It was in order that he might make this message clear, without compromise and without fear, that he asked the prayers of the saints.

We have "boldness" before God (Eph. iii. 12), shall we be fearful before man whose breath is in his nostrils! Yet we are, and hence the value of intercessory prayer for one another.

An Ambassador.

"In behalf of which I am conducting an embassy in a chain" (Eph. vi. 20).

Speaking as a man, Paul had a passion for liberty. One has only to read Gal. ii. to catch something of his burning spirit. Yet he could rejoice in the honour of his bonds, his prison, his chains, for after all they were the badges of highest honour. The figure of an ambassador provides a very apt illustration of the distinctive spheres of administration given to the apostles Peter and Paul. At the moment of writing the King of England has Ambassadors in France and Germany. Now the ambassador in France, when dealing officially with Franco-British affairs, speaks with all the authority of the King he represents. If however, the ambassador to France should go to Germany, he would of course have the individual's right of personal opinion, but he could no longer act in things of state nor speak with delegated authority. Peter, the Ambassador of the Lord to the circumcision, received power and authority which he exercised, but Peter when dealing with the present interval of the mystery confesses to things that are hard to be understood, and realizes that they belong to the embassy of Paul, and that he has no jurisdiction in that province (II Pet. iii. 15, 16). Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles. To him had been

granted the dispensation of the grace of God to the Gentiles. He was an Ambassador in a chain, and when he spoke as the Ambassador he spoke with full authority.

My affairs and how I do.

It is one thing, however, to pray with a purely doctrinal interest; it is another to pray because of acquaintance with actual needs. When the reader takes up a printed page, his mental image of the writer may be far removed from reality. How can intelligent prayer therefore be offered? The apostle felt this need, and adds to his request for prayer the means for information. Yet once again, let us observe the delicacy of his method. Here is no harrowing list of details of prison life, no list of privations and hardships, no pose, for we know from his own words that he felt a fool when compelled in sheer defence to appear boastful. What he does do is to give an intimation to those who were desirous of this intelligent fellowship that the necessary information could be obtained from Tychicus. That this was no casual mission to fulfil we may gather from the character of the man who received it:--

"Tychicus, the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord" (Eph. vi. 21).

"Tychicus, who is a beloved brother, and faithful minister fellow-servant in the Lord "
(Col. iv. 7).

"Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus" (II Tim. iv. 12).

The last reference is comforting. Demas had forsaken Paul. All in Asia had left him, but Tychicus remained faithful. Tychicus and Trophimus are mentioned in Acts xx. 4, and Trophimus was an "Ephesian" (Acts xxi. 29). Both Tychicus and Trophimus therefore are connected with Ephesus, and this is a strong argument in favour of the retention of the word "Ephesus" in verse 1 of this epistle. If the epistle had been written to "the saints that *are*", as some have suggested, to whom would Tychicus convey the message concerning the personal affairs of Paul? Paul's last thought, however, is for the saints. Not only did he send Tychicus with the necessary information concerning his own affairs, but he concludes, "and that he might comfort your hearts" (Eph. vi. 22). The same is true of Col. iv. 8. A glimpse is given of the intimate relationship between Paul's "affairs", "the mystery", and the "heart's comfort" of the believer in Col. ii. 1-3:--

"For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you that their hearts might be comforted the full knowledge of the mystery of God—Christ, in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

The Benediction.

The contemplation of this noble spirit falls like a benediction itself in a world of sordid self-interests and covetousness, but the "peace" and the "love with faith" so markedly present come not from the heart of man but "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Eph. vi. 23), and so the benediction falls from Him Who was the strength and the sweetener of Saul of Tarsus,

"Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

The word translated "sincerity" is *aptharsia* = incorruptibility. Are we to understand that our love to the Lord is "incorruptible", and that this benediction rests upon those only whose love will never change, but is incorruptible? This is the opinion of many. *Dr. Bloomfield*, however, cites the interpretation of Beza to show that the words *en aptharsia* are to be read with the word "grace" and not with "love". It is the grace of the Lord that is imperishable, incorruptible, immortal. It is a point that perhaps we cannot settle. True love is as strong as death. The grace of the Lord is beyond the touch of corruption. Let us seek to love with all sincerity, and rest upon a grace that reaches out beyond the grave. Here is the last word of the epistle—"incorruptibility". Resurrection is stamped on the whole unfolding of the epistle. In chapter i. it is "the power to usward that believe", in chapter ii. it is the sphere of our blessings, in chapter iv. it is seen in the new man, in chapter v. it forms the exhortation to awake from sleep, and in chapter vi. it constitutes the strength of the good soldier.

What shall we say unto these things? Who is sufficient for these things? What shall we render for these things? As we ask these questions in the presence of the Lord there can be but one answer:--

"I follow after, if that I may *laid hold of* that for which also I was *laid hold of* by Christ Jesus but one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, according to a mark I press toward the goal, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. iii. 12-14).

So concludes a long but happy, and we trust profitable, study. Though we pass from the definite study of this epistle to other parts of Scripture, this one epistle more clearly indicates our peculiar testimony than does any other single book of Scripture. We shall from time to time revert to this epistle to consider from some fresh angle truth already reviewed. We shall, if spared to continue this witness, be obliged to remember new readers and the need for a re-statement of fundamentals. To all who have this precious truth at heart, who value the "good deposits", and realize both its privilege and responsibility, we would humbly but most sincerely repeat the apostle's prayer:--

"And for me, that utterance may be given."

Perfecting Holiness

#1. II Cor. vii. 1. pp. 41 - 45

The Scripture speaks of faith being perfected by works, of love being perfected by keeping the word of God, of holiness being perfected by the cleansing from the filthiness of flesh and spirit (James ii. 22, I John ii. 5, II Cor. vii. 1). Before we can give any real heed to the exhortations that underlie these passages it is essential that we entertain correct ideas as to the meaning of perfection.

In associating the word perfect with holiness we are very likely to allow the thought of freedom from taint, or blemish, to express something of the meaning of the word perfect. This is undoubtedly the meaning of such a passage as Lev. xxii. 21, where it says of the sacrifice, "it shall be perfect to be accepted", for the words immediately follow, "there shall be no blemish therein". It is when we read such a passage as the following of the Lord Jesus that we feel called upon to pause and consider:--

"Yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered, and *being made perfect*, He became the author of *aionian* salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. v. 8, 9).

Does this teach that the Lord became without blemish through the things that He suffered? We know that such an idea is contrary to the whole teaching of Scripture. We must therefore look closer and criticize our own views rather. Perfect, *teleios*, is allied with *telos*, the end. The primary meaning of "perfect" is "attaining the end" as expressed by the apostle in Phil. iii. 12, "That I may lay hold on that for which I have been laid hold of by Christ"; and set in contrast with "beginning" in Gal. iii. 3: "Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now *made perfect* by the flesh?"

We can understand in this sense that through sufferings the Lord was perfected, for until He "finished" the work He came to do He could not be said to have been "perfected", for that implies the reaching of a goal. Of all the blessings that we receive through Christ holiness seems the last which *we* should be exhorted to perfect, yet so it is:--

"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).

In this passage the word perfecting is *epiteleō*, "to bring to a full end".

To have arrived at some approximation to a Scriptural meaning of the word *perfect* is to have come a long way towards an understanding of the phrase "perfecting holiness", but as the verse is introduced by a "therefore" and the "having" of certain "promises", it is necessary also to know what promises these are. The promises are found in the closing verse of II Cor. vi.:--

“I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.”

“I will receive you and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.”

These are the promises that are the propelling force that makes for the “perfecting of holiness”. But these promises do not stand alone, they too are closely connected with the argument of the context. We must therefore go back to verse 14 to commence the conditions that regulate the enjoyment of the promises, “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers”. The unequal yoke appears to refer back to the typical law forbidding the use of ox and ass together at the plough (Deut. xxii. 10), and therefore speaks particularly of service. The first epistle told them that while at heart and in spirit they were to be a separated people, it was not possible, neither were they called upon, to withdraw themselves from all contact with the outside world. When we come to participation in the things of God no such latitude is allowed. The unequal yoke is contrary to the first principle of holiness. This inequality is expanded for us in a series of statements:--

“For what participation has righteousness with lawlessness?
Or what fellowship light with darkness?
And what concord Christ with Belial?
Or what portion a believer with an unbeliever?
And what connection a temple of God with idols?” (II Cor. vi. 14-16).

There is no need to labour the point. There can be but one answer. The last figure, that of the temple, carries the argument to a higher point. The saints themselves are the temple of the living God, purged by the promise that God has said that He will dwell among them, walk among them and be their God.

Let us now observe the turn that is taken both in the exhortation, the quotation and the consequence. “Ye are the temple” states a fact; accomplished by God. “Come out, be separate, touch not” states a personal outworking of that fact, and not something static. “I will walk, dwell and be their God” is connected with the fact of the believer’s holiness in Christ. “I will receive, be a Father, and ye children” is the blessed result of “perfecting holiness”, of living as though we were the temple, of practicing and making our own that sainthood that is ours by the blood of Christ.

The title “Father” is deeper than the name “God”. We have been reconciled to *God*. That is the initial fact. We can have access to the *Father*. That is the consequent privilege (Eph. ii. 18). So here. While it is glorious to be the temple of God, it is even more glorious to be sons and daughters of the Father. If the temple of God is holy by reason of its use and purpose, the children of God will be holy because they are children of such a Father. The temple stones may be no better than the stones of the house near by, the gold no purer than that which adorned the careless in the street. Its sanctity is not personal, it is not moral, but the holiness that is brought to its end (perfected) is that response in the quickened believer to rise and walk in newness of life and serve in newness of spirit. The highest incentive to practical holiness lies in sonship, and it is

cramping and harmful to have only in mind the ceremonial or un-moral side. All the types of O.T. sanctification are swallowed up in our relation to the Father, Who chose us to holiness, and predestined us to sonship.

We perceive, too, how personal this perfecting should be; “let us cleanse *ourselves*.” It is not so much the ceremonial “touch not the unclean thing”; the unclean thing is within. It is not the Pharisaic separation, “God, I thank Thee, I am not as other men or even as this publican” (Luke xviii. 11), it is that sanctification that keeps us truly separate while we mingle with publicans and sinners, sit at their tables, eat their food and run the risk of being labeled and libeled “gluttonous and wine-bibbers” as the ceremonialists misunderstood the perfect holiness of “the Son”.

The Pharisee would have been defiled had he touched a leper; not so Christ. The believer whose conception of holiness is still expressed in terms of “temples” and “unclean things” may feel compelled to stay away from this meeting, to avoid appearing at that function: the believer whose holiness is expressed in terms of the Father and His children will manifest the spirit of the Father combining two aspects of holiness that are usually condemned by those who are on a lower standing:--

“That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect” (Matt. v. 45-48).

To those who rest satisfied with the sanctification of temples and holy things, separation from evil and unjust men seems the only consistent thing, but those whose holiness has passed beyond the images to the reality act in just the reverse way:--

“For He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust” (Matt. v. 45).

There are some who will not give a penny to a hospital collection because it may not be “of God”; such have the ceremonial and temple conception of holiness. Others, who have passed this stage and seen the “end”, feel no more contamination over helping a purely humane institution than their heavenly Father is less perfect because He does not discriminate in His largesse of sun and shower. In none of these things must we judge another, and in no circumstance must liberty be construed as license. He who attempts, as an outcome of this highest conception of holiness, to “cleanse himself of all stain either of flesh or spirit”, will have no occasion to boast except in the Lord.

We have not by any means exhausted the subject, and hope at intervals to return to it and view the important reaching of holiness from other angles. Let us rejoice that the same Christ Who is made unto us redemption and righteousness and wisdom, is surely made unto us sanctification, but let us not hide from ourselves the fact that he who *is* righteous, whether by faith or by works, will *do* righteousness, and he that *is* sanctified will act as such to the glory of God, “perfecting holiness in the fear of the God” (II Cor. vii. 1).

#2. Root and Fruit (*hagiasmos*). pp. 76 - 78

Everything pertaining to the new nature is unalterably ours in Christ. Yet practically every blessing thus already our own is placed ahead of us for our own personal realization. These two statements are true of holiness. It is impossible to “perfect” that which does not exist—fruit can only be expected after the root has become grounded and settled.

The figure of fruit is a true picture of the idea of perfection. The cycle of vegetable life reaches its climax in fruit. The man in the street thinks of fruit as such things as apples and pears; the botanist knows that fruit is the goal of the lovely rose, the meadow buttercup or the stalwart oak. The cycle is then finished or perfected. The root from which all practical sanctity must spring is that holiness which is ours in Christ once and for all:--

“But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, Who is made to us wisdom from God, besides righteousness and holiness and redemption” (I Cor. i. 30).

The apostle was writing to Corinthians among whom wisdom was highly esteemed. Had he been writing to a company who trusted in their own righteousness, he could have placed the word righteousness where wisdom stands. Or those to whom he wrote may have needed the teaching that sanctification is as much ours in Christ as is justification, holiness as much as righteousness. Yet knowing this would we say that the man to whom Christ has been made wisdom manifests this fact best by always acting like a fool? Is justification by faith safeguarded most when those thus justified remain destitute of practical righteousness? Can holiness in Christ be best manifested by uncleanness of person? Are the holy fakirs of India nearer the truth than the apostle Paul? The use of the word *hagiasmos*, “sanctification”, makes the will of the Lord very clear:--

“For this is the will of God, even your sanctification for God has not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness” (I Thess. iv. 3-7).

What the uncleanness is that is set over against sanctification and how intensely practical this sanctification is, the passage before us declares. It is largely a matter of “going beyond”, of overstepping bounds fixed by God, of defrauding a brother. Holiness in Scripture is a healthy thing. It does not drive men and women into monasteries and nunneries, it declares marriage to be honourable and undefiled. Mere abstinence or negation is not holiness; holiness in its practical aspect is the outcome of righteousness in action, not of emasculation. For this we may turn to Rom. vi. 19:--

“As ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness.”

Further on in verse 22 he speaks of “servants to God, and fruit unto holiness”. The whole passage (Rom. vi. 16-23) is to the last degree intensely practical and everyday doctrine. Our members are the instruments either of unrighteousness or of holiness. “The mortal body” of verse 12 is not rendered immortal for this service; the same hands that stole may steal no more but rather labour in order that their owners may not only earn their own living, but have to give to the needy. The same feet that were swift to shed blood may, like Paul’s, carry the gospel unto the regions beyond. It is not a blessed thing that here and now with all the consciousness of our failings this manifestation of the victory of Christ can be given?

If I Cor. i. 30 exhibits the root of holiness, Heb. xii. 15 reveals the root of bitterness that can defile. In Heb. xii. 14-16 we read:--

“Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled: Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.”

In what way was Esau “profane”? The word *bebelos* is related to *belos*, a threshold, and indicates anything “trodden”, “accessible”, and so not “private”. This word being used as an antithesis to holiness partly explains the latter word. That is something sacred, set apart for God, not for the crowd. Now Esau thought more of easing a healthy appetite than he did of the higher things of God, and holiness can easily be sacrificed upon similar principles. Self sows a bitter root whose fruit is not unto holiness but unto corruption.

Hagiasmos occurs ten times in the N.T., and is translated five times “holiness”, and five times “sanctification”. We give the ten occurrences so that any who may so desire can read the complete setting given in Scripture of this one phase of the doctrine of sanctification: Rom. vi. 19, 22; I Cor. i. 30; I Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7; II Thess. ii. 13; I Tim. ii. 15; Heb. xii. 14; I Pet. i. 2. Seven of the occurrences deal with the practical outworking of holiness, the remaining three speaking of sanctification in Christ and by the Spirit.

Redemption. New Series.

#5. The Cherubim, their pledge.

pp. 4, 5

(Concluded from Volume XV, page 191).

Although we have now traversed the whole of the Scriptures and tested the references to the cherubim, we believe there is yet one other period where their presence is felt if their name is not pronounced. Let us tabulate the different periods that have already been dealt with in which the cherubim are mentioned.

1. Ezek. xxviii.	Eden. Profaned. Cast out. The anointed.
2. Gen. iii.	Eden. Pledge to life and restoration.
3. Exodus	The tabernacle and the covenant.
4. Kings	The glory and the temple.
5. Ezekiel	The glory departing and returning.
6. Revelation	Gen. iii. fulfilled.

Christ, the fulfillment.

There is one period of history that must be added, if we are not only to have the pledge of Gen. iii. fulfilled, but see how it was accomplished. That period is the earthly life of Christ covered by the four Gospels. Why four Gospels? Why a fourfold presentation of Christ? Because in Him is fulfilled the pledge of the cherubim, and by Him was accomplished the undoing of the works of the cherub of Ezek. xxviii. He too was on "the holy mount" (II Pet. i. 18), but he was not cast out as profane, but rather was proclaimed as the beloved Son in Whom the Father was well pleased. We do not read anywhere in Scripture except in Ezek. xxviii. of an anointed cherub. This title is reserved for Christ. The four Gospels set Him forth in the fulfillment of the four faces of the cherubim:--

1. Matthew	The LION	The King.
2. Mark	The OX	The Servant.
3. Luke	The MAN	Genealogy to Adam.
4. John	The EAGLE	The Word.

This now fills in the list, brings the number to seven periods, and provides the great antidote to the profanity introduced by the anointed cherub who fell ere man was made. Let us conclude therefore by inserting this important member and let us glory in the fullness that there is for "the all things" in Christ, the living One.

- A | The anointed cherub. His Fall.
- B | Paradise lost, pledge of restoration.
- C | Tabernacle and Wilderness (Exodus).
Temple and Land (Kings).
The Glory (Ezekiel).
- A | The Anointed. His Triumph.
- B | Paradise restored.

#6. The Jubilee. pp. 37 - 41

In dealing with the great importance of redemption in the typical history of Israel, the year of the jubilee must be included. The jubilee occurred every fifty years, when hired servants, property and possessions (with one or two exceptions) automatically went out free, were restored to their liberty or to their possessions.

The meaning of the word.

The word *jubilee* has come into English as a transliteration of the Hebrew word *yobel*, which is derived from *yabal*, meaning *to flow* or *go forth*, as in Isa. lv. 12:--

“For ye shall go out (*yotsa*, as in the exodus, Exod. xiv. 8, and in the jubilee, Exod. xxi. 2, 3), with joy, and be led forth (*yabal*) with peace.”

The first and the last occurrences of the word *yobel* are Exod. xix. 13 and Josh. vi. 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, where it is translated in the A.V. by “trumpet” and “rams’ horns”. The remaining twenty occurrences, all of which are found in Leviticus and Numbers, are translated by the word *jubile*, which we more commonly spell *jubilee*.

While dealing with the meaning of the word we must not ignore the testimony of the Septuagint. Granting that the translators of the Septuagint were uninspired men, we must ever remember the following facts, that the bulk of the quotations in the N.T. are from the Septuagint version, and the presence in home, synagogue and school of that version for several centuries gave sanction and fixity to the words used in its doctrines which neither the Lord nor His apostles contravened, but accepted as starting points for their own teaching.

The word used by the LXX throughout Leviticus and Numbers for translating *jubilee* is the Greek word *aphesis*. What they meant by the word they explain themselves:--

“And ye shall hollow the fiftieth year and *proclaim liberty*” (Lev. xxv. 10).
“The Spirit of the Lord God is upon Me to *proclaim liberty* to the captives to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord” (Isa. lxi. 1, 2).

The connection between the jubilee and the acceptable year of the Lord is beyond controversy if words mean anything. Moreover this “acceptable year” is given another title in Isa. lxiii. 4 where it is called “the year of my redeemed”. Isa. xxxv. refers to the same event. There we have the close association of vengeance and the salvation of Israel. If the acceptable year is called the year of my redeemed in Isa. lxiii., they who participate in it are called “the ransomed of the Lord” (Isa. xxxv. 10).

Whatever our appreciation of the LXX may be, we can have no reserve with regard to the inspiration of the Hebrew of Ezekiel. There we have the Greek word *aphesis* translating the Hebrew *deror*, “then it shall be his to the year of *liberty*” (Ezek. xlvi. 7), which is a direct reference to the jubilee, “to proclaim *liberty* throughout the land” (Lev. xxv. 10).

These passages present one solid unassailable front and he who rejects them rejects the Word of God. To complete our survey we must observe the way in which the word *aphesis* is used in the N.T.:--

Forgiveness.—Mark iii. 29; Acts v. 31; xiii. 38; xxvi. 18; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14.

Deliverance.—Luke iv. 18 (confirming Isa. lxi. Sept.).

Liberty.—Luke iv. 18 (confirming Isa. lxi. Sept.).

Remission.—Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark i. 4; Luke i. 77, iii. 3, xxiv. 47;
Acts ii. 38, x. 43; Heb. ix. 22, x. 18.

The institution of the Jubilee.

The institution of the jubilee follows immediately upon the law concerning the sabbatic year recorded in Lev. xxv., and is indeed an extension of the principle of the sabbath:--

“And thou shalt number seven Sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years, and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all the land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee unto you: and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family” (Lev. xxv. 8-19).

There is a designed stress upon the number seven. The trumpet of the jubilee sounds at the end of the 49th (7*7) year, in the 7th month. The tenth day of the seventh month is the day of atonement. The jubilee is most clearly associated with that day. It comes into effect in the fiftieth year, but it has its roots in the 10th day of the 7th month of the 49th year. The jubilee is the year of the Lord's redeemed. The self-same redemption that formed a basis for the forgiveness (*aphesis*) of sin purchased the possession into which the redeemed shall yet enter (Eph. i. 7 and 14), but there were not sacrifices offered for this twofold redemption. What we must remember when dealing with Israel is that they were a redeemed people. The jubilee and the day of atonement belong to Israel as a redeemed people and not otherwise. Seeing moreover that their redemption, their sacrificial system, their land were typical of the future reality, we must trace this progression of sabbaths up to its climax. We have the seventh day, the seventh month, the seventh year, the seven times seven years, and lastly as a fulfillment of all the seventy times seven of Dan. ix.:--

“Seventy sevens are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to

bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy” (Dan. ix. 24).

In the climacteric period the day of atonement, the jubilee, the redemption of the purchased possession, all meet together in blessed fulfillment. The fact that at the second coming the Lord Jesus shall appear “apart from sin”, and “without a sin offering” gives no warrant to believe that any blessing then introduced can be experienced and enjoyed apart from the shedding of His blood both as the great redeemer and atoning sacrifice.

“The last trump.”

The year of jubilee was ushered in by the sound of a trumpet (Lev. xxv. 9). In Lev. xxiii. 24 we find the first day of the seventh month ushered in by the blowing of trumpets. This is a holy convocation. What is of importance is that the trumpet sounded on the 10th day of the seventh month is “the last trump” of Israel’s typical year. I Cor. xv. 50-57 is “the last trump” in reality. Rev. x. 7 and xi. 15 is the last trump of the seventh angel, and fulfils the type. The “trump of God” of I Thess. iv. 16 is not called the “last” and may be a fulfillment of the earlier trump on the first day of the seventh month.

The jubilee trumpet not only means deliverance for Israel, but the overthrow of Israel’s enemies, for the very word “jubilee” is translated “rams’ horns” in Josh. vi. Joshua vi. tells of the fall of Jericho. Seven priests bear before the ark seven trumpets and compass the city six days. On the seventh day they compass the city seven times and blow with the trumpets. At the sounding of a long blast of the trumpet all the people shout and Jericho falls:--

“And it came to pass at the seventh time, when the priests blew with the trumpets, Joshua said unto the people, SHOUT: for the Lord hath given you the city” (Josh. vi. 16).

This shout and the sounding of the jubilee trumpet on the overthrow of the accursed city finds its echo in the Hallelujahs that go up at the judgment and overthrow of Babylon (Rev. xix., and the “shout” of I Thess. iv.). It is interesting to note that the “shout” of Josh. vi. 5 & 20 and the word jubilee in Lev. xxv. 9 are the same. The note in *The Companion Bible* at “trumpet” is misleading. The word *yobel* does not occur until verse 10.

Such is a brief survey of the teaching connected with the jubilee, and we believe few would have the temerity to divorce what God has joined together, and will give little heed to that system of teaching which has to say that those who are saved at the consummation are *not* elect and *not* redeemed. Such types as “the present interval of bondage”, “the two seeds” and “the kinsman-redeemer” are by the same system set aside as being “all concerned with the process and not the goal. They apply to intermediate conditions and not ultimate result few were set free by redemption, but *all* went free in the jubilee”. The Virgin birth and the doctrine of I Cor. xv. 21, 22 appear to us as being the

very truth of the kinsman-redeemer type of Israel, and as being connected not only with intermediate conditions but ultimate results.

Summarizing what Scripture actually says, we find that the jubilee is a wonderful type of redemption, emphasizing by the language used the liberty and the re-entry into forfeited rights that are inseparable from the conception of redemption everywhere presented in the Word. We have been redeemed (Eph. i. 7), we are looking forward to *our jubilee* (Eph. i. 14), to the day of the redemption of the purchased possession. Let no man rob us of the blessed hope, ours by the blood of Christ.

#7. Sin. **pp. 183 - 191**

Redemption is both “from” and “to”. Sin underlies the whole purpose of redemption, and necessitates its peculiar characteristics. It is impossible to under-estimate the importance of a Scriptural understanding of “sin”. The purpose of the ages, redemption, death, and resurrection, indeed practically all doctrine, prophecy, and practice are shaped and coloured by its fact and presence.

While it is possible for a study of words to remain barren and lifeless, yet no true doctrine of sin can be attained which either ignores or traverses the words that are used in Scripture, and the meanings which that usage establishes. To study the words we must consider the Hebrew of the O.T., the Greek of the N.T., and also the Greek of the LXX, the latter which, though uninspired, forms a providential link, or bridge, whereby the original Hebrew idea as contained in the O.T. can be discovered without reference to classical Greek in the New. At some other time we hope to deal with the place of the Septuagint Version (LXX) in the interpretation of the Scriptures, but will not go into the matter here other than express deep gratitude for the overruling providence of the Lord, Who has so wonderfully provided us with a ready means of extending and of checking our knowledge and interpretation of the Old Testament Hebrew.

Sin is essential failure.

The word that stands for sin in its widest meaning in the O.T. is derived from the Hebrew word *chata*, which finds its Greek equivalent in the N.T. word *hamartano*. The meaning of both the Hebrew and the Greek word is *failure*. The word *chata* is used in a non-doctrinal sense in Judges xx. 16, where we read of “seven hundred chosen men left-handed, every one of whom could sling stones at an hair’s breadth, and not *miss*”. In Prov. xix. 2 we read, “He that hasteneth with his feet *sinneth*”. Here the word “sinneth” has been rendered “strayeth”, “trippeth”, “miss his step”.

Cremer gives the derivation of *hamartano* as privative or negative, and *meiromai*, not to become participator in, not to attain, to arrive, to arrive at a goal. Numerous examples

can be found in classical Greek writers where the word means “to miss”, as in shooting (*Il.* xxiii. 857), or “to miss the way” (*Thucyd.* Iii. 98, 2). As a rule the LXX renders *chata* by *hamartanein*; other renderings are rare.

The apostle Paul gives expression to the radical idea of sin in Rom. iii. 23 when he says, “For all have sinned, and *come short* of the glory of God”.

Sin is essentially negative.

At first sight it may appear that these two words chosen by God to express generic sin are not strong enough, that we look in vain for the guilt, the transgression, the positive wickedness of sin. Upon closer acquaintance with the subject we learn that wickedness and rebellion with all their concomitants spring from that initial failure on the part of man. Man was made in the image of God, and placed on the earth to have dominion. By the deception of Eve Satan caused Adam to miss the mark, to come short of the glory of God expressed in the “image”, and he who had been given dominion himself came under the twofold dominion of sin and death. One has only to read II Cor. iv. 4, “the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, Who is the image of God”, to see the complete reversal of this failure on the part of Adam brought about by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There are one or two passages in the N.T. which taken together present an inspired and authoritative definition of sin.

Sin defined.

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law” (I John iii. 4).

A literal translation of this verse reads:--

“Every one who is doing the sin is doing the lawlessness also, and the sin is the lawlessness.”

“The sin is the lawlessness.” The definition is negative. In I John v. 17 we read, “All unrighteousness is sin”. Again unrighteousness is negative. In Rom. xiv. 23 we read, “Everything which is not out of faith is sin”. *Not* out of faith is once more a negative. Here we have the three occasions where Scripture uses the expression “sin is”, and in each case it has to be defined by a negative. Sin is the negation of law, of right, of faith.

Anomia and *anomos* do not in their primary sense mean transgression, but rather that state denominated “not under law” with its resulting condition “lawless”. For example, I Cor. ix. 20 and 21 places the Jew who was “under the law” in contrast with the Gentile who was *anomos*, “without law”, in this instance limiting *nomos* to the law as revealed in the O.T. The same may be said of Rom. ii. 12, “Those who sinned without law”; for in the fuller sense sin cannot be imputed where there is no law at all (Rom. v. 13). Sin is that state and resulting condition that places the sinner outside the pale of

God's law (not necessarily limiting the word to the law of Moses). Righteousness on the other hand is that condition and state arising out of complete conformity to God's law (not necessarily limiting the word to the Mosaic). Hence sin and righteousness are the two extremes, sin the negative, righteousness the positive. This is further emphasized in the words, "All unrighteousness is sin".

Righteousness, the real and the positive.

It is an indescribable comfort to have reached this Scriptural conclusion. Darkness is the negation of light; sin is the negation of right. The perennial dispute as to the origin of sin ceases to have interest. God is light, darkness is the result of shutting out that light. We are here concerned with the positive "light"; there is no problem concerning the negative "darkness". All the other phases of sin with which both Scripture and experience have made us familiar are but the "unfruitful works of darkness", they arise of necessity out of the lawless condition that is essentially sin. Let us give attention to some of the outstanding developments of that original "failure" whereby man "sinned and came short of the glory of God".

The first word which we intend to study is *asham*. This word occurs 35 times in the O.T., and is translated as follows in the A.V.: acknowledge offence; be desolate; be found faulty; be found guilty; be guilty; be made desolate; become desolate; become guilty; hold one's self guilty; offend; trespass; destroy. The LXX translates *asham* by ten different Greek words, *agnoeo*, to be ignorant; *hamartano*, sin; *aphanizo*, corrupt or disfigure; *metameleomai*, repent; *miaino*, defile; *mnesikakeo**, to bear in mind evil received; *parapipto*, fall away; *plemmelleo**, behave unseemly. In combination: *exolothreuo*, destroy; *krino*, judge. (* - *These do not occur in N.T.*)

The LXX like the A.V does not use one Greek word for one Hebrew word, but allows a wide margin in the translation. We must, therefore, to make our understanding clearer and our ground work broader, see what other Hebrew words beside *asham* the LXX renders by the various Greek words cited above:--

<i>Agnoeo</i> translates	/ <i>Sakal</i> (II Chron. xvi. 9), "to do foolishly". / <i>Yaal</i> (Numb. xii. 11), "to do foolishly". \ <i>Shagag</i> (Lev. v. 18), "to err", "sin ignorantly". \ <i>Shagah</i> (Lev. iv. 13), "sin through ignorance".
<i>Hamartano</i> translates	so many words and particularly <i>chata</i> that we reserve notes until we consider that word.
<i>Aphanizo</i> translates	/ <i>Abad</i> (Esther ix. 24), "to destroy". \ <i>Ayin</i> (Prov. x. 25; xii. 7), "no more", "are not".
<i>Metameleomai</i> translates	/ <i>Nacham</i> (Gen. vi. 7), "to repent". \ <i>Asah</i> (Prov. xxv. 8), "to do". / <i>Gaal</i> (Lam. iv. 14), "to pollute self". / <i>Chata</i> (Deut. xxiv. 4), "cause to sin". / <i>Zanach</i> (II Chron. xxix. 19), "to cast away". / <i>Nuach</i> (Eccles. vii. 18), "withdraw".

<i>Miaino</i> translates	{	<i>Chalal</i> (Gen. xlix. 4), “to defile”.
	\	<i>Chaneph</i> (Jer. iii. 1), “be polluted”.
	\	<i>Tumah</i> (Ezek. xxiv. 13), “filthiness”.
	\	<i>Tame</i> (Gen. xxxiv. 5), “to defile”.
	\	<i>Lamad</i> (Jer. ii. 33), “to teach”.
<i>Mnesikakeo</i> translates	/	<i>Gamal</i> (Joel iii. 4), “recompense”.
	\	<i>Chasab</i> (Zech. vii. 10), “imagine”.
<i>Parapipto</i> translates	/	<i>Maphal</i> (Esther vi. 10), “to let fall”.
	\	<i>Maal</i> (Ezek. xiv. 13), “trespass”.
	/	<i>Maal</i> (Josh. vii. 1), “trespass”.
<i>Plemmelleo</i> translates	{	<i>Male</i> (Jer. xvi. 18), “to fill”.
	\	<i>Shagag</i> (Psa. cxix. [cxviii.] 67), “to go astray”.
	/	<i>Abad</i> (Deut. vii. 10), “destroy”.
	/	<i>Baar</i> (II Sam. iv. 11), “take away”.
<i>Exolothreuo</i> translates	{	<i>Gada</i> (I Sam. ii. 31), “cut off”.
	\	<i>Charam</i> (Exod. xxii. 20), “be utterly destroyed”.
	\	<i>Charath</i> (Gen. xvii. 14), “cut off”.
<i>Krino</i> translates	/	<i>Din</i> (Gen. xv. 14), “judge”.
	\	<i>Shaphat</i> (Gen. xvi. 5), “judge, etc.”.

The word *asham* is used many times in Lev. iv. and v. For example, in Lev. iv. 13 *asham* is rendered “are guilty”, and is used to sum up the whole verse, which is as follows:--

“If the whole congregation of Israel SIN THROUGH IGNORANCE, and the thing be HID FROM THE EYES of the assembly, and they have DONE SOMEWHAT against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which should not be done, AND ARE GUILTY (*asham*).”

Similar words come in verses 22 and 27, *asham* is guilt as a result of a sin of *ignorance*. In Lev. v. 2 the touching of an unclean thing, if it be hidden from a person, renders such guilty (*asham*). In verse 17 come the words, “though he *wist it not*, yet is he guilty”, and in verse 19, “he hath certainly trespassed against the Lord”. *Asham* is used in Lev. vi. 4 not only for a sin of ignorance, but for positive dishonesty: “Because he hath sinned, and is guilty (*asham*), he shall restore that which he took violently away.”

The result, effect, and fruit of *asham* are indicated in the other words by which it is translated. It gives “offence” (Ezek. xxv. 12); it brings “desolation” (Ezek. vi. 6); it is “found faulty” (Hos. x. 2); and carries with it the element of destruction (Psa. v. 10, 11). The Greek renderings emphasize the character of ignorance, foolishness, pollution, defilement, and wandering. It is possible that *asham* has been confounded with the verb *shammah*, “to be desolate”, and therefore “desolate” should be expunged from the meaning of the word *asham*.

Returning to Lev. v. and vi. we find the word continually rendered “trespass offering”, and it is the word used in Isa. liii. 10, “When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin”. In II Kings xvii. 30 we read, “The men of Hamath made (*Ashima*)”. This idol the Rabbins say was in the form of a *goat* and a *man*, much as the Romans

describe the satyrs and the god Pan. The connection of the word *asham* both with sin and sin offering might easily suggest this form. There is probably an allusion also to the “sin” of Samaria (Amos viii. 14), which was plainly the *golden calf* set up by Jeroboam (I Kings xii. 30; Hos. viii. 5; Deut. ix. 21).

The Companion Bible gives as the meaning of *asham*, “It is a breach of commandment done in ignorance, but when guilt is proved, requiring atonement”. It appears to have close relation to commandments, and cannot be predicated of those to whom no law is given. The reader when reminded of the tragedy of Gentile *ignorance* revealed in such passages as Rom. i. 18-32, and Eph. iv. 18, 19 (*see* Volume XV, pp. 99-106 for fuller treatment of this phase) will not consider this firstborn child of sin one to be treated lightly.

Purposeless toil.

The next in the awful genealogy of sin is *amal*. Failure (*chata*) begat ignorance (*asham*), and guilty ignorance begat weary, purposeless toil (*amal*). Sin has made life a burden, work has been turned into weariness, why? Because it has *missed the mark*. Labour that does not consistently and consciously aim at the glory of God must spend its strength in vain. Sin dominates the members of our bodies, and uses them as instruments of unrighteousness. Only when freed from this dominion, only when we can “serve in newness of spirit” can we entertain the hope that our labour shall not be in vain (I Cor. xv. 58). The book of Ecclesiastes is Scripture’s commentary upon sin’s purposeless, wearisome toil.

Amal occurs 68 times and is translated as follows in the A.V.: grievance, grievousness, mischief, misery, pain, perverseness, sorrow, toil, travail, trouble, labour, iniquity, and wickedness. With the exception of Hab. i. 13 (“iniquity”) and Job iv. 8 (“wickedness”), all the other renderings stress the sorrow, toil and travail of that labour which, having lost its true aim, gives to self and Satan that which belongs alone to God. The old English word *irk*, which gives us *irksome*, is but the Runic *yrk*, work of labour, and tells the same story. Neither time, space, nor the purpose of these articles will allow us to give a similar analysis as that given under the word *asham*; this we may do separately in subsequent issues. What is the next in this descent from sin? Job xv. 35 says, “They conceive mischief (*amal*) and bring forth vanity (*aven*), and their belly prepareth deceit (*mirmah*)”. So the frightful pedigree grows.

Aven.—Although the word *aven* is rendered in Job xv. 35 vanity, that is not the best translation, and the margin reads, “or iniquity”, and this is the true rendering. Whereas *vanity* occurs but six times for *aven*, *iniquity* occurs 47 times, *wickedness* or *wicked* 7, *idol* twice, *affection* and *mischief* three times each, and one occurrence only of the following, *evil*, *mourning*, *nought*, *sorrow*, *false*, *mourners*, *unjust*, *unrighteous*, and *vain*. While iniquity may be a truer rendering of *aven* than vanity, yet we must not bring our modern idea of iniquity into the word. In Hos. iv. 15 Beth-aven is the house of idolatry or vanity, and a play upon the word is found in Amos v. 5—“Bethel shall come to

nought (*aven*)". The last occurrence of the word used in the O.T. is in Zech. x. 2: "The idols have spoken *vainity*". Both Jew and Gentile have passed through this stage:--

The Gentile.

"Because when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were they thankful; but became *vain* in their imagination and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image uncleanness and vile affections inventors of evil things" (Rom. i. 21-30).

The Jew.

"They changed their (or My) glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass they joined themselves unto Baal-peor they provoked His anger with their inventions" (Psa. cvi. 20-29).

The first meaning of iniquity, as discovered by the meaning and usage of the word *aven*, is not so much the violation of any one particular law, but the violation of the basis of all law, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me". The LXX renders *aven* by *anomia* more than by any other word. The mystery of iniquity is expressed by the "lawless one", and manifested by the usurpation of Divine honours by the man of sin. It is a wholesome corrective to remember this phase. We are more prone to place murder, robbery, adultery, and lying, foremost; these are but the outcome of that primitive iniquity which, by enthroning self, dethrones God. The state of heart and mind resulting from sin is expressed in the word *avah* (N.B.—Care should be taken by those who "search and see" not to confuse this word which commences with the letter *ayin* with the word *avah* which commences with the letter *aleph*).

Deformity.

Avah means wrong. Wrong comes from the same source that provides "to wring" and "awry", and is cognate with the Dutch "wring", *acid* or *sour*. The original idea of *avah* is expressed in the following:--

"I was *bowed down* at the hearing of it" (Isa. xxi. 3).

"He hath made my paths *crooked*" (Lam. iii. 9).

"He *turneth* it upside down" (Isa. xxiv. 1).

Perversity seems to express the meaning of the word. Sin having missed the mark renders all labour abortive, and our very natures are wrung out of course or "wrong", "perverse".

Deceit.

Avah leads to *aval*. If *avah* means that nature which is crooked, *aval* indicates those actions that are deceitful and unfair. In about thirty passages the word is rendered iniquity, and in the sense of a departure from that which is equal or right; this expresses fairly well the meaning of the word. "He that soweth iniquity (*aval*) shall reap vanity

(*aven*)” (Prov. xxii. 8). And so the weary process is repeated from generation to generation.

We now reach those aspects and phases of sin that demand more vigorous and active titles to express their character. Up till now we have seen sin as a failure, its condition ignorance, its fruit vanity, its course distortion, but this can have but one result, viz., active rebellion and transgression.

Restless revolt.

Thus we get *abar*, transgression. The primary meaning of *abar* is to pass over (*see* Gen. xxxii. 10, 16, 31, xxxiii. 3; Exod. xii. 12). *Pasha*, rebellion, and *rasha*, wickedness. I Sam. xx. 3 uses the word *pasha*, “There is but a *step* between me and death”, and the marginal reading of Isa. xxvii. 4, “I would *march* against them”. These usages show that *pasha* is similar to *abar* in the thought of overstepping. *Abar* oversteps the bounds, *pasha* revolts against authority. “I have nourished and brought up children, and they have *rebelled* against Me” (Isa. i. 2).

Rasha, wickedness, is revolt in progress, rebellion rushing to ruin. Its essential meaning is that of violent commotion, the exact opposite of peace. Micah vi. 11 speaks of the “wicked balances”, which contrast with that sense of equal poise expressed by “just balances”. Job iii. 17 speaks of the wicked in a context that expresses restless character. “There the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary be at rest.” So also Isa. lvii. 20, 21 speaks to the same effect: “The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waves cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.” These are the “ungodly” of Psalms i. 1, 4, 6, and the “malefactors” and “thieves” indicated prophetically in Isa. liii. 9.

Evil and ruin.

Such negation of right and commission of wrong has but one end. This is foreshadowed in the word *ra*, evil. This word is translated *evil* no less than 444 times in the O.T. Its primary meaning is to break, and to destroy, “Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron” (Psalms ii. 9). Then *to afflict, to entreat evil* (Job xxiv. 21). *Ra* is translated by a number of words that suggest calamity and trouble: *adversity* 4 times, *affliction* 6, *calamity* once, *displeasure* 4, *distress* once, *grief* and *grievous* 3, *harm* once, *hurt* 20, *misery* once, *sad, sore, sorrow, trouble, wretchedness* among others will show that the primitive idea of “ruin” is never absent from the word. The reader, with a concordance before him, or even the above citations, will not be greatly troubled by those who wish to bring out of Isa. xlv. 7 a bolster for the teaching that God is the creator of sin. The book of Ecclesiastes provides a commentary upon the meaning of evil no less than that of vanity. The writer speaks of *sore travail* (i. 13), work that is *grievous* (ii. 17), a vanity and a great *evil* (ii. 21), as he sees the ruin and the purposeless toil that has resulted from sin.

There are several other words used to portray the many-sidedness of sin, but those we have considered are the chief. By one man sin entered into the world, and all have sinned and COME SHORT (*chata*). This condition is named as one of lawlessness and unrighteousness. Our very natures are wrung out of their course, or wrong and crooked (*avah*), we are plunged into ignorance that is not synonymous with innocence (*asham*), and all our efforts are purposeless, wearisome toil (*amal*). We have turned our backs upon God, and a usurper has dominion over us. Sin has mounted the throne of God (*aven*), and deceit and inequality, iniquity in fact, now mark us (*aval*). We pass over or transgress the law of conscience or of revelation (*abar*), and become rebels (*pasha*). Restless wickedness becomes our characteristic (*rasha*), and utter ruin, or evil, is our end (*ra*). Such is the condition of the sons of Adam. From such a state nothing can deliver them, but the redemption that is in Christ.

It will be found that in Rom. v. 6-10, when speaking of those who stand in need of salvation, the apostle deals with sin in somewhat the same way in which we have treated its development. He begins with the negative and passive, and leads on to the positive and active:--

For when we were yet WITHOUT STRENGTH	\	negative.
In due time Christ died for the UN-GODLY	/	
While we were yet SINNERS	\	positive.
When we were ENEMIES	/	

The types of sin in the Scriptures will need examination before we have considered all that has been given to teach us, and these we must pass in review in a subsequent article. So far we have gathered something of the nature of sin from the inspired language employed to describe its character and its outgoings. We must, however, seek a clearer Scriptural understanding of the redemption that delivers. We commend this study to all true *Bereans*, praying that the method suggested in investigating the word *asham* may stimulate others to search out similar phenomena in connection with the remaining words. We should welcome any help in this direction, and would forewarn any who contemplate the search, that they will have "need of patience", and that, as the study requires accuracy both of text reference and original words, some system of checking must be adopted to make such study of service.

The Epistle to the Romans.

#1. Introduction to the Study.

pp. 33 - 37

Perhaps no one book in the whole of the Scriptures may be considered to have a claim upon all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, more than the Epistle to the Romans. Where all exhibit the hall-mark of inspiration comparisons are odious, but inasmuch as a building needs foundations as well as top stones, so we may speak of the epistle to the Romans as essentially fundamental in character.

In this epistle Israel as well as Gentile, both in their sin and their salvation, are placed in their true relation to the purpose of God. Here sin receives its fullest exposure and here justification by faith its grandest exposition. Doctrinal, practical and dispensational truth receive equal attention, and the whole argument is conducted upon a calmer level than was possible when dealing with matters so personal as those which prompted the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians.

To those who are vitally concerned with the teaching of Ephesians, Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 is of supreme importance, for Eph. ii. 1 proceeds upon the assumption that Rom. vi. is practical truth. Philippians too does not teach but assumes knowledge of justification by faith (Phil. iii. 9). (*See Booklet "Romans Stones for the Ephesian Temple"*).

The theme of the Epistle.

As we read the epistle it is very evident that the church at Rome contained a fairly even mixture of Jewish and Gentile believers, and the necessity to adjust the differences between them and both of them to the gospel is the motive that prompted the writing of the epistle.

We must be on our guard against a too sweeping generalization in the attempt to express in one line the teaching of this epistle. As Dean Farrar writes, "Who will pretend to give in a few words the central conception of the 'Prometheus Vincit' or of 'Hamlet'?" Much less can we hope to do so with such an epistle as that to the Romans.

The central feature of the epistle may well have been the dispensational passage covering chapters x. and xi., for this touches the sore point of Israel's rejection. This would necessitate not only a reference to Sinai and to the covenant made before that with Abraham, but in virtue of Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles would demand a statement that carried things as far back as Adam. This is indeed what we find. To the apostle Paul we must look for information concerning the relation of Adam and the race, and to this epistle in particular for its fullest exposition.

Inner and outer teaching.

The epistle to the Romans, while it must be read through as one would an ordinary letter, must be studied along the lines of its divisions, and the first division of importance is that which we call the outer and the inner. The outer occupies Rom. i. 1 - v. 11 and ix. 1 - xvi. 24. The inner occupies Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 and xvi. 25-27. The dominant figure (speaking of men) in Rom. i. - v. 11 is Abraham, whereas the dominant figure in Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 is Adam. The background of Rom. i. is Babel; the background of Rom. v. 12 is Eden. Sins are the concern of the outer; sin the concern of the inner.

The reader will observe that the concluding verses of Rom. xvi. are considered as a part of the inner teaching of Romans. This we must study in its place, but we will here say that we do not believe that "the mystery" of Ephesians is in view in Rom. xvi. Let us compare the opening and closing words of the epistle.

The Outer Section. Introduction. (Rom. i. 1-7).	The Inner Section. Conclusion. (Rom. xvi. 25-27).
The gospel of God. Concerning His Son Jesus Christ. Promised afore by His prophets in the holy Scriptures. For obedience of faith unto all nations. Grace from God our Father.	My gospel. The preaching of Jesus Christ. According to the revelation of the mystery, kept in silence in age times, but now manifested, and through prophetic writings made known. To all nations for the obedience of faith. Praise to the <i>aionian</i> God and the only wise God.

As a further unfolding of the different point of view of the inner and outer portions of the epistle we observe the usage and occurrence of some important words.

Sin.—Occurs 47 times. Of these 6 occurrences are found in the outer portion (chapters i. - v. 11, ix. - xvi.) and 41 in the inner portion (v. 12 - viii.). It will be seen that this word is particularly connected with the inner portion.

Wrath.—This word occurs 12 times, and is exclusively used in the outer section. Contrary to popular exposition, the wrath of God is not mentioned in connection with Adam's sin. As a parallel to this, we might mention that wrath is not spoken of at the great white throne; wrath was completed in the vials poured out upon the earth before the Millennium.

Justify.—

<i>Dikaioo</i> (to justify).	11 times in outer, 4 times in inner.
<i>Dikaiozes</i> (justification).	One occurrence in each.
<i>Dikaioma</i> (judicial sentence).	Twice in outer. Three times in inner.
<i>Dikaiozune</i> (righteousness).	28 times in outer, 8 times in inner.
<i>Dikaioz</i> (righteous).	5 in outer, 2 in inner.

Justification and righteousness are the theme of the outer portion, rather than the inner.

Faith.—

<i>Pistis</i> (faith).	38 occurrences, all in outer section.
<i>Pisteuo</i> (believe).	20 occurrences in outer, one only in inner.

Here we have 59 occurrences of "faith" and "believe" with but one occurrence only in the inner section.

Gospel.—

<i>Euaggelion</i> (gospel).	9 occurrences in outer, once in inner.
<i>Euaggelizo</i> (preach gospel).	4 occurrences in outer portion.

The one occurrence in the inner section is in the doxology of chapter xvi., where the gospel is intimately related to the mystery. There is no mention of either faith or gospel in v. - viii.

Death.—

<i>Thanatos</i> (death).	Once in outer, 21 in inner.
<i>Thanatoo</i> (to die).	3 times in inner portion only.
<i>Apothnesko</i> (to die).	9 times in outer, 12 in inner.

Spirit.—

Pneuma. 12 in outer, 22 in inner. Of these 22 occurrences, 21 are found in chapter viii.

Comparing this word with the distribution of "faith", it will be seen that faith is practically confined to the outer section and spirit to the inner. Another method of comparison, which brings out the distinctive viewpoints of the two sections, is to take similar expressions found in both sections, and observe their different usage and connection, e.g:--

Redemption.—

Apolutrosis. Rom iii. 24 outer: Rom. viii. 23 inner.

The first occurrence speaks of the redemption that is in Christ and deals with sin and justification. The second speaks of the redemption of the body, the adoption, the resurrection. In the former we are saved by *faith*, in the latter we are saved by *hope*.

Reckon.—*Logizomai*. In chapter iv., where the word occurs 11 times, it is God that reckons, the believer being passive. In Rom. vi. and viii. it is the believer who reckons, and he is no longer passive.

The earnest student will not rest here, but will accept the above as a suggestion only, and will prosecute similar comparisons and so bring the two sections into clearer focus.

The outer section (i. 1 - v. 11 and ix. 1 - xvi. 24) is sub-divided as follows:--

Doctrine (i. 1 - v. 11).

- a | i. 1-17. General statement. Justification by faith.
- b | i. 18-32. Gentile.
- c | ii. 1-29. Jew.
- d | iii. 1-31. All the world.
- e | iv. 1 - v. 11. Particular exposition. Justification by faith.

Dispensation (ix. - xi.).

- a | ix. 1-29. Elect remnant.
- b | ix. 30-33. Prophets.
- c | x. 1-13. Law.
- d | x. 14-21. Gospel.
- e | xi. 1-36. Elect remnant.

Practice (xii. - xii. 24).

- a | xii. 1-21. Relation to God and members of body.
- b | xiii. 1-14. Relation to civil authority and neighbour.
- c | xiv. 1 - xv. 7. Relation of Jewish and Gentile members.
- d | xv. 8-33. Relation of Jewish and Gentile believers.
- e | xvi. 1-24. Relation to individual workers.

This article is confessedly introductory, and here for the moment we stay so that we may commence the exposition of the epistle proper untrammelled by these tabulations and outlines. This we hope to do in our next article. We do not mean that the above method of study is to be despised or discounted, but rather valued and encouraged, and we commend it to all readers who desire first-hand knowledge of the Word itself.

#2. The Salutation (i. 1-7). pp. 65 - 76

The opening section of the epistle is comprised of three parts,
(1) The salutation (1-7);
(2) The personal references to the apostle (8-16);
(3) The thesis of the epistle (17).

The salutation, which occupies seven verses, is far more doctrinal and weighty than that of any other epistle. The earlier epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians and Thessalonians are addressed to the churches in those respective towns. This epistle is the first to be addressed, not to a church, but to the "saints". Whatever may have been the reason for this change of address, it certainly reveals the fact that the individual believer began to occupy a position of greater importance than did the corporate assembly, the church.

The salutation is sent (1) from Paul the apostle, (2) to the saints at Rome, (3) greeting them with the twofold salutation of grace and peace. Paul describes himself as (1) a bond slave of Jesus Christ, (2) a called apostle, (3) one separated unto the gospel of God.

At the revelation of the gospel the apostle pauses to make two most vital observations, shewing (1) the gospel's relation to the O.T. Scriptures, and (2) the gospel's relation to the Son of God.

For reasons to be given later, the reference to the Son of God is divided into two parts, one referring to Him "according to the flesh", and the other referring to Him "according to the spirit of holiness". Paul returns to his apostleship to affirm that it was (1) for obedience of faith, and (2) among all nations (or Gentiles); and so to those particularly in view, (1) all at Rome; (2) beloved of God; (3) called saints. Such is the brief analysis. It will repay us to give these weighty words a closer scrutiny.

Paul's three titles.

"Paul, bond slave of Jesus Christ."—From the moment that Paul had been commissioned as a chosen vessel to bear the name of the Lord to the Gentiles, his life had been a fight, both for his message and for his authority. How his whole being shrank from the appearance of boasting that the assertion of his apostleship necessitated may be sensed in II Cor. xi. How vital to the progress, nay the very existence, of the truth, the recognition of his apostleship is may be gauged by reading Gal. i. and ii. Yet we are certain that there was no title that was nearer to the heart of him who loved much, because he had been much forgiven, than that which comes first in this salutation "Paul, a bond slave". He recognized indeed that he was not his own, but that he had been bought with a price. "Whose I am and Whom I serve" is his clear heart-felt testimony.

The first spoken words of Paul the saved were, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do". Even in the epistle to the Galatians, where inspiration demands two chapters out of six to prove the independence and authority of Paul, even there, at the very last, and written with his own hand, he speaks of the "brand marks" that he bears in his body as the bond slave of Christ. Yet as we learn through this self-same Paul that the Lord he served laid aside His glory and humbled Himself, taking upon Him the "form of a slave", we can begin to appreciate that Paul could know no higher honour than to be called the bond slave of that same Christ.

"*A called apostle.*"—It is not correct to read as in the A.V., "called to be an apostle". He was "a called apostle". What this means may be gathered from Heb. v. 4, "And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is *called* of God". The apostle being called of God was neither self appointed nor commissioned by man. We can trace this feature in several references to his apostleship:--

"Paul, an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, Who raised Him from the dead)" (Gal. i. 1).

"Am I not an apostle? Am I not free? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? Are not ye my work in the Lord?" (I Cor. ix. 1).

"I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ and lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth" (I Tim. ii. 7).

The word "apostle" is from *apostello*, "to send from" someone as his legate (Acts xxii. 21, xxvi. 17). In this sense the Lord Himself is called "the Apostle" (Heb. iii. 1), for He was pre-eminently "the Sent One" (*see* John's Gospel). The "sent one" or the "apostle" comes with all the authority of the One that sends him (Matt. viii. 9; Luke x. 16), and it is this fact that lies behind the title "apostle". Not only was Paul an apostle, he was peculiarly separated unto the gospel of God. This separation took place at birth and at Antioch:--

"But when it pleased God, Who SEPARATED me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles" (Gal. i. 15, 16).

Here we have three items that are repeated in Acts xiii., xiv. and Rom. i., viz., (1) the separation; (2) preaching *Him*; (3) among the Gentiles:--

"The Holy Ghost said, SEPARATE me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them they preached the word of God I have found David of *this man's seed* hath God according to His *promise raised* unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus as it is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee by Him all that believe are *justified* from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses it was necessary that the word of God should *first* have been spoken to you (Jews) we turn to the Gentiles they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Acts xiii. and xiv.).

The parallels of this passage with Rom. i. 1-17 are too patent to necessitate detailed proof. It is very evident that Paul's separation unto the gospel of God took place then. Some of the allusions we have quoted will appear more clearly when we have examined Rom. i. a little more. Paul's separation was unto the gospel of God.

What is this gospel?

It is common knowledge with most of our readers that the word gospel means "good news". It may be as well to have the meaning more fully demonstrated at this first occurrence, as we desire this series on Romans to provide as complete a repository of knowledge and understanding as possible for those who are engaged in making this gospel known.

Euaggelion is made up of *eu* (well) and *aggelia* (a message). It is one of a group of words made up with *aggeleia*.

Aggeleia is a message, news (I John i. 5).

Aggello. To bring a message (John xx. 18).

Aggelos. Messenger, angel (Luke vii. 24; ii. 13).

Anaggello. To report back (I John i. 5).

Apaggello. To announce or report (Acts iv. 23).

Diaggello. To convey a message (Rom. ix. 17).

There are thirteen more words necessary to complete the list, but the above are all we need to show the primary idea.

The gospel is God's good message.

God's good message may be the proclamation concerning our forgiveness, our hope of heaven, our peace, etc. God's good message may be the proclamation of the ground or source from which all these blessings flow. In other words, the gospel may be a detailed proclamation of the ills that may be cured, or the proclamation concerning Him Who alone can cure them. Rom. i. leaves us in no doubt as to which is the Scriptural view:--

"The gospel of God concerning His Son" (Rom. i. 1 and 3).

"The gospel the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. i. 15, 16).

"Christ the power of God" (I Cor. i. 24).

"We preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified" (I Cor. i. 23).

"We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord" (II Cor. 14. 5).

These and many other passages clearly set forth this fact. Salvation is not the gospel-- the gospel is the power of God *unto* salvation. Justification is not the gospel, for in the gospel is *revealed* a righteousness of God. Rom. i. 1-4 gives three important tests for the gospel:--

1. It is of GOD.
2. It is according to His WORD.
3. It is concerning His SON.

We believe these three features are unalterable. That neither Christian charity, nor force of circumstances, neither empty churches nor declining subscriptions can ever justify the modification or the excision of one of these three items. No other message has a right to the name gospel, but that of which God is Author. No other message can use this title, but that which rests upon the promises of Holy Scripture. No other message is the gospel, but that which coming from God and fulfilling His word finds its goal in the person of the Son of God.

The gospel and the O.T. Scriptures.

Paul had been charged with introducing innovations, of preaching a self-evolved message, of altering laws and customs, and therefore before he defines his gospel he turns aside to declare that it was entirely in harmony with the O.T. Scriptures, and indeed was the fulfillment of its promises. In verse 17 he picks out one verse from an O.T. prophet and makes it live for all time: "The just shall live by faith." In chapter iii. 10-18 he shows that his doctrine of universal sin is founded upon the O.T. Scriptures, and in chapter iii. 21 declares that the gospel presentation of a righteousness of God without the law is witnessed by the law and the prophets.

The controversy as to faith or works is settled by the appeal "What saith the Scriptures?" (iv. 3). The same appeal runs through chapters ix.-xv. where the remnant, Israel's temporary blindness, the sovereignty of God's choice, the judgment of believers, the justification of Paul's extended ministry, and the inclusion of Gentiles, are all based upon quotations from the O.T. Scriptures. This attitude is not to be looked upon as peculiar to the apostle Paul, it is also the attitude of Peter:--

"The word of the Lord endureth for ever. And THIS IS THE WORD which by the gospel is preached unto you" (I Peter i. 25).

This moreover is the attitude of Christ Himself.

"Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?" (John v. 46, 47).

He who tampers with Moses destroys John iii. 16 (*see* iii. 14). He who ridicules Jonah denies the resurrection (Matt. xii. 40). He who disbelieves the flood doubts the second advent (Matt. xxiv. 37-39). Moreover as a final witness against modernism it was the risen Christ Who declared that all things must be fulfilled that had been written of Him, "in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms" (Luke xxiv. 44). The many who believe the gospel of God as preached by Paul can have neither part nor lot with one who denies the inspiration of the O.T., narrow and old fashioned though such an attitude may appear.

His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

Those who are able to read the original have presented to them in the arrangement of verses 3 and 4 a wonderful conception of this title of Christ, for the words "His Son" are

separated from the words "Jesus Christ our Lord" by the whole of verses 3 and 4, thereby enclosing all the testimony of those verses in this one great title. It is important enough to display in English.

HIS SON	{	/ According to flesh, Seed of David.	\	}	JESUS CHRIST
		\ According to Spirit, Son of God with			OUR LORD.
		power, by resurrection of dead.			

This fact reveals how full that statement is which says, "The gospel of God is concerning His Son".

We have yet to discover the fullness of that great parenthesis of verses 3 and 4 where the title "Son" is explained. We will not waste valuable time and space in repeating the great variety of interpretations that have been put forward by both ancient and modern commentators as to the meaning of almost every clause of this passage, but with a consciousness both of our own fallibility and also of the utter trustworthiness of the Scriptures we seek afresh its meaning and its purpose. And surely this last thought is a good start along the road. If we do not believe that the apostle had any particular purpose in view or that he chose his words with precision like Koheleth of old ("words of truth") we rob ourselves of a great incentive to search and see. If we believe that the words used are the most fitting to express his meaning, and if we believe that the passage is most relevant to the theme of the section and of the epistle, we are the more prepared to receive its message. Let us begin to read and note any feature that looks important.

"Which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh."—Why the seed of David? David's testimony in the Psalms is most emphatic concerning the resurrection of Christ (Acts ii. 25, 29-34; iv. 25). To David were promises made that could only be fulfilled in Christ (Acts xiii. 22, 34, 36). The prophecy of the rebuilding of the tabernacle of David was intimately connected with the salvation of the Gentiles (Acts xv. 16). David unites with Abraham in bearing witness to the essence of the gospel (Rom. iv. 6), and prophesies the failure of Israel (Rom. xi. 9).

If we examine the testimonies of Peter and Paul in the Acts with reference to David we shall perceive a fundamental difference between the good news appertaining to each. Peter sees Christ as the seed of David raised from the dead to sit upon the throne of his father David (Acts ii. 30). Paul sees the same Christ raised from the dead as Saviour both for Israel and the Gentiles, and bringing to light the doctrine of justification by faith (Acts xiii.). Both Peter and Paul were divinely inspired and both give in their opening utterances (Pentecost and Antioch) the key to their respective messages. Peter had preached "Jesus Christ of the seed of David raised from the dead" according to his gospel, which had the circumcision always in mind, whereas Paul in writing to Timothy says:--

"Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel, wherein I suffer trouble as an evil doer study rightly dividing the word of truth" (II Tim. ii. 8-15).

Paul knew from painful experience the attitude of the circumcision to his gospel, and it was necessary therefore when writing to the saints at Rome to begin with Christ according to the flesh and to lead on to Christ according to the Spirit. Paul's gospel necessitated Jesus Christ "made of a *woman*, made under the law" (Gal. iv. 4), to touch the need of Gentile and of Jew, more than Christ as the Seed of David. Paul needed to emphasize that Christ was the Seed of Abraham (Gal. iii. 16) for the Gentiles' sake, rather than His descent from David. Christ as the Seed of the woman, the Seed of Abraham, and the Seed of David are the three great foundation stones of the gospel. At the same time Paul adds "according to the flesh", and as such he had already declared that he no longer knew Christ (II Cor. v. 16). Christ according to the flesh is connected with Israel: "Who are Israelites and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came" (Rom. ix. 4, 5). Until the Lord died on the cross He was "straitened", and limited His ministry to the lost sheep of the house of Israel:--

"Now this I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers" (Rom. xv. 8).

Not until He was raised from the dead could the Gentiles glorify God for His mercy (Rom. xv. 9-12, 16). The Gentiles' relation to Christ as root of Jesse is clearly millennial in its full application (Rom. xv. 12; Isa. xi.). The reference to Christ as the Seed of David according to the flesh is preparatory to the second statement.

"And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."—There are a series of problems that need solution in this verse. What is the meaning of *horizo*, "declared"? Do the words "with power" read with the word "declared", i.e., powerfully declared, or do they read with the words "the Son of God"? Do the words "spirit of holiness" refer to the Holy Spirit, the gifts of the Spirit given at Pentecost, or the risen and spiritual nature of Christ? Finally, does the resurrection of the dead refer to the raising of such as Lazarus, or to the saints as recorded in Matt. xxvii. 52 and 53, or to the resurrection of Christ Himself? Quite a number of answers have been given to these questions.

Horizo, "declared", and *aphorizo*, "separated" (verse 1), have much the same meaning. The ancient Syriac translates *horizo* by "known to be". The Latin Vulgate reads "predestinated". The primary idea of the word is "to be bound", "to fix the limits", as in Acts xvii. 26, "and hath determined (*horizo*) the bounds (*horothessio*)". Then, to determine as a purpose (Luke xxii. 22; Acts ii. 23). The resurrection of the dead marked off the Lord Jesus as the Son of God with power. It fixed a boundary, it indicated a phase of the purpose of God. Scripture declares that Christ "was crucified through weakness, yet He liveth by the power of God" (II Cor. xiii. 4). Scripture declares that "Christ dieth no more", and it is equally true to say Christ suffereth no more, is weary no more, is hungry no more, is tempted no more, weeps no more, shall be buffeted and scourged and spit upon and crucified no more. The boundary fixed by God for that weakness was at the cross. The resurrection marked Him off the Son of God with power. It will be remembered that Peter quotes the second Psalm in Acts iv. and Paul quotes it in Acts xiii. In that Psalm we read:--

"I will declared the decree: the Lord hath said unto Me, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron" (Psa. ii. 7, 9).

The word decree has much the same force as *horizo*, and it is possible that there is an allusion to this passage in the apostle's words. A great number of commentators and expositors translate the words "with power" adverbially, "powerfully demonstrated to be the Son of God", referring the power to the act of demonstrating. The order of the words in the original seems to be against that interpretation, for the ordinary Greek construction was open to the apostle and would have expressed that meaning without ambiguity. We believe that had he meant the words "with power" to be understood adverbially he would have placed *en dunamei* between *tou* and *horisthentoo*; as it is *en dunamei* follows the words *huion Theou*, "Son of God". Moreover it is not in line with Greek thought to use *dunamis*, "power", for a "powerful" argument or demonstration. The simpler rendering and the one that fulfils all requirement is to read, "The Son of God with power".

What are we to understand by the spirit of holiness? We may be fairly sure that the Holy Spirit is not intended here, for the words used when the Holy Spirit or spiritual gifts are intended are *to pneuma to hagion*, or *pneuma hagion*, whereas the words used here are *pneuma hagiosunes*. Moreover the words "according to the flesh" and according to "the spirit of holiness" are in such evident relation to one another as to demand the meaning to be the setting forth of the two aspects of the nature of Christ. In resurrection the Lord is called "Spirit":--

"The last Adam was made a quickening Spirit" (I Cor. xv. 45).
"Now the Lord (Jesus) is that Spirit" (II Cor. iii. 17).
"Offered Himself through the *aionian* Spirit" (Heb. ix. 14).
"Put to death in flesh, yet quickened in Spirit" (I Pet. iii. 18).
"Manifested in flesh, justified in Spirit" (I Tim. iii. 16).

"*From resurrection of dead.*"—The word from is *ek*, out of suggesting origin. There is no article before either resurrection or dead. The resurrection manifested Him to be the Son of God with power. Why is the expression so vague? It does not definitely say "by His resurrection" or "by the resurrection from among the dead", but just "by resurrection of dead". Paul himself has made it abundantly clear in I Cor. xv. that all who ever have or who ever will be raised from the dead are raised only through Christ. The raising of Lazarus is closely associated with the confession of Martha, "I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John xi. 27), and in fulfillment of that glorious title, "I am the resurrection and the life" (John xi. 25). From the fact that the words of Rom. i. 4 may read, "by a resurrection of dead persons", some see a reference to Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, where "many bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of their graves after His resurrection", and once again (in the context) we must meet with the confession, "Truly, this was the Son of God".

In John v., by claiming to be the Son of God, the Lord came near to being stoned for blasphemy, and He added to that claim the power to raise from the dead, "all that are in the graves". All the claims made by the Son of God were vindicated at His resurrection. Then it was that He was declared to be the Son of God with power. The resurrection of Christ is the pledge given by God that all His purposes shall be fulfilled:--

"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).

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know ASSUREDLY, that God hath made that same Jesus, Whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ" (Acts ii. 36).

"Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted He hath shed forth THIS" (Acts ii. 33).

Now all this is involved in the title, "His Son Jesus Christ our Lord"; and all this is of necessity involved in the gospel of God which is concerning His Son. The preaching of "Jesus, a man approved of God" is not sufficient, and, despite popular evangelism, to determine to know nothing among men save Jesus Christ and Him crucified does not fulfil the requirements. The gospel of God concerns His Son Who died and was buried and rose again according to the Scriptures.

**The gospel. His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.
The apostle.**

If the gospel is seen to be so full by reason of Him Who is its glorious subject, the apostleship of Paul also grows in dignity as we realize the One Who sent him.

"By whom we have received grace and apostleship."—The apostle never seemed to be able to think of his office unmoved. The glory of it made him marvel at the grace that could save and commission one such as he had been. Speaking not merely of his salvation, but of his ministry, he said, "To me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given" (Eph. iii. 8). This apostleship was

"For faith obedience among all the Gentiles for His name."—How are we to understand the words "obedience of faith"? Some refer to Acts vi. 7, "A great company of priests were obedient to the faith". In Rom. i. 5 there is no article, whereas in Acts vi. 7 there is. The gospel is often designated "the faith". The same expression "faith obedience" is repeated in Rom. xvi. 26. There it is not believing the gospel that is in view, but the "stablishing" of those who had already believed and moreover had knowledge of the mystery there revealed. A comparison of Rom. i. 8 with Rom. xvi. 19 suggests the true meaning:--

"Your FAITH is spoken of throughout the whole world."
"Your OBEDIENCE is come abroad unto all men."

Or again, in Rom. x. 14 and 16 he says:--

"How shall they BELIEVE in Him of Whom they have not heard."
"They have not all OBEYED the gospel, for Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath BELIEVED our report?"

Faith obedience is set in vivid contrast with legal obedience. The one is grace, the other works. The sphere of one is spirit, the other flesh. Christ is the head of one, Moses

if the other. This faith obedience was for all nations, and on account of His name. Among these nations were the believers at Rome. They were "the called of Jesus Christ", "the beloved of God" and "called saints". To such the apostle sends the greeting:--

"Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."—"Grace" by itself was the light hearted Greek salutation (Acts xxiii. 26). "Peace" (*shalom*), the deeper greeting of the Hebrew. The two are combined by the apostle. Such is the greeting of the apostle placed at the opening of this weighty epistle. Like all the works of God, it is entirely in keeping with its position. Witness how in its short compass it contains weighty words concerning:--

- (1). Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles.
- (2). The gospel as it relates to Christ.
- (3). Christ considered according to the flesh and the spirit.
- (4). The sphere of Paul's ministry.--"All nations."
- (5). The nature of his testimony.--"Faith obedience."
- (6). The incentive for both minister and believer.--"For the sake of His Name."

May we be permitted to make a few observations for the help of those who are engaged in the ministry of the Word. You are not your own master, nor your congregation's servant. You like Paul are the bond slave of Christ. Whether you labour with your hands in the work-a-day world, or whether your whole time is devoted to the ministry, you are separated unto the gospel of God. You cannot preach that gospel and doubt the O.T. Scriptures. Neither can you preach that gospel and fail to preach Christ. Even though you preach Christ you will not preach a full gospel without Christ risen. Your own obedience and the obedience enjoined by you upon others is not a legal obedience, but an obedience of faith. *Grace and peace be with all such.*

#3. Paul: the man and the message (i. 8-17). pp. 113 - 121

"Plans pertain to the heart of man, but the last word is from the Lord" (Prov. xvi. 1).

These words apply not only to the average man, but even to an apostle. Paul had on more than one occasion experienced the crossing of his plans. Nevertheless he had proved that the "last word" of the Lord excelled the dearest plans of the heart of man. "Forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia", he "assayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered him not", and therefore taking the only course left he found himself at Troas, there to see the vision of the man of Macedonia, and to "gather assuredly" both the will of the Lord and the reason for the closed doors in Asia and Bithynia (*see* Acts xvi. 6-9). On another occasion the Corinthians apparently suggested that he made promises but did not keep them, and the paraphrase of Chrysostom on II Cor. i. 17 is:--

"Did I show levity, or do I plan after the flesh, that the yea with me must be always yea, and the nay always nay, as it is with a man of the world who makes his plans independently of God's overruling of them?"

It may *appear* to be a very high standard of righteousness that makes a man's word his bond: it may actually *be* a higher one still for a man to appear untrustworthy because he desires ever to obey the higher will of God. To recognize such a state makes the added "D.V." a sacred duty and no longer a pious convention. Consistency has sometimes been obeyed before the claims of added light, and then humbling for a leader to confess to making a mistake, but what a trustworthy leader is he who will make the confession!

Paul's projected visit to Rome.

Paul had many times prayed for and planned a journey to Rome. His non-appearance he says must not be put down either to fear or laxity.

"Oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, but was let hitherto" (Rom. i. 13).

In chapter xv. he gives expression to the latest plan he had devised and the grounds upon which it rested. We are men, we make plans, our grounds may be as true as the apostle's, but our ability to forecast all that God has for us to do may as signally fail. Therefore it will be no waste of time to learn from the apostle here. He had fully preached the gospel, and had striven to preach where Christ was unnamed, and had accomplished a grand circle from Jerusalem unto Illyricum:--

"For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming to you" (Rom. xv. 19-22).

He now saw that his work in those parts was done, and this combining with a great desire for many years to visit Rome, his plan was that after taking the contribution he had for the poor saints at Jerusalem, he would journey to Spain and on his way visit Rome and be somewhat filled with their company. Let us view this "plan" in the light of "the last word". His estimate was correct as to his having finished his appointed ministry in those parts. His desire to visit Rome was granted, and his assurance that when he did visit Rome he would come "in the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ" (Rom. xv. 29) was fulfilled in a sense that Paul then could not conceive. He asked the saints' prayers that he may be "delivered from them that do not believe in Judaea" (Rom. xv. 31).

This apprehension of the apostle was prophetic. It was the instrumental cause of his journey to Rome, and also of his imprisonment. It will be seen that God's answer to Paul's prayers transcended in spiritual value the highest flight of his petitions. It was a glorious thing to contemplate a visit to Spain with the gospel, but seen from the standpoint of history it was infinitely more glorious for Paul to have been cast into prison, there to receive the crown of all revelation. This story should be a comfort to us. It may be that we see clearly that another phase of our experiences is closing. We pray, we plan, we *think* we see, we go partly forward. Doors close, we appear in the eyes of others to

have hesitated, trifled, failed to make up our mind. Perhaps we have too readily said yea yea, and nay nay, and not so emphatically "If the Lord will". Both in Rom. i. 10 and xv. 32 we find the expression "by the will of God to come unto you". God reads the heart. It was good to find in the heart of David the desire to build a house for God, although it could not be permitted to him.

The apostle Paul has been given to us as an example. A picture was once described in a catalogue as being "After Rembrandt", and someone prefixed the words "A long way", making the description read "A long way after Rembrandt". Most of us must come in this category, "A long way after Paul", yet we have received him as a precious gift from the Lord, as a pattern, as a guide, one who bids us follow him as he followed his Lord. Therefore, however far off our following may be, we rest easy when we can find any parallel between our path and that of the great apostle. When we are thwarted as he was thwarted, when we are cast down as he was cast down, when we are delivered as he was delivered, and oh joy! when unconsciously we are falsely accused and misrepresented as he was. Nothing is so strengthening to one's position than to receive a letter from someone whose fulminations against one's teaching or character resemble those which were hurled at the apostle of the Gentiles by the religious leaders of his day.

All my affairs, and how I do.

It will therefore be readily understood that the personal items that the Spirit of God has included in Holy Writ concerning the apostle Paul are items of too deep an interest for us to slur over. We are convinced that it is a false species of sanctity that cannot stoop to these lowly things of daily life. The "high-brow" will be found in religion as well as in art or music. The God we love marks the sparrow's fall, the Lord we trust spoke of such trifles as patching old garments. Paul could entrust Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, with so lowly a message as "my affairs, and how I do" (Eph. vi. 21).

Can we imagine Tychicus resenting the humble task? He would have been neither the beloved brother nor the faithful minister if he had. We remember hearing once that the words of Paul asking for "the books, but especially the parchments", saved the library of a super-sensitive soul. Have the words of Paul respecting "the cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest bring with thee" no word of comfort to-day? Is it of no service to be reminded that the mighty Paul was a man of like infirmities as ourselves? There is a great deal of hypocrisy which passes for sanctity, that vanishes into the air upon the searching acquaintance of a few months under the same roof. Let us live in the company of this man of God, we shall all be the better for it.

Paul's concern for Rome.

We must now turn our attention a little more closely to Rom. i., noting the steps that lead up to the great declaration of verse 17:--

1. Thanksgiving for the faith of the saints at Rome.
2. Incessant prayer for them also.

This prayer is further detailed so as to show his intense desire to visit them, which had in view:--

3. The establishing of the saints by the imparting of some spiritual gift.

This is very graciously expanded to include the comfort also of the apostle, "by the mutual faith of you and me". Moreover the apostle desired fruit from these Gentiles as of others.

4. To show that his long delay was prompted neither by fear nor laxity he declares that he was a debtor to preach the gospel to all men, Rome included, and that
5. He was not ashamed of the gospel, because it was the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.

This leads on to the theme of the epistle, viz., i. 17. Why did Paul feel it necessary to call upon God as a witness concerning his prayer for the Romans? When he called upon God to bear witness that he had not used flattering words, nor a cloak of covetousness (I Thess. ii. 5), it must have been because some had falsely accused him of these things. When he claimed to be a preacher and an apostle and a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth he was compelled to say, "I speak the truth in Christ and lie not" (I Tim. ii. 7), the reason being that his apostleship had been challenged. When he heads the dispensational section of Romans with the words, "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. ix. 1), the reason is that his zeal as the apostle of the Gentiles had been misrepresented and he had been accused of having lost his love for his own people, which was grossly untrue. So in Rom. i. 9. Paul knew that enemies were busy defaming and misrepresenting him. He says in effect that no man can be said to be either afraid or neglectful of whom God will bear witness that unceasingly he prays for the opportunity of visiting them and of being a means of blessing to them in the hands of God.

The apostle desired by his visit to impart some spiritual gift "to the end ye may be established". The apostle's attitude to spiritual gifts was of preference for those that edified the church rather than drew honour and credit to the possessor. Gifts were *confirmatory* (I Cor. i. 6, 7, and II Cor. i. 21). He desired to *establish* the saints at Rome. The apostle had one gift that was perhaps greater than all put together, the gift of love that "vaunteth not itself and is not puffed up", and he immediately follows the statement which makes him the dispenser of the gift by one that makes him the sharer with others, viz., "the mutual faith of you and me", a blessed echo of the words and spirit of Matt. xvii. 27. He who could say with clear conscience that he remembered all the saints without ceasing was not above publicly asking the prayers of those to whom he ministered, including such humbling requests as "utterance", "boldness", and grace to speak "as he ought". It takes a great spirit to be so humble. What pigmies we are as we compare ourselves with this man of God!

Moreover the apostle wanted fruit, "fruit unto holiness" (Rom. vi. 22), which was not exclusive of the contribution to the poor saints at Jerusalem, which he called "this fruit"

(Rom. xv. 28). "Fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v. 22); "Fruit of the light" (Eph. v. 9, R.V.); "Fruits of righteousness" (Phil. i. 11); "Fruit unto God" (Rom. vii. 4), and "Fruit that may abound to your account" (Phil. iv. 17). Paul always urged the believer to go on unto perfection.

"*I am debtor*" (Rom. i. 14).—In verse 5 Paul speaks of "grace and apostleship"; here he speaks of responsibility and indebtedness. What he "ought" to do. It is a perversion to look upon grace as a release from all responsibility and obligation, as giving a liberty that is but a veiled license. "I am debtor", said Paul the apostle to the Gentiles. "You are debtors", he said to the Gentile saints when speaking of Jewish believers (Rom. xv. 27). The "grace and apostleship" was unto "all nations" (Rom. i. 5). The *indebtedness* was to Greek and barbarian, wise and unwise, in verse 14. They are but two sides of one truth. That indebtedness included "Rome also" (verse 15).

Rome and the gospel! Rome the proud mistress of the world. The ruthless, crushing iron kingdom on the one hand, the gospel, the preaching of the Crucified on the other. The gospel may be well enough for barbarians and fools, but Rome! Paul had, however, perceived that "all the world was guilty and helpless before God". The highest pinnacle of Roman glory was transient, enduring but for a moment; the purest wisdom of this world was but foolishness with God. "I am not ashamed of the gospel" (verse 16) said Paul. Unless we can feel the force of the figure here we shall lose much of the triumphant ring of Paul's words. There are several examples of the figure of belittling or *tapeinosis* in Romans. "I would not have you ignorant" (i. 13) means much more than a negative wish. It was a strong desire that they should know his intentions and hindrances. "And being not weak in faith" (iv. 19); in reality Abraham was very strong in faith. "Hope maketh not ashamed" (v. 5), yes, but that is not its meaning. Hope triumphs over all tribulation and rejoices in the prospect of the glory of God. The street urchin who replies to our question as to whether he would like this or that by saying "Not half!" is undoubtedly using slang, but those acquainted with the writings of James Russell Lowell will see in the slang of to-day the tropes and figures of to-morrow's poetry. When Paul said, "I am not ashamed", he meant that he gloried in the gospel committed to him. Though he be loaded with ridicule and contempt he knew enough of the power of that gospel to lift him above it all. This same undaunted spirit is manifested in the last epistle he wrote, and the cause is much the same:--

"I suffer these things, nevertheless I am not ashamed, for I know Whom I have believed" (II Tim. i. 12).

In this section of Rom. i. the argument is indicated by the presence of the word "for". He says, I am ready to preach even at Rome, *for* I am not ashamed of the gospel. The reason why he gloried in the gospel, and was willing to preach it to wise and unwise, he expresses by saying, "*for* it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth". The power is next discerned in the words "*for* therein is righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith" (verse 17). The power of God was manifested to the Gentile world by His works in creation (i. 20), but the power of the gospel is something different from this evidence of the old creation, because it belongs to the new, even that power which is so signally connected with the risen Son of God (i. 4). Christ crucified

(I Cor. i. 18) and Christ risen (Rom. i. 4) make the gospel the power of God unto salvation.

A dispensational note.

Between the statement concerning the gospel and its revelation of righteousness the apostle interposes a remark concerning the priority of the Jew. To say that he paused at this important point to remark the perfectly obvious fact that the Jew had the gospel preached to him before the Gentile is scarcely complimentary to his sense of fitness, to say nothing of its trifling character. Are we also to believe that the Jew will be judged at a special judgment earlier than that of the rest of mankind? (Rom. ii. 9). The words of Rom. ii. 16 do not countenance such an idea. "To the Jew first" is a recognition of Israel's dispensational position, and Paul's custom of going first to the synagogue in a town was a recognition of this priority. The apostle was called to serve among the Gentiles, and he magnified his office, yet his heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel was that they might be saved (Rom. x. 1).

Now Rom. i. 17 shows that salvation is essentially connected with righteousness by faith. Rom. x. reveals that the failure of Israel to obtain salvation was because they were ignorant of God's provision, and sought a righteousness of their own by works of law. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, and they had rejected Him. Believing the fact of the resurrection of Christ and believing unto righteousness are parallel expressions in Rom. x. 9, 10. Salvation came to the Jew first, but they failed, and:--

"Through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, to provoke them to jealousy"
(Rom. xi. 11).

Israel were not provoked either to jealousy or to emulation, they became hard and deaf and blind. In Acts xxviii. we see the rejection of Israel, and that the salvation of God was sent unto the Gentiles, as revealed in the prison epistles.

The place of the Gentile during the Acts.

While the believing Gentile was blessed with faithful Abraham, and as a wild olive graft partook of the root and fatness of the olive tree, it is a mistake to believe that the covenant with Abraham was really put into force. The Gentile participation in the covenant with Abraham awaits the salvation of the Jew (Gal. iii. 13, 14), and the calling out of nature's darkness of a company of Gentiles in the time of Israel's probation during the Acts was with the object of provoking Israel to jealousy and making them wake up to the call of the gospel. They did not respond, and their day passed. The present dispensation of the mystery is not the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant; that will begin to operate when Israel are saved and become the kingdom of priests unto God. The fact that the olive tree was cut down to the ground, together with its Jewish and Gentile branches, shows that the Abrahamic covenant could not have been in operation, for that will never fail so miserably. After this dispensational digression we come to the great statement of verse 17:--

“For therein is righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith.”

What are we to understand by the “righteousness of God”? What is meant by “from faith to faith”? Do these words read with the word “revealed” or with the word “righteousness”? Is it correct to speak of justification as a forensic or legal term? Is faith a modified work, a kind of dividend? These are questions that must be answered. The way has been prepared, we have caught something of the spirit of the epistle, we must now be prepared to devote both time and patience as we seek light from the Lord upon this critical verse. Let us close this present paper by giving the structure of the opening verses of Rom. i.:--

Paul and the gospel (Rom. i. 1-17).

- A | a | i. 1. Paul separated unto the *gospel*.
- b | c | i. 2. Promised in the Scriptures.
- d | i. 3-5-. The *gospel* the power.
- B | i. -5, 6. The sphere of Paul’s apostleship. “All nations.”
- C | i. 7-13-. Paul’s concern for Rome. “Service in the *gospel*.”
- B | i. -13-15. The sphere of Paul’s apostleship. “Greeks and Barbarians.”
- A | a | i. 16-. Paul unashamed of the *gospel*.
- b | d | i. -16. The *gospel* the power.
- c | i. 17. Anticipated in the Scriptures.

The focal points are the relation of Paul to the gospel, the sphere of his ministry, and the twofold power.

#4. The righteousness of God (i. 17). pp. 168 - 173

Rom. i. 17 is the crux of the epistle to the Romans, and indeed of the gospel as committed to Paul. All that follows in this epistle is necessitated by the statements of this verse, as we hope to show. That it is vitally connected with that gospel of which Paul was unashamed, and which he declared to be the power of God unto salvation, we can see by the presence of the word “for”. Where all is important it may be unwise to suggest distinctions, but the student of Scripture, and of Paul’s epistles particularly, should never lose sight of the little word *gar*, generally translated “for”. The theme runs: The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all that believe, *for*—then follows the reason:--

“For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written,
The just shall live by faith. ”

Before we can make any real progress in the understanding of this passage, we must seek the Scriptural meaning of the terms, “the righteousness of God”, and “the just”.

The truth from the Hebrew.

If we commence our study of these words with allusions to the legal processes of either the Roman Forum, or any modern court of law, we shall soon obliterate the simple issues of these terms; our safe course is to go back to that repository of all doctrine, the Hebrew of the O.T., and taking this as our basis, to build thereon. In this we have the apostle's own example, for he concludes his statement in Rom. i. 17 by a quotation from the prophet Habakkuk, which we shall find throws light upon one, if not more, disputed point in this verse.

Dikaioṣunē = "righteousness", arises out of the verb *dikaioō*, which, in the LXX, translates the Hebrew verb *tsadaq*. Let us observe the way in which this word is used in the O.T.:-

"If there be a controversy between men, and they come *unto judgment*, that the *judges* may *judge* them; then they shall JUSTIFY (*tsadaq*) the righteous, and CONDEMN the wicked" (Deut. xxv. 1).

Here the issues are simple. It is a case of pronouncing judgment. The words, "they shall condemn the wicked", are literally, "they shall make him wicked", which of course mean, to declare him to be so. As there can be no thought on the part of the judge of infusing into the wicked man any wickedness, neither can there be any thought of imparting righteousness into the one who is justified. He is simply "declared righteous". These sentiments recur in Exod. xxiii. 6-8 and Prov. xvii. 15. The primary idea of the word *tsadaq* is "balance", "equivalence", "up to standard". This underlying meaning comes out in the law, "eye for eye, tooth for tooth", and in the insistence upon "Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin" (Lev. xix. 36), and in such passages as, "To be laid in the balance, they are altogether lighter than vanity" (Psa. lxii. 9; see also Dan. v. 27).

There is moreover an echo of this feature in the word "sin", which means "to miss" or "to fail", as expressed in Rom. iii. 23, "Coming short of the glory of God". *Canon R. B. Girdlestone* remarks in his "*Synonyms of the Old Testament*":-

"It is unfortunate that the English language should have grafted the Latin word *justice*, which is used in somewhat of a forensic sense, into a vocabulary which was already possessed of the good word righteousness, as it tends to create a distinction which has no existence in Scripture No distinction between the claims of justice and the claims of love is recognized in Scripture We have no one word which can convey the idea of *righteousness*, and that of *justification*, as they are set forth in Scripture We see the wisdom of God in selecting Hebrew as a means of communication with His creatures, because here the ideas of *righteousness*, *justification*, and *acquittal* all cluster round one verbal root, and are seen to be parts of one whole."

Dikaioō is used in the N.T. in the same way as the Hebrew *tsadaq* (*Piel* and *Hiphil*) is used in the O.T. Let us take a few examples that are not doctrinal first, in order to see its meaning:-

"Wisdom is justified of her children" (Matt. xi. 19).

“By thy words thou shalt be justified” (Matt. xii. 37).
“The people justified God” (Luke vii. 29).
“He, willing to justify himself” (Luke x. 29).
“Ye are they which justify yourselves” (Luke xvi. 15).

In none of these citations can the idea be tolerated that justify implies the transfusion of righteousness within. The meaning is simply the declaring righteous of those in view. This is the meaning in all the passages where Paul uses the word in his epistles.

Light from equivalent terms.

When we read of the imputation of righteousness without works (Rom. iv. 6, 11), the apostle speaks of the forgiveness of sins, and the covering of iniquity. So in Rom. v. 9, 10, justification by the blood of Christ is placed in correspondence with reconciliation by His death. There is no idea of the infusing of anything into the believer by the work of reconciliation. By comparing Acts xv. 11, Gal. ii. 16, Eph. ii. 8, 9, salvation is seen to be an equivalent to justification. The remission of sins, receiving the reconciliation, not coming into judgment, these and similar expressions may all be taken as illuminating the meaning of justification, the declaring righteous the one that believes in the Lord.

Law terms are used.

In both the Old and New Testaments the process of justification is expressed in terms of law, e.g.:-

1. God is looked upon as a Judge (Isa. i. 7, 8; Rom. viii. 33).
2. The person to be justified is guilty. He is looked upon as exposed to the judgment of God (Rom. i. 32), and whose mouth is shut (Rom. iii. 19).
3. There are three accusers: (i.) The law (John v. 45); (ii.) Conscience (Rom. ii. 15); (iii.) Satan (Zech. iii. 2 and Rev. xii. 10).
4. The charge is drawn up in legal handwriting (Col. ii. 14).
5. The gospel provides the guilty person with a plea (Rom. iii. 23-25).
6. The Lord Himself is the Advocate (I John ii. 1, 2).
7. The sentence for all believers is one of complete remission, justification, acceptance, and title to life and to inheritance (Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34; II Cor. v. 21).

Dikaiousunē is that which fulfils the claims of *dikē*, which meant to the Gentiles “right established by custom”, and was personified as the daughter of Zeus, and mentioned in Acts xxviii. 4, where it is translated “vengeance”. In the sense of demanding justice it is found in Acts xxv. 15, the rendering of justice in Jude 7, and the punishment meted out for the violation of right in II Thess. i. 9. Instead of custom being the standard, the Scripture reveals God, and in the Scriptural meaning of the word *dikaiousunē* is that conformity of heart and life to right, of which God Himself is the standard and author. In the teaching of Paul, justification by faith is that righteousness which God bestows upon the believer in Christ in virtue of which he stands accepted and assured in Christ for ever.

Viewed dispassionately, and shall we say anatomically, we may speak of this righteousness as being imputed without being imparted, we may speak of justification as

something distinct from sanctification, but, as Liddon says, only “as are the arterial and nervous systems in the human body: but in the living soul they are coincident and inseparable”. John’s dictum is universally true, “Let no man deceive you, he that doeth righteousness is righteous” (I John iii. 7).

The righteousness of God.

It seems that we are shut up to one of two meanings, for the above expression:--

1. The righteousness of God as Judge.
2. The righteousness provided by God through Christ.

The righteousness of a judge meeting the unrighteousness of a sinner can have but one issue—condemnation. This can hardly be the meaning of the apostle, for he declares that this righteousness of God constitutes the very power of the gospel, and its issue in salvation. Phil. iii. 9 speaks of a righteousness of God *by faith*, which is contrasted with “mine own righteousness which is of the law”. This righteousness of God is, moreover, contrasted with “their own righteousness” in Rom. x. 3, and is proved by the next verse to be Christ Himself, “*For* Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth” (Rom. x. 4), which is further contrasted with the righteousness of the law as “The man that *doeth* these things shall *live* by them” (Rom. x. 5).

Moses and Habakkuk.

With Rom. x. 5 and Rom. i. 17 we arrive at a point when the truth emerges into light. The two quotations made by Paul settle the matter:--

“The righteous by faith shall live.” The is GOSPEL.
“The man that doeth shall live.” The is LAW.

There are two ways revealed by Scripture whereby a man may be saved. Whether it is possible for anyone to “do” the things of the law, we shall see as we go through the epistle. What we have learned is that the term, “the righteousness of God”, refers to that “gift” (Rom. iii. 22, v. 17) of God in the virtue of which the sinner may be justified and saved.

From faith to faith.

Ek pisteōs eis pistin: How are we to understand these words? The problem is mainly the question as to whether *ek pisteōs* belongs to *dikaioσunē*, “righteousness”, or to *eis pistin*, “to faith”. Many authorities have decided in favour of the latter. *Theophylact* says: “Our first faith is not sufficient, but we must ascend from inceptive faith to a more perfect degree of it.” We ourselves have leaned rather to the idea that “out of faith” refers to the faith or faithfulness of Christ, and “unto faith” to the faith of the believer. Now that the passage is before us, we must examine it afresh, and if need be adjust our previous views. First, what is the demand of the passage?

The idea that justification is in any sense a process, a series of developments, leading on to a climax, as Clemens Alex puts it:--

“A common faith is as it were a foundation a *teleia* faith is one that can remove mountains”;

does not seem to be in line with the apostle’s continual stress upon the freeness and the fullness of justification which he preached. As the interpretation of this passage lies very near the root of the gospel, let us spare no pains to arrive at a right conclusion. We may attain a true perspective by considering the usage of parallel expressions in Paul’s epistles:--

“A righteousness of God through faith” (*dia pisteōs*) (Rom. iii. 22).

“Justify by faith (*ek pisteōs*) through faith” (*dia pisteōs*) (Rom. iii. 30).

“Seal of the righteousness of the faith” (*tes pisteōs*) (Rom. iv. 11).

“The righteousness of faith” (*dia dikaiosunēs pisteōs*) (Rom. iv. 13).

“Therefore being justified by faith” (*ek pisteōs*) (Rom. v. 1)

“The righteousness which is of faith” (*ek pisteōs*) (Rom. ix. 30; x. 6).

We need not go further than this very epistle to establish the apostle’s usage. In every case it means a righteousness that is of faith, and in contrast with a righteousness of works or of law. If these six steps in the development of the doctrine all point one way, it is surely strange to believe that in the enunciation of the theme of the epistle Paul should use these words in a different manner. The rendering that does not violate the testimony of the remainder of the epistle simply supplies the word “righteousness” after the word “revealed”:--

“For therein is the righteousness of God revealed, a righteousness of faith, unto faith, as it is written, The just by faith shall live” (Rom. i. 17).

The quotation from Habakkuk seems clearly to confirm this when seen in the original. There *diakios ek pisteōs*, “the just by faith”, is clearly placed in correspondence with *dikaosunē ek pisteōs*. It is quoted by the apostle to confirm his teaching, “as it is written”. The translation, “revealed *from* faith”, when examined does not seem to yield any good sense.

So far we have dealt with the idea of righteousness and its meaning. We need to give closer attention to the other term, “faith”. This, together with an examination of the quotation from Habakkuk, we must reserve for another article.

The Unity of the Spirit. **pp. 154 - 157**

What it means to “keep” it, and how much truth may we sacrifice in the endeavour?

The direct exposition of Ephesians as a whole has now been completed in these pages, but there are many side issues both of a doctrinal and practical nature that demand attention. There is much more to be said in connection with the subjective side of the conflict of Eph. vi. which cannot be satisfactorily dealt with until Rom. vi. has been considered also. The particular point that we feel called upon to deal with at the moment is that which has reference to the keeping of the unity of the Spirit and the problem that attaches by reason of differences of doctrine and practice on the part of other believers.

May we agree to differ?

If we have studied the addresses of those who urge the union of Church with Dissent, or of one phase of sectarianism with another, one item is constant. The union contemplated can only be brought about by agreeing to differ concerning some items of doctrine or practice. From an outside position it is apparent that many of the causes of division are man made, and could well be dropped to mutual advantage, but the unity thus brought about would not be the unity of the Spirit.

We cannot remember one passage in the whole of Scripture that would warrant a child of God relinquishing the veriest jot or tittle of truth for the sake of unity. All truth comes from God, and we as stewards are not free to be liberal with our Master's possessions, even though such liberality be called by fair names, and faithfulness be called by very foul ones. If Paul had “agreed to differ” he would have saved himself many a sleepless night and heart-ache. Because he perceived the sacredness of stewardship and the blindness of truth, he had to write, “all in Asia be turned away from me”.

What is the unity of the Spirit?

This unity cannot be brought about by agreement, neither are we enjoined to do anything but endeavour to “keep” it. Its author is the Spirit. The expression is loosely used by all sorts and conditions of Christians. Those who are keen on the re-union of Christendom appeal to Eph. iv. as an argument why Baptists should not stress believer's baptism, Churchmen should not sprinkle infants, Presbyterians and Episcopalians should sink their differences on the question of holy orders. These things may be the causes of differences and divisions, and their abandonment would bring about a species of unity, but it would not be the unity of the Spirit. Eph. iv. has something most uncompromisingly insistent to say about baptism, holy orders, etc., which cannot be ignored.

The One Baptism.

We may take it as a fact that the bulk of believers repudiate the teaching of Eph. iii. 1-11 and Col. i. 24-27, and stoutly maintain that *the church began at Pentecost*. It is impossible for such to discern the things that differ, and consequently their idea of the unity of the Spirit is a fusion of the teaching of more than one dispensation. The unity of the Spirit among other items emphatically speaks of *one* baptism. Everyone who believes that the church began at Pentecost has no option but to believe that there are *two* baptisms (Acts x. 44-48; xi. 15-18), and the word “one” has to be so explained as to imperil the truth that there is *one Lord* and *one God*.

Can the unity of the Spirit be maintained by tampering with one item of its sevenfold perfection? In the dispensation of the mystery there is *one* baptism. If Col. ii. 12 teaches baptism in water, Col. ii. 11 as surely teaches literal fleshly *circumcision*. If one be spiritual so must the other. If one be a literal ordinance so must the other.

The One Hope.

In the unity of the Spirit there is no room for more than the one hope of our calling. At the end of the Acts Paul confessed his adherence to “the hope of Israel” (Acts xxviii. 20), and as he had previously written the epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians and Romans, the hope of the church during the Acts period cannot be dissociated from the hope of Israel. In the epistles of this period we read of the archangel (I Thess. iv.) who is connected with the hope of Israel (Dan. xii. 1, 2), the manifestation of the man of sin in the temple of God, which also links the hope of Israel with the church of the Acts (II Thess. ii.).

The one hope with which the unity of the Spirit is occupied is “the one hope of our *calling*”. This, taken together with the parallel expression in Eph. i. 18, “the hope of His *calling*”, must indicate something different from the hope of the Acts period, for the apostle prayed that in order that the church may get to know *this* hope, a “spirit of wisdom and revelation” might be granted, which would be quite unnecessary had no change taken place since the writing of the earlier epistles. “The hope of glory” of Col. i. 27 was “the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles”, viz., “Christ among you”, Who had been previously preached only in association with Israel. The “blessed hope” of Titus ii. 13 goes back “before the world began”, or “before the age times” (*see* Titus i. 2), so also does its “calling” (*see* II Tim. i. 9). Here once more we have the unique character of the “hope” and the “calling” connected with a period parallel only with Eph. i. 4, “before the foundation of the world”.

Having seen this truth and having embraced it, how can we think of giving it up or merging it with the hope of another calling in the name of unity? Such unity cannot be the unity of Eph. iv.

The bond of Peace.

Rom. xii. 18 says, “if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men”. It will be noticed, that there are two qualifying statements. “If it be possible” suggests that there will sometimes arise conditions that will render peaceableness impossible. “As much as lieth in you” shows that a disturbing factor may arise from without. “Peace at any price” evidently is not a maxim of Scripture.

The complete armour of the saint includes “feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace”. This shows that the believer has no conflict with man, but when all has been said, no thought of giving up an iota of truth is countenanced by the Scriptures, even though such an attitude bring not peace, but a sword.

The bond of peace is specific. It definitely refers to Eph. ii. It is really “the bond of *the* peace”, that peace connected with “the creation of the two into one new man, so making peace” (Eph. ii. 14, 15). There we have the creation of the one body, and this is the first item in the sevenfold unity of the Spirit. To attempt to introduce I Cor. xii. in face of I Cor. xiii. 10 (“in part”, I Cor. xiii. 10, and “in particular”, I Cor. xii. 27, are translators of the same word) is to introduce the passing things of childhood into the experience of “the perfect man” (Eph. iv. 13). This will not keep the unity of Eph. iv. This “peace of God” is to act as “umpire” (not “rule”, Col. iii. 15), and is inseparable from the “calling” of the “one body” as it is written:--

“Let the peace of God be as the umpire in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body.”

To allow any tampering with the sevenfold unity of Eph. iv., to add to, to subtract from, or to agree to differ, is not allowing the peace of God to be umpire, but our own ideas of fellowship, usefulness, charity, etc. To deny the one body, its one baptism and its one hope of glory, is to decide against the “ruling” of this very peace of God, and shatters all semblance of true unity. The unity that we are enjoined to keep is perfect and sevenfold, viz.:--

ONE LORD.
ONE HOPE OF CALLING. ONE FAITH.
ONE SPIRIT. ONE BAPTISM.
ONE BODY. ONE GOD AND FATHER.

There are not two baptisms or two hopes any more than there are two Lords.

To us has been committed a sacred trust, a “good deposit” (I Tim. vi. 20; II Tim. i. 12-14, ii. 2). It is required in stewards that a man be found *faithful*—peaceable, useful, charitable by all means, so long as the first element of stewardship be untouched. Keeping the unity of the Spirit is part of walking worthy of our calling (Eph. iv. 1-6). Let us not be tempted to “come down” from our glorious position, but humbly, yet resolutely, set ourselves by the grace given us and by the power that worketh in us to endeavour to keep as a sacred trust the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Words in Season.

#4. Faith. A Few sidelights.

pp. 29 - 31

A.—I do not bring forward any particular difficulty this time, but simply ask for any further light you may have upon the subject of faith.

B.—Let us take notice of some of the contexts of faith in the Scriptures. These will include the objects of faith, the parallels of faith, synonyms and antonyms. All these will illuminate our understanding. Take a few instances of the objects of faith as set forth in John's Gospel:--

Belief is said to be "on His name" (i. 12); "in Him" (iii. 16); "on the Son" (iii. 36); "on the Son of God" (ix. 35); "on Him that sent" the Son (v. 24). The Lord said, moreover, "If ye believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins" (viii. 24). This reference to the great name I AM not only takes us back to Exod. iii. but also comprehends the seven great claims recorded in John, such as "I am the light of the world", "I am the bread of life", etc.

The whole purpose of John's Gospel is concentrated in the one note:--

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

A.—I notice in this last reference a distinction which in some measure clears up the difficulty I have expressed with regard to the connection between "*historic* faith" and "*saving* faith".

First, "these things" which were written are nothing less than "signs which Jesus did in the presence of His disciples" (John xx. 30), and were to lead to believing certain facts about the Person of Christ, namely, that "Jesus", the man, was "the Messiah", and moreover "the Son of God". So far this is mere historic fact, but it is impossible to believe that the man "Jesus" was God's Anointed and God's Son without also believing all that these names connote consequently "life through His name" is the sequel, and historic faith in an event or a person that can mean nothing if they do not mean salvation must also of necessity be saving faith too.

B.—That is a well learned lesson, and you have made it your own. There is one other phase given in John's Gospel that we must not pass by. In John v. 39 we read, "Search the Scriptures", a command that not one of us can neglect with impunity. Nevertheless, we believe the Lord did not intend a command here, but made a statement:--

"Ye search the Scriptures: for in THEM ye think ye have *aionian* life: and they are they which testify of ME. And ye will not come to ME, that ye might have life" (John v. 39, 40).

"There is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed ME: for he wrote of ME" (John v. 45, 46).

Faith in the Scriptures can only bring salvation because of the fact that its testimony is concerning Christ. II Tim. iii. 15 does not say that the Scriptures save, but that they are able to make wise *unto salvation* through faith that is *in* Christ Jesus. So that believing the word, like believing the signs, leads to believing the Saviour and receiving His salvation.

Can you think of any words that are used as parallels or synonyms of faith?

A.—We have already referred to John i. 12, there we read "as many as *received* Him" placed over against "them that *believe* on His name", so receiving is a synonym for believing.

B.—This synonym is found again in John iii. 11, "*ye receive* not our witness". So also iii. 32, 33. You must seek for others yourself.

Looking now at the antonyms or opposites to faith, we notice that Heb. x. 39 places "drawing back" in opposition to "believing". John xii. 47, 48 places "believing" and "rejecting" in opposition. A vast field lies before us in the epistles of Paul, which we can only mention but not investigate here.

It will not be difficult to reconcile believing with receiving, or seeing that its opposite is drawing back and rejection, for the faith that accepts the testimony concerning the Saviour must necessarily accept the way of salvation.

A.—I see clearly that Scripture does not raise the question as to *what* faith is so much as *Who* is the object of faith. I know I have believed, and I know Whom I have believed, and there I gratefully rest, praying now for grace to live by faith even as in the first case I receive life through faith in His name.

[N.B.--The reader is notified that there is no intention of presenting a systematic view of any one phase of truth, but rather a series of helpful talks upon various subjects that exercise the minds of believers. There is much to be said concerning faith of a profound character that could not be dealt with in these little talks. The reader must look for such notes in the more serious expositions given in our pages.]

#5. Faith. Head verses Heart.
pp. 45 - 47

A.—You remember our conversation concerning the nature of faith? Well, I have a difficulty in accepting your presentation owing to the continual use of the word "heart" in connection with saving faith. Your way of looking at it savours too much of the "head".

B.—Let us have some of the passages which show this continual use.

A.—“If thou shalt confess with my mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe *in thine heart* that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For *with the heart* man believeth unto righteousness” (Rom. x. 9, 10).

B.—That is one passage, certainly, and must be considered, but let us have the others before we commence our examination.

A. (*After a pause*).—I do not seem to be able to discover the other passages. Yet I am sure there are many.

B.—Perhaps the word translated "heart" occurs elsewhere under another rendering.

A.—No, that is not so, for Young's Concordance Index says *kardia*, heart, 158 occurrences, and that it is not translated in any other way.

B.—It looks as though you have imagined that there were many such passages, partly because of your earlier conceptions as to "historic faith", &c. The truth is that this passage quoted from Rom. x. is the only one which makes the positive statement. I can help you to add two more if we include the negative point of view. Heb. iii. 12 speaks of an "evil heart of unbelief", and the Lord rebuked His disciples saying, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe" (Luke xxiv. 25). but these hardly warrant your statement as to "continual use". You will remember that Rom. x. 9, 10 is contextually associated, in verses 14-17, not so much with a miraculous interposition of God, but with such arguments as:--

"How shall they believe in Him of Whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?"

A.—What is your object in taking away the emphasis upon the heart, and transferring it to the head?

B.—That is hardly a fair statement. You have read the only passage that there is in the N.T. which speaks of believing with the heart, and the context immediately speaks of the necessity of hearing and preaching in order to make faith possible. Without being

uncharitable I would suggest that you are labouring under the influence of a misunderstanding.

A.—What is it I pray? let me not rest on unscriptural foundations.

B.—Well, I think I should be right if I said that in your way of thinking the "heart" is set in contrast with the "head".

A.—Yes, that is so.

B.—The Scripture does not make the distinction. The brain is never mentioned, and the idea of thinking with the head as opposed to believing with the heart is unscriptural. Let us see what Scripture says. Where is the first occurrence of the word "heart" in Scripture?

A.—Gen. vi. 5.

B.—What does it connect with it?

A.—“The imagination of the thoughts of the heart.”

B.—Will you turn to Matt. ix. 4, xiii. 15, xv. 19 and Mark ii. 8 and see what is said?

A.—The passage connect "thinking", "understanding", "thoughts" and "reasoning" with the heart.

B.—You will find, moreover, that the Hebrew word for heart (*leb*) is translated 12 times by the word "mind", and such passages as Heb. viii. 10 shows a great affinity between heart and mind. Without prosecuting this point further I think you will see that it is not quite in harmony with Scripture to speak of "believing with the heart" as something very different from merely "intellectual faith".

A.—While I readily accept the facts of Scripture on this point, the difficulty I had in mind remains untouched.

B.—I think I know your difficulty, and will do my best to help you to solve it, but I felt that we must first get rid of unscriptural ideas, as otherwise we should only add to our confusion. Your problem is something like this:--

If believing the gospel and the Word of God is the exercise of that same faith which we put into operation upon the testimony of accredited witnesses, "for if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater", how is it that men who are possessed with normal faculties and exercise faith in everyday matters appear to be utterly unable to believe the truth apart from some act of grace?

A.—Yes, that expresses fairly well my difficulty, and in the attempt to solve it I concluded that the difference must be between heart belief and mere intellectual faith.

B.—We must meet again and carry the subject further.

#6. Repentance. **pp. 78 - 80**

A.—When we were talking over the nature of faith you seemed to imply that something was necessary before the natural man would believe the testimony of God. I should be glad if you would take up that point.

B.—Most readily. You will find the answer in the following passages which you might read: Mark i. 15; II Tim. ii. 25; Acts xi. 18; xx. 21.

A. (*Reads*).—

"Repent ye, and believe the gospel."

"If God peradventure will give them repentance unto the acknowledging of the truth."

"Then hath God also to Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

"Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

B.—Here you will observe that repentance comes before faith, before knowledge and before life, and that it is necessary for repentance to be directed toward God if faith is to be exercised in the Lord Jesus Christ. Before we go further, however, we must be sure that we understand the meaning of the term we use. What does repentance mean?

A.—I understand that repentance is derived from the word penitence, and implies a certain amount of sorrow for sin.

B.—That is true so far as the English word is concerned, and sorrow or penitence is a part—perhaps a later part—of Scriptural repentance, but that is not its primary meaning. What are the Greek words for repent and repentance?

A. (*Using Concordance*).—*Metanoeo* and *metanoia*.

B.—What does *meta* mean when used in composition with other words?

A.—*Meta* means "after" or "change".

B.—Can you give me any illustrations of this meaning?

A.—

Metathesis.—Translated or transferred (Heb. xi. 5).

Metallatto.—To change one thing for or into another (Rom. i. 25).

Metamorphoo.—To be transformed (Matt. xvii. 2; Rom. xii. 2).

B.—What does *noeo* and *noia* mean?

A.—*Noeo* means to think, and *noia* comes from it.

B.—So then repentance literally means *a change of mind*. The reason why natural man does not believe the testimony of God concerning His Son is because something is wrong with his mind. The reason why he does not acknowledge the truth is for the same reason.

You may remember that we found in the Scriptures that the heart and the mind are not such separate terms as they are in modern use. A man thinks with his mind and believes with his heart in modern phraseology, but in Scripture thoughts arise in the heart—"as a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

A.—What then is wrong with the mind of man?

B.—Let us discover from Scripture. Speaking of man by nature Scripture says that he walks "in the vanity of his mind", that his "understanding is darkened", that he is "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in him" (Eph. iv. 17, 18). That men's minds are "corrupt" and "defiled" (I Tim. vi. 5, II Tim. iii. 8), and that they have been given over to a "reprobate" mind (Rom. i. 28). Now if this be the case, how is it possible for that man whose very compass is wrong, whose judgment is distorted, whose understanding is so darkened as to alienate him from the very life of God, how is it possible, I say, for him to believe the gospel or to acknowledge the truth without that *change of mind* which we call repentance?

A.—Repentance then of itself does not necessarily mean a change of life.

B.—Not necessarily, but in the Scriptures it is usually presented as one half of an action, the other half of which consists in the change of conduct and life. For example, you will find *metanoia* joined with *epistrepho*, to turn:--

Acts iii. 19, "Repent and be converted." "Change your mind and turn you."

Acts xxvi. 20, "They should repent and turn to God."

While men are exhorted to repent, Scripture also tells us that it is God Who gives or grants this change of mind, and into that problem we will not at this point enter.

A.—Thank you for this opening of the subject, I must give it a fuller consideration.

B.—You must remember that there is another word translated repent, namely *metameleomai*, which means "to be concerned about something after something has been said or done", and *ametameletos*, which is the same word with a negative.

#7. Faith as a fruit, a gift, and inwrought. **pp. 92 - 94**

A.—May I re-open the question of faith? There seems to be a phase of the subject that does not conform to the presentation you made when last we spoke on the subject.

B.—By all means; one point of view rarely gives a full presentation of any Scripture.

A.—My new problem arose out of Gal. v. 22, 23, where we read:--

"The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance,"

B.—Your point is that this hardly conforms to the idea that faith is the reception of accredited testimony.

A.—That is so; it is said to be part of the fruit of the Spirit, which cannot be produced before the person producing it has believed on the Lord Jesus. Besides, it is classed with long-suffering, meekness, temperance and the like, which removes it still further from that idea.

B.—If you turn to Rom. xii. 3-6 you will find faith used in a somewhat similar way.

A.—I notice that the apostle addresses the believer, and tells him not to think more highly of himself than he ought, "but to think soberly, according as God has dealt to every man a *measure of faith*".

B.—You notice also in verses 4 and 5 references to the body and its members, and then verse 6 returns to the subject saying:--

"Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the *proportion of faith*."

A.—The allusion to the body and its members, together with gifts, makes me think of I Cor. xii.

B.—If we turn to that chapter we shall see more clearly this phase of faith which is before us:--

"But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom knowledge faith healing miracles, etc." (I Cor. xii. 7-11).

You will find also by reading Gal. iii. 2-5 that the same faith which is associated with justification is also connected with working miracles. It seems therefore that we must be prepared to find that faith may mean:--

1. That faith whereby the sinner believes unto salvation.
2. A spiritual gift exercised during the Acts period and spoken of together with miracles, tongues and other gifts of the Spirit.
3. The fruit of the Spirit, which by being contrasted with the works of the flesh indicates not so much a supernatural gift exercised only by those endued, but the product of the new nature.

A.—I notice that all our references keep within the period of the Acts. Is there anything parallel to these in the prison epistles?

B.—Oh yes, for read the following:-

"And what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe according to the inworking of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead" (Eph. i. 19, 20).

"Buried with Him in the baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the inworking of God, Who hath raised Him from the dead" (Col. ii. 12).

While we have not "the gift of faith" as in I Cor. xii., we certainly have an inwrought faith directly connected with the power of the resurrection, which transcends all other manifestations of the Spirit. That this faith may not be experienced and enjoyed as it should be is sadly true, and because of this the apostle prayed, "that we might know". Let us then pray along the lines marked out for us, and not vex ourselves because we do not possess the "gift of faith". At the same time it should be a real concern that the fruit of the faith should take the place of the works of the flesh.

A.—I think I now see the distinction between faith unto salvation and faith exercised thereafter; it is all a matter of "right division".

**#8. Can “before the foundation of the world” refer to the future?
pp. 173 - 175**

A.—I am afraid I must introduce a subject that may be considered controversial, but it lies near the root of much of your teaching, and I believe you ought to consider it. Someone who is very much opposed to your teaching has offered some criticisms; among them he gives his interpretation of the expression in Eph. i. 4, "before the foundation of the world", which I feel needs attention.

B.—Let us be prepared at all times to test the teaching we hold, for after all it is the *truth* we seek, even though it should involve the casting aside of accepted ideas, and with them our little reputations.

A.—I will read what has been written in explanation of Eph. i. 4:--

"We are as 'lively stones', material in preparation for a building to be erected in the future, and 'predestinated', or intended for that age or world before it is 'founded', and before the 'present evil world' is 'overthrown' for its establishment."

B.—There are several items in this reply that call for consideration, but the chief feature, I take it, is the one dealing with the words, "before the foundation of the world"?

A.—Yes, that is so, for I have little difficulty with regard to predestination and election.

B.—If I understand the interpretation suggested aright, "the foundation of the world" refers to "the future", and that the present time during which the "lively stones" are being prepared is a period before that time comes.

A.—Yes, I cannot understand the interpretation otherwise.

B.—Our first concern then is to seek from the Scripture evidence of that which will determine whether the period called "the foundation of the world" is past or future. In I Pet. i. 20 we have the words concerning Christ, "Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world". Can that refer to this present period?

A.—From what I understand of our critic's belief concerning Christ, I think he would probably say that it did.

B.—Yet Peter contrasts the period "before the foundation of the world" with "these last times", i.e., about A.D.60.

A.—I do not see how our critic can fit his interpretation in here.

B.—The phrase occurs again in John xvii. 24, "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world". This must be read with verse 5, "O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was".

A.—I believe that our critic holds that this love and glory were only possessed in purpose and not in person.

B.—This, as you know, I most decidedly repudiate, yet on his own ground "before the world was" cannot be "after the world has been running some 4,000 years", and therefore this takes us back to Gen. i. But there are seven passages which use the expression "*From* or *since* the foundation of the world". Let us have them all before us:--

"I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world"
(Matt. xiii. 35).

"Come inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world"
(Matt. xxv. 34).

"The blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world"
(Luke xi. 50).

"Although the works were finished from the foundation of the world" (Heb. iv. 3).

"For then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world"
(Heb. ix. 26).

"Whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8).

"Whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world"
(Rev. xvii. 8).

I believe your critical friend would agree that a period called "from or since the foundation of the world" must be later than a period called "before the foundation of the world".

A.—If he cannot accede to that, I should say that argument was wasted on him.

B.—If therefore we prove that "from the foundation of the world" goes back to Gen. i.-iv., then "before" that period cannot by any form of reasoning be a time yet future. We need not examine the whole seven, one or two will be sufficient. The passage quoted from Luke xi. 50 is practically dated for us.

A.—How dated? I don not see any date.

B.—No? yet verse 51 says, "from the blood of Abel", which dates this period near enough to Gen. iv. for our argument, does it not?

A.—Yes, it does.

B.—And with it dates Eph. i. 4 as earlier still?

A.—Yes, I cannot avoid that argument either.

B.—Heb. iv. 3 is dated likewise?

A.—I will not question it, I will look at the context.

B.—You grow wise I see—what do you discover?

A.—I find that verse 4 takes us back to the creation of Gen. i., ii.

B.—So then Eph. i. 4 must be before Gen. i., ii.?

A.—May I venture to say that Heb. ix. 26 is also dated?

B.—You may, for you have observed that the period "from the foundation of the world" is placed in strong contrast with "Now", "the end of the world or ages", and the "now" was written before A.D.70.

A.—Thank you. Scripture evidence is abundant to prove that the period when the church of the One Body was chosen in Christ was before the creation of Gen. i.

B.—That is all we had to prove. The question as to whether a better translation would not be, "before the overthrow of the world", is not before us at the moment. Before we leave the question you may take note of a further corroboration in II Tim. i. 9, where speaking of the same "choice" the apostle says:--

"According to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began (or as it is literally, 'before age times')."

"Before age times" and "before the foundation of the world" are one and the same period. "Since the ages" and "since the foundation of the world" are one and the same period, and as we have seen, this latter period lies back behind Abel and the creation. The first feature therefore of our teaching appears to stand the test.