

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 XVII.

1927

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

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS,

Since the first number of *The Berean Expositor*, as far as human limitations have allowed, the claims of a rightly divided Word of truth have been honoured in its pages. We trust that our readers perceive that the study of dispensational truth is only of value as it reveals the fullness of *Christ*, which fullness is the glory of the Prison Epistles.

Now that the long period of pioneering has in measure passed, we intend, as grace is given, to sound this note more emphatically in future issues.

We commend to every reader the words of Col. iii. 11:--

“CHRIST IS ALL, AND IN ALL”,

and make it our prayer that the witness of this magazine may, in some degree, merit this glorious message as its motto.

Yours in the bond of the peace,

CHARLES H. WELCH
FREDK. P. BRININGER

December, 1927.

INDEX

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS	15
BRITISH-ISRAEL TRUTH	33
COVENANT AND PASSOVER	126
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
The tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 10-22)	17
The table of shewbread (Exod. xxv. 23-30)	49
The golden lampstand (Exod. xxv. 31-40)	84
The tabernacle; its fabric and foundations (Exod. xxvi.)	161
HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
The rainbow of faith (xi.)	11
The perfecting of faith—	
Encouragement and reproof (xi.)	44, 61
Abel's offering (xi. 4)	75
Enoch, or the faith that transfers (xi. 5, 6)	106
Noah: the faith that inherits (xi. 7)	140, 152
Abraham: the obedience that inherits (xi. 8)	183
MAN CHRIST JESUS, THE--	
Jesus Christ come in the flesh	81
The last Adam, the one Mediator	124
The Son	145
The Apostle of apostles	178
MINISTRY OF CONSOLATION, THE--	
Earthen vessels	79, 94
Ourselves	94
Sympathy	59, 156
The bowed soul, and the fixed heart (Psa. lvii. 6, 7)	158
PROPHETS, STUDIES IN THE--	
The theme of all the prophets	1
Israel's restoration, and the new covenant	37
To obey is better than sacrifice	65
Times and seasons	102, 136
The nation and the nations	171
PYRAMID, THE GREAT; ITS DIVINE MESSAGE	35

REDEMPTION (NEW SERIES)--	
The meaning of redemption	25, 55
The way out and the way in	89
Atonement; a covering by cancellation	118
The five offerings of Leviticus	150
The whole burnt offering	189
ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE--	
The just by faith shall live (i. 17)	6
The suppression of the truth (i. 18)	40
Inexcusable (i. 19, 20)	71
Glory and thankfulness of God for His goodness (i. 21)	97
Given up (i. 21-32)	129
An important parenthesis, and its point (i. 18 - iii. 20)	166
SIGN OF THE TIMES	15, 31, 63, 159
WORDS IN SEASON--	
Onions and garlick, or this manna! (Numb. xi. 5, 6)	92
YOUNG PEOPLE, SPECIALLY FOR--	
Talks on the way	113
Christ the way	154

Answers to Correspondents. p. 115

E. (Urmston) asks for information concerning words which are used in Scripture that have a bearing upon the idea of eternal or everlasting. We give just a preliminary hint here, hoping to deal with the subject more fully later.

Hebrew.

Ad.—Eternity, ever, everlasting, old perpetually. Refers to past (Job xx. 4), to the Divine present (Isa. lvii. 15).

Netsach.—always constantly, evermore, perpetual. Usually rendered by the LXX, *eis to telos*, unto completion.

Tamid.—Always, continual, daily, ever, perpetual. Usually rendered by the LXX, *diapantos*, continually.

These are the most important. Added to these we have:--

Orek (Psa. xxiii. 6); *dor* (Psa. lxxvii. 8); *tsemithuth* (Lev. xxv. 23); *gedem* (Deut. xxxiii. 27); *yom* (Deut. vi. 24); *eth* (Psa. x. 5).

All these words are used to express some form of duration, beside the one which is most frequently used, viz., *olam*.

Greek.

Aion and *aiionios*.—Variously translated age, world, for ever, etc.

Aidios.—Perpetual (Rom. i. 20).

Pantote.—Evermore (John vi. 34).

Eis to dienekes.—For ever (Heb. x. 14).

These words practically cover the whole ground. You may look for explanation of their meanings, examples of their usage, and LXX translations in a series of articles in course of preparation.

To our new readers.
p. 177

It is a joy to those responsible for this magazine to know that many who subscribed to the first volume are still keenly interested in its witness. At the same time we gladly welcome every new reader, trusting that they may be an additional strength in this fellowship of the gospel, while the darkness deepens and perilous times draw near.

We realize, however, that there are many items known to older readers that must seem puzzling to new subscribers, and so, without going over the ground already covered, we hope to help the newcomer as well as more fully establish the veteran by commencing a series in January, 1928, entitled:--

The Mystery.
Its meaning, its message and its ministry.

We should value the co-operation of all readers in drawing the attention of any who would profit by such a series. Do you know of any gift costing 3s. that would represent as much value for the outlay? Let us send a copy to your friend. Canadian and Australian readers are reminded of the honorary agencies tabled on the notices page.

“British-Israel Truth”, and “The Great Pyramid, its Divine Message”.

What should be our attitude to these things?

pp. 33 - 36

British-Israel Truth.

In nine cases out of ten the attitude of Neh. vi. 3 is the one to adopt when tempted to turn aside from positive testimony, and only occasionally does the seriousness of error justify a departure from this rule. If we so desired, we could easily occupy a deal of space monthly in the unsavoury exposure of the erroneous teaching that is growing all around, but we have neither the commission to attempt the task, nor the qualification necessary to make it profitable. There is, however, a double line of teaching that appears to have fascinated many true children of God, and as we have been asked more than once what our attitude might be, we feel that a brief word may be of service to the generality of readers. The two lines of teaching about which we have been asked to express opinion are (1) Anglo-Israelism, and (2) The Witness of the Great Pyramid.

Anglo-Israelism, or British-Israel Truth, as it is called teaches that the “lost” ten tribes of Israel migrated across Europe, and by a series of divinely guided settlements or invasions found themselves established in Great Britain. There are as adjuncts to this idea wonderful stories which speak of Jeremiah coming to Ireland with a daughter of Zedekiah, bringing with him also the ark of the covenant and the stone used by Jacob at Bethel, which stone is now under the Coronation Throne in Westminster Abbey. Into all this we do not here attempt to enter, but we draw attention to one serious and awful result of accepting Anglo-Israelism.

Under this teaching the reigning house of Britain is said to be the dynasty of David, and a book is published by one whose letters are M.A., F.R.G.S., and A.V.I., to prove that our present King, His majesty George V, is a direct and lineal descendant of David through the marriage brought about by Jeremiah between the daughter of Zedekiah and a King who ruled in Ulster, Northern Ireland. Together with this is the teaching that the “Stone Kingdom” of Dan. ii. is the British Empire, and that it began to function round about 1558A.D. The whole fabric is so monstrously unscriptural, and so manifestly untrue, that the space devoted to its exposure would be sheer waste were it not for this serious and anti-Christian issue. *Anglo-Israelism, by declaring that the British reigning house “is in direct succession” to the throne of David, aims a blow at the royal rights of the Lord Jesus!*

Two genealogies of the Lord appear in Matthew i. and Luke iii., respectively, the one through David’s son Solomon, the other through David’s son Nathan. These two lines meet in the person of Christ, *and are exhausted in Him.* The Lord Jesus Christ is

shown to possess the exclusive right to David's throne. He died without natural successor. He was raised from the dead "to sit upon his (David's) throne" (Acts ii. 30), and consequently any other claimant to that throne must be an incipient Antichrist. The stone kingdom also of Dan. ii. is described as a kingdom which "the God of heaven shall set up", "which shall never be destroyed", and "which shall stand for ever". This is said to be the British Empire. Dan. vii. shows that this kingdom is that of the coming Christ:--

"And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. vii. 14).

If the royal house of Great Britain be the true dynasty of David, and if the stone kingdom which is to fill the whole earth and never pass away be the British Empire, FOR WHAT PURPOSE IS THE LORD COMING AGAIN? We leave the subject at this issue. All else is subsidiary.

The Great Pyramid, its Divine message.

Closely associated with British-Israelism is the teaching connected with the Great Pyramid of Gizeh, which stands on the border of upper and lower Egypt, and is said to fulfil the word of Isa. xix. 19, 20:--

"In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be a sign and a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt."

The Great Pyramid of Gizeh is a marvel of masonry, its stone work being compared to the accuracy of an optical instrument. This very feature is fatal to its ever being "an altar unto the Lord", for the law has never been rescinded that is given in Exod. xx. 25, 26:--

"If thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it, neither shalt thou go up by steps unto Mine altar."

Here we see that as an altar the Great Pyramid must be reckoned as polluted, and all are familiar with the huge blocks of stone that make the ascent like climbing a giant stairway.

Just in the same way the identification fails in connection with the word "pillar". In what way can the Great Pyramid be called a "pillar"? The Hebrew word *matstsebah* is sometimes translated "image", "standing image". Moreover, the two words "altar" and "pillar" come together in Exod. xxiv. 4, "And Moses built an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel". Isaiah himself uses the feminine form of the same Hebrew word in vi. 13, where the margin reads "stock or stem". A pillar that in any sense resembles an image of Baal or a stem of a tree is no true description of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh.

Into the ocean of astronomical mathematics and chronological arguments we cannot plunge, but quite a series of books have been written purporting to show that the Great Pyramid contains a most elaborate and detailed prophecy of the purpose of God in Christ. The chronology of “the time of the end” as given by the Great Pyramid covers A.D.1557 to A.D.1914. Its minuteness of detail is remarkable. The exact date of the entry of Great Britain into the War in August, 1914, together with the date of the Armistice is given by the Great Pyramid.

So many dates and events which have such deep and immediate personal application are given, that one of the effects is that *the prophetic chronology purporting to be that of the Great Pyramid* becomes more vivid and important than the Scripture itself. Imagine the effect upon the mind of a person who has accepted the teaching that the Great Pyramid is God’s own divinely ordained prophetic witness for these last days, being solemnly told that the Great Pyramid marks off with uncanny precision the following dates as events in the bringing in of the end, 3:53p.m. on 29th May, 1928; 11:14a.m. on 16th of September, 1936; 0:45a.m. on 20th August, 1953. The Bible can show nothing like it. If this is divine, then the Bible so far as prophetic exactness is concerned must take a second place. Without dating the second coming of the Lord, the Great Pyramid makes it very plain that it cannot *be later than 16th September, 1936*. If the Lord has not come by 16th September, 1936, what will the Pyramid believers do if Antichrist should appear? Will they not be forced to accept him?

We do know that the Egyptian Book of the Dead has much to say of Pyramid symbolism. Osiris is called “The Lord of the Pyramid”, and “The Lord of death and resurrection”. Ancient Egyptian religion is Messianic in character. *So was ancient Babylonianism*. As surely as God recorded the coming of the Seed of the woman, so did Babel travesty that truth and fill the earth with its prophecies and its symbols.

We have already referred to Anglo-Israelism. According to Pyramid chronology the times of the Gentiles ended in 1917, the stone kingdom, namely kingdom, Britain, holding the mandate over Jerusalem now being not a Gentile power, but, unknown to the Jews, really Israel. The Pyramid prophecies really bolster up Anglo-Israelism, and so from two points of view should be left alone by all those who believe that in the written Scriptures we have all the revelation of God’s purpose that we may legitimately expect until that day when we shall know even as we are known.

Covenant and Passover.

pp. 126, 127

In the pamphlet entitled *The dispensational place of the Lord's Supper*, the third edition of which we have just published (*see Notices*), readers will remember that we have drawn attention to the intimate association of the Lord's Supper with the new covenant, and teaching that the passover stands to the old covenant in somewhat the same relation as the Lord's Supper stands to the new. The relation of a covenant with the passover has been called in question, and as this is an important item we would add the following:--

The exodus and the covenant.

“The children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage and God heard their groaning, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob” (Exod. ii. 23, 24).

This one citation alone would be proof enough that the deliverance of Israel from Egypt was in direct line with a covenant, and a reference back to Genesis will confirm this:--

“Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance in the fourth generation they shall come hither again” (Gen. xv. 13-16).

There can be no shadow of doubt but that this refers to the exodus of Israel from Egypt. We have further evidence in Exod. vi.:--

“I appeared unto Abraham I have also established My covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I HAVE REMEMBERED MY COVENANT I will redeem you and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will bring you in unto the land concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it you for an heritage: I am the Lord” (Exod. vi. 3-8).

The deliverance of Israel by the passover is central in the remembrance of this covenant, and cannot be considered apart from it. Jer. xxxi. looks back to the passover and the old covenant, and looks forward to the true passover Lamb, and the new covenant:--

“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: 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, which My covenant they brake” (Jer. xxxi. 31, 32).

When the Lord Jesus took the cup on that passover feast, and said, “This is My blood of the new covenant”, it was a direct fulfillment both of type of the passover covenant, and the prophecy of the new covenant of Jeremiah.

I Cor. x., xi., and the wilderness.

Another objection is based upon the fact that I Cor. x., which speaks of the cup, the Lord’s table, and the broken bread, relates to the wilderness and not to the passover. In Exod. xii. 12-14 we read:--

“I will pass over you and this day shall be unto you for a MEMORIAL.”

while in I Cor. xi. 24 we find the words:--

“This do in REMEMBRANCE of Me.”

It was quite impossible to “remember” as a memorial feast the passover in Egypt until it was an accomplished fact, and it would have been equally impossible for the twelve apostles to have “remembered” the Lord’s death at that first “Lord’s Supper”, for that death had not then taken place. But as the years succeeded their exodus from Egypt, so the memorial feast was spread, and as the occasion was seized, the new covenant saints of the early church showed forth the Lord’s death while they waited for “the hope of Israel” which covered the Acts (*see* Acts xxviii. 20), and therefore included the hope expressed in the words “till He come”.

We are grateful for the query, for it has enabled us to see the connection of passover and covenant more clearly than before. Criticism is welcomed, for we can do nothing against the truth.

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth.

#58. The Tabernacle.

The ark and the mercy seat (Exod. xxv. 10-22).

pp. 17 - 25

The first item of the tabernacle that is specified is the ark. This is severally called:--

- “The ark of the testimony” (Exod. xxv. 16);
- “The ark of the covenant” (Numb. x. 33);
- “The ark of the Lord” (Josh. iii. 13);
- “The ark of God” (I Sam. iii. 3);
- “The ark of the Lord God” (I Kings ii. 26);
- “The ark of Thy strength” (II Chron. vi. 41);
- “The holy ark” (II Chron. xxxv. 3).

These seven titles are doubtless distributed throughout the Scriptures with that discrimination which we always find whenever we subject the Word to a careful examination. For example, the title “The ark of the testimony” is reserved for the period covered by Moses and Joshua, whereas the title “The ark of the covenant” extends from Moses’ tabernacle to Solomon’s temple, from wilderness to kingdom. We must leave the tabulation of these titles, with the added one “The ark of the God of Israel” (I Sam. vi. 3) and others, to those who may be able to spare the hours that verification and accuracy demand.

The ark and its contents.

The ark was an oblong wooden chest 2-1/2 cubits long, 1-1/2 cubits wide, and 1-1/2 cubits high, covered within and without with gold, and having upon it round about a crown of gold. For the purpose of transport four rings of gold were fixed to the four corners, and two staves of shittim wood overlaid with gold were placed in the rings, and left there in constant readiness for the removal of the ark. The shittim wood of which the ark was made is most probably that of the acacia tree. It is mentioned, together with the cedar, the myrtle and the oil tree, fir tree, pine, and box, in Isa. xli. 19, and appears to be one of seven trees that indicate blessing:--

“The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of My sanctuary’ (Isa. lx. 13).

Jerome says that the wood of the shittim tree affords long planks smooth and free from knots, and that it does not grow in cultivated places, or in any other place of the Roman Empire, except in the desert of Arabia. It is intensely interesting to note that the LXX renders the word shittim wood *xulon asepton* = “incorruptible wood”. The woodwork of the tabernacle was covered; it was designed for constructional purposes, and not for beauty, and the humbler office was fulfilled throughout by the shittim or acacia tree. Where every detail is so specifically shown, and where the typical character of every item

seems so apparent, we can hardly dismiss as fanciful that suggestion that the two natures “flesh” and “spirit” (Rom. i. 3, 4) are set forth by the wood and gold used in the construction of the ark. Within the ark was placed, at different intervals of time:--

1. The tables of the covenant.
2. Aarons’ rod that budded.
3. The golden pot of manna.

The tables of stone are called “the testimony” and “the covenant”, and give their names to the ark. These were the only articles placed in the ark when it was first made (Exod. xxv. 16). The tables of stone originally given to Moses were broken by the angry law-giver at the sight of the people and the golden calf, and after having demonstrated that they had so soon broken the covenant into which they had entered, Moses prayed for the people:--

“Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin---; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written” (Exod. xxxii. 31, 32).

Passing over much that we shall have to consider later, we find the Lord restated the covenant, after bidding Moses to hew tables of stone like unto the first. After the proclamation of His mercy and graciousness, the Lord in restating the covenant lays particular stress upon idolatry (Exod. xxxiv. 10-28). Moses returned to Israel with the new tables of stone, and Exod. xxxv. 4 re-introduces the question of the tabernacle. What we have to learn from this rather complicated parenthesis is the old lesson of the ages. Before Israel actually received the tables of stone, they had broken them, and when Moses once more returned with the fresh tables of stone, he said in effect: “Make an ark. This covenant cannot be kept by you. All that you can hope for is to have a system of types and shadows, and await the advent of Him Who alone can magnify the law and make it honourable.”

The same story is found in Gen. iii. Man failed, and is shut up to the promised Seed. Israel failed, and is shut up unto the faith that should afterward be revealed. The important fact for us at the moment is that the *ark contains the unbroken law*. It is fundamental to both doctrinal and dispensational truth that it should be so. One cannot imagine, after a knowledge of the truth, the *broken* tables of stone being placed in the ark. The ark speaks of a law and a covenant fulfilled. Now the tabernacle and its furniture were shadows of the true or heavenly reality. Two references from the *Apocalypse* will be sufficient to prove that the ark was a pattern of a heavenly reality:--

“And the temple of God was opened *in heaven*, and there was seen in His temple the ark of the His covenant” (Rev. xi. 19).

“Behold, the inner shrine of the tabernacle of the testimony *in heaven* was opened” (Rev. xv. 5).

Following the former quotation came lightnings, voices, thunderings, earthquakes, and great hail, which in turn is followed by the sign of Israel and the dragon (Rev. xii.).

Following the latter quotation we find the seven angels with the vials of wrath spoken of as a sign “great and marvelous” (Rev. xv. 1).

This is the covenant of marvels, which God made upon the restatement of the covenant with Israel:--

“Behold, I make a covenant: before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation” (Exod. xxxiv. 10).

Thus it is that the plagues which fell upon

equaling about three pecks) instead of the ark; a lid made of lead, instead of the mercy seat made of gold. Wickedness within instead of righteousness, and two women with wings like those of an unclean bird to serve as cherubim, finally taking it back to its own resting place, Babylon. A remarkable statement in Jeremiah leads us to understand still further the typical character of the ark:--

“In those days (of Israel’s restoration) saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord; neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall it be made again” (Jer. iii. 16),

the reason being, according to verse 17, that the throne of the Lord will then be at Jerusalem, and therefore the type will no longer be necessary.

Priesthood and provision.

Beside the two tables of the covenant, there were placed in the ark Aaron’s rod that budded, and the golden pot of manna. The rebellion of Korah and Dathan, that foreshadows the great revolt against the Lord Himself, was followed by the command to lay up in the tabernacle, before the testimony, the rods of the leaders of Israel, among them Aaron’s. On the morrow it was discovered that Aaron’s rod had budded, bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds. This symbol of life, while it confirmed Aaron in his office, pointed on to Him Who by means of resurrection hath an unchangeable priesthood. The golden pot of manna was a constant memorial of the faithfulness of God in supplying all pilgrim needs until the land of promise was reached, and is a very real type of Christ. Is it no comfort to us in our wilderness journey to know that beside the unbroken law, there is the reminder of that Priest Who ever liveth to make intercession for us, and of that faithfulness that has said no good thing will He withhold while we walk the pilgrim pathway?

The golden ark with its crown, its unbroken covenant, its pledge of the ever living Priest, and its memorial of ever faithful care, was incomplete without the mercy seat that rested upon it. Righteousness without mercy would not bring salvation to sinners:--

“Though justice be thy plea, consider this, that in the course of justice, none of us should see salvation.”

In the ark and the mercy seat, “righteousness and peace have kissed each other”.

The mercy seat.

The mercy seat was made of pure gold, unlike the ark which was made of wood overlaid with gold. Made of one piece with it were the cherubim with their wings stretched forth on high, and with their faces toward the mercy seat:--

“And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I will give thee. And THERE I WILL MEET WITH THEE, and I will commune with thee” (Exod. xxv. 17-22).

The N.T. word mercy seat in Heb. ix. 5 is translated in Rom. iii. 25, “propitiation”, and is the word used by the LXX to translate the Hebrew word mercy seat. The word mercy seat (*kapporeth*) is from the word *kaphar*, to make atonement. Now whatever our conclusions may be as to the exact meaning of the word translated “atonement”, one thing is established, and that is that it is an essential part of the great sacrificial work of Christ.

We endeavour in this series to avoid arguments that are complicated, or that necessitate too close an investigation into the originals, and as we hope to give the doctrine of the *atonement* a careful study in the series headed “Redemption”, we leave the controversial side alone in this article. If we were asked what ideas came to the mind at the mention of the mercy seat, we should probably say, something to do with atonement, acceptance, or forgiveness. All these are true, but they are not the primary truth. This atonement is necessitated by our sins, but what is the object before us which necessitates the removal of the barrier, sin? We may receive a precious lesson from the very first statement made concerning the use of the mercy seat. To Moses the Lord said, “There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee”. Fellowship and communion, these are the real objects; all else but makes a way.

I will meet.—The words *to meet* mean “to meet by appointment”, and the Hebrew word enters into one of the names of the tabernacle, viz., “the tabernacle of the congregation” (Exod. xxvii. 21). It is translated “to betrothe” in Exod. xxi. 8, 9, and “agreed” in Amos iii. 3. It will be remembered that the tabernacle number was given as number 5, and 5 times in the book of Exodus does the Lord speak of the mercy seat, or the altar, where the blood was shed that sprinkled the mercy seat, as the place where He would meet Moses, and the children of Israel (Exod. xxv. 22; xxix. 42, 43; xxx. 6, 36).

The meeting place, a beautiful symbol of the result of the atonement, contains within itself the ideas of entrance, access and acceptance. A most interesting and helpful suggestion of the fullness of this meeting with God is contained in the LXX rendering of the word “meet” in these passages, where the translation reads, “And I will *make Myself known* to thee from thence”. The knowledge of Himself and His ways are made known *there*. Knowledge in the scriptural sense is far removed from mere scholarship, valuable

asset though that is. Asaph learned this lesson, and recorded it in Psa. lxxiii., for when he went into the sanctuary of God he understood that which before he could not discover.

I will commune.—The Hebrew word *dabar*, which is translated “commune” 20 times, is translated “speak” 814 times, so that while we lose an apparently spiritual idea by giving up the deeper word “commune”, we in reality gain by using the commoner word “speak”, for instead of thinking of set occasions, and for specially holy purposes Moses heard the voice of the Lord, it was here at the mercy seat that *every* word was heard, every instruction given, every problem settled. Here it was that the Lord “spake (*dabar*) with Moses face to face, as a man speaketh (*dabar*) unto his friend” (Exod. xxxiii. 11). Here it was that the Lord “talked” with Moses (Exod. xxxiii. 9):--

“When Moses was gone into the tabernacle of *meeting* to *speak* with Him, then he heard the voice of One *speaking* unto him from off the mercy seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim, and he *spake* unto him” (Num. vii. 89).

Who will have the temerity to decide that the meaning of the last clause should be written, “and *He* spake unto him”, or “and he spake unto *Him*”? Is it not the very essence of this meeting place that both should speak; Moses speaking with God, and God speaking with Moses? Is not this “communion”? To speak with God, and to hear His word, before the blood sprinkled mercy seat? Truly we have yet to learn of burnt offerings and sin offerings, offerings to make atonement and peace, yet are they not all with the very object to remove all barriers and unfitness so that, unhindered, we may enter into the presence of God, to “meet” with Him and to have this “communion”?

So important is this somewhat forgotten aspect of the result of atonement, that the word *dabar* was used as a name for the holiest of all, and appears in the word “oracle” (II Sam. xvi. 23), and in the slightly modified form (*debir*) in sixteen other passages in the O.T. The mercy seat, though associated with the work of atonement, is essentially a place of fellowship, and the hearing of the word of God.

The references to the mercy seat (*kapporeth*) in the tabernacle are 26 in number, and those who have Dr. E. W. Bullinger’s *Number in Scripture* will find examples tending to show the connection of the number 13 and its multiples with the subject of atonement. These 26 references to the mercy seat are divided into three groups:--

1. Those in Exodus which speak of the actual making and placing of the mercy seat.
2. Those in Exodus and Numbers that refers to it as a place of meeting and communion.
3. Those in Lev. xvi. which deal with the great day of atonement.

The references in Lev. xvi. are seven in number. What was the actual origin of the day of atonement? The sin and death of Aaron’s two sons Nadab and Abihu. These men offered strange fire before the Lord, and were destroyed:--

“Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is that the Lord spake, saying, I WILL BE SANCTIFIED in them that come nigh Me, and before all the people I will be glorified” (Lev. x. 1-3).

Lev. xvi. begins with the words:--

“And the Lord spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before the Lord, and died Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times within the vail before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not.”

The words “at all times” mean “just at any time”. Aaron and his sons were becoming too familiar, and made certain religious conventions necessary. It is the habit of the superior person to sneer at conventions, but with some natures they have their place, and while set forms, solemn ritual, and ceremonial may degenerate into superstition and empty formalism, they have their place. The solemn ritual of the day of atonement, and the restriction of access to the high priest once every year, would have the tendency to hallow the name of God and prevent that unholy familiarity that was evidently developing. And so there is the washing of the flesh, the linen clothes, the sin offering and the atonement, the incense and the seven times sprinkled blood. The words of the wise man are very appropriate here:--

“Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few” (Eccles. v. 1, 2).

The cherubim [which are so closely associated with the mercy seat as to be made “of the matter of the mercy seat” (Exod. xxv. 19 margin)], have been dealt with in the series *Redemption*, both in connection with the cherubim themselves, and in connection with the original office of Satan, and though we do not pretend to have exhausted the teaching of Scripture, we can say nothing more to profit at the end of an article. May the four simple features brought before us in connection with the ark and mercy seat be a blessing to us:--

1. An unbroken covenant.
2. An undying Priest.
3. An unfailing supply.
4. A place of fellowship and communion.

“And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin” (I John i. 3-7).

**#59. The table of shewbread (Exod. xxv. 23-30).
“All one in Christ.”
pp. 49 - 55**

Having considered something of the rich teaching set forth by the ark of the covenant, and the mercy seat within the second veil, we now, following the order of the narrative before us, pass into the holy place and turn our attention to the furniture there.

Divine service.

Before passing on to detailed descriptions, however, we must have some idea of the typical meaning of the “holy place” in which this furniture stood:--

“There was a tabernacle made; the *first*, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary (margin, the holy, Gr. *hagia*). And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all” (Gr. *hagia hagion*) (Heb. ix. 2, 3).

Here we have very clearly the subdivision set forth with the distinctive names of the two parts, the division being made by the second veil:--

“Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went *the high priest alone once* every year, not without blood” (Heb. ix. 6, 7).

Without seeking to force a distinction beyond its limits, it appears from the usage of the words “service” and “serve” that these do not so much describe the great atoning work of Christ, as that they refer to the worship and service of the redeemed. Both the Saviour and the saved were set forth in type in the tabernacle. The Saviour being typified by the solitary act of the high priest “alone once”, the saved being typified by the priests who went “always” accomplishing the “service”. *Latreia* (service) occurs in Heb. ix. 1 and 6, *latreuo* (to serve or worship), in Heb. viii. 5; ix. 9, 14; x. 2; xii. 28; xiii. 10. It will be seen that the “service” is entirely connected with the Levitical priesthood, or its N.T. counterpart. They that did the service were not perfected as pertaining to the conscience by the daily ritual then imposed (Heb. ix. 9). It necessitated a greater high priest than Aaron, and a better sacrifice than was offered on the day of atonement to purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Heb. ix. 14). The shadows of the law with its typical sacrifices could not make the comers thereunto perfect, for their consciences were not really purged from sin (Heb. x. 1, 2). The gifts and sacrifices that constituted the service of the typical tabernacle “stood only in meats and drinks, and divers baptisms, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 10).

Latreuo and *latreia*, are not found in the Septuagint of Genesis, they appear for the first time in Exodus. The Passover feast is called “this service” (Exod. xii. 25, 26). Pharaoh understood “service” to involve the offering of sacrifice, for in Exod. iii. 12; iv. 23; vii. 16; viii. 1 & 20 the demand had been made that Israel should be liberated to “serve” God, Pharaoh’s words are, “Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land” (Exod. viii. 25). Moses, moreover, when speaking once again to Pharaoh, uses another expression of similar import. To Pharaoh’s “Go, serve the Lord”, Moses replies, “We must hold a feast unto the Lord” (Exod. x. 8, 9).

While *latreuo* seems to have special reference to “the service of a worshipper”, and is omitted from Genesis, *douleuo* is of frequent occurrence in that book. It is used of the service rendered of kings (Gen. xiv. 4); of Israel’s bondage (xv. 14); of the elder serving

the younger (xxv. 23); of men serving man (xxvii. 29, 40); and of Jacob's service to Laban (xxix. 15, 18, 20, 25, 30; xxx. 26, 29; xxxi. 6, 41). The apostle uses the two words in Rom. i.:--

“Paul, a bond slave (*doulos*) of Jesus Christ” (Rom. i. 1).
“Whom I serve (*latreuo*) with my spirit in the gospel” (Rom. i. 9).
“Who worshipped and served (*latreuo*) the creature” (Rom. i. 25).

If the distinct aspects of service that these two words indicate are kept in mind, the meaning of the apostle will become more clear. Coming now to Exod. xxv. we bring with us the thought that here in the first tabernacle, where priests ministered daily, we are dealing with *service*, and it is in connection with service that we must view the table of shewbread.

Divine sustenance.

The table not only held the twelve loaves of shewbread, but also was laid with “dishes, spoons, covers, and bowls of pure gold”. It was a table, not an altar, a table spread in the presence of the Lord with food wherewith those who rendered service might be fed. The margin of Exod. xxv. 29 renders “to cover withal” by “to pour out withal”, and the LXX reads:--

“And thou shalt make its dishes and its censers, and its bowls and its cups, *with which thou shalt offer drink offerings*; of pure gold shalt thou make them” (Exod. xxv. 29).

This makes us think of the supreme act of service contemplated by the apostle Paul in Phil. ii. 17, and carried through in II Tim. iv. 6, where we have the only occurrence of *spendomai* in the N.T. He was willing to be poured out as a drink offering upon the sacrifice and service of faith. While therefore the bread is the important item on the table, the drink offering must be remembered.

This feminine form of the word occurs seven times in Scripture. The passages are Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16; v. 12; vi. 15; xxiv. 7 and Numb. v. 26. *Zikkaron*, the masculine form, occurs twenty-four times. We give a selection only. We use the word “reminder” as variant, as familiarity with the A.V. sometimes blunts our senses: “This day shall be unto you for a *reminder*” (Exod. xii. 14). “It shall be for a sign and a *reminder*” (Exod. xiii. 9). These two passages refer to the feast of the Passover and the unleavened bread: “Stones for a reminder unto the children of Israel their names before the Lord as a *reminder*” (Exod. xxviii. 12, 29). Here the names of Israel engraven upon the stones of the ephod and breastplate are a reminder both to Israel and to the Lord. We cannot give all occurrences, they can easily be found. *Zikkaron* is used seven times in blessing, and once in judgment against Amalek in Exodus. *Zeker*, another masculine form, occurs several times. The first occurrence is Exod. iii. 15, “This is My name for the age, and this is My *reminder* unto all generations”.

The Passover was a reminder of redemption, the unleavened bread of the bondage endured and the exodus effected, together with the need to “purge out the old leaven of wickedness”. The name “Jehovah Elohim of your fathers” was a sufficient reminder for God to “remember His covenant” (Lev. xxvi. 42, 45). The frankincense upon the twelve loaves was a *reminder*. A reminder of what? Before we can answer that question we must answer another: “What did the twelve loaves typify?”

The bread of the presence.

It is good to see in books dealing with the tabernacle and its typical teaching that every opportunity is seized to bring forward the fullness of Christ, but there may be even in this, zeal without knowledge. We refer to the interpretation that speaks of the twelve loaves as typical of Christ as “the bread of life”. In John vi. the Lord says, “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead I am the living bread” (John vi. 49, 51). It will be seen that lying upon the ground outside the tabernacle morning by morning was to be found the type of Christ as the bread of life. That therefore can scarcely be the meaning of these twelve loaves also. This “bread of presence” before the Lord “always” (Exod. xxv. 30), the “continual bread” (Numb. iv. 7), like the names engraved upon the stones of the ephod and the stones of the breastplate, represented the twelve tribes of Israel.

The table of shewbread is mentioned in II Chron. iv. 19 under Solomon, and again in II Chron. xiii. 11 it is mentioned in king Abijah’s appeal to the ten tribes when he pleaded for the true unity of Israel, also in Hezekiah’s reign (II Chron. xxix. 18). When the captivity returned under Nehemiah, even though called by their enemies “these feeble Jews” (Neh. iv. 2), and even though the restored temple was in the eyes of those who knew the Lord’s house in its first glory “as nothing” (Hag. ii. 3), there is not the remotest suggestion either by Abijah, Hezekiah, or Nehemiah that any number of loaves than twelve should be used, or that the frankincense should be omitted. The twelve loaves set forth Israel as viewed in Christ, not as viewed in themselves. “He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath He seen perverseness in Israel” (Numb. xxiii. 21). This was no “legal fiction”, but based upon the offering of their Messiah:--

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God” (Rom. iii. 25).

Whatever the personal state of Israel may have been whether united as one nation or divided into two, whether humbly seeking God or wickedly departing from His commandment, one thing remained “always” and “continual”. That was the “everlasting covenant” or the “covenant of the ages”. This it will be remembered is connected with the command concerning the shewbread in Lev. xxiv. 5-9. Just as the memorial in the offering for jealousy was to bring “iniquity to remembrance” (Numb. v. 15), so the memorial upon the shewbread was to bring the sweet savour of Christ to remembrance.

The age-abiding covenant.

The first mention of *berith olam*, “an age-abiding covenant”, is in Gen. ix. 16, where God sets His bow in the cloud as a “reminder” (“that I may remember”) of His covenant with all flesh. Now this covenant was made *notwithstanding* the fact that “the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth” (Gen. viii. 21), and in *close association* with the “sweet savour of rest” that spoke of the offering of Christ. So with Israel. Abram’s name was changed to Abraham, and the Lord said:--

“I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for *an age-abiding covenant*, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, And I will give unto thee, and to they seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for *an age-abiding possession*; and I will be their God” (Gen. xvii. 7, 8).

Though Israel broke this age-abiding covenant (Isa. xxiv. 5), yet in the person of their Messiah that covenant is established (Isa. lv. 3 and lxi. 8). This age-abiding covenant lies behind the new covenant which was sealed by the blood of Christ (Jer. xxxii. 40 and xxxi 31-37). Perhaps there is no more marvelous setting for this covenant, nor a passage that emphasizes its utter independence of human merit than Ezek. xvi. 60. Charges are made against Israel in Ezek. xvi. that reveal a condition that dwarfs the sin of Sodom “as a very little thing (xvi. 47), and by comparison can justify the words “they (Sodom and Samaria) are more righteous than thou” (xvi. 52). Then come the words of verse 60:--

“Nevertheless I will remember My covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish with thee an age-abiding covenant.”

All this is set forth in the table of shewbread. Twelve loaves show Israel complete and undivided before the Lord. These twelve loaves are all unleavened, Israel’s righteousness is fully provided for in *Jehovah Tsidneku*. “Pure” frankincense above, and a “pure” table beneath, indicate their perfect acceptance in the Beloved. Here is a “reminder” of that “age-abiding covenant” that glorifies the end of Ezek. xvi., and will glorify the end of this stiff-necked and gain-saying people.

The shewbread and service.

Returning to our

(Eph. v. 27) the “offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour” (Eph. v. 2). For us no type or symbol is necessary. “The bread of presence” is expressed for the church once and for ever in the blessed words, “Accepted in the Beloved” (Eph. i. 6), and “Made meet” (Col. i. 12).

#60. The golden lampstand (Exod. xxv. 31-40).
Unity in witness.
pp. 84 - 89

If it be true, as we sought to show in our last article, that the holy place is connected with worship and service, that will be true not only as it relates to the table of shewbread, but as it relates to the golden lampstand. The word candlestick is misleading. No candles were used, but oil for the lamps is specifically mentioned:--

“And thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof” (Exod. xxv. 37).

“Oil for the light” (Exod. xxv. 6).

“Pure olive oil beaten for the light” (Exod. xxvii. 20).

“Not by might, nor by power.”

There is a chapter in Zechariah that deals so pointedly with the symbolism of this golden lampstand, that to attempt an interpretation of Exod. xxv. before first considering this passage would be to insult the Author of Scripture, therefore, let us turn to Zech. iv. Here we have one of a series of visions, all concerned with one object, the fulfilling of the *age-abiding covenant*, whose memorial or reminder we have seen was found in the twelve loaves of presence, the shewbread. These visions are eight in number, and occupy chapters i.-vi., a new section of the prophecy commencing with chapter vii. Readers of *The Companion Bible* will notice a light change in the structure of these visions, as we feel that there is no warrant for uniting the sixth and seventh as one member.

The eight visions of Zech. i.-vi.

A | i. 7-17. The horses. “My house shall be built.” “The Lord shall yet choose Jerusalem.”

B | i. 18-21. The horns and the smiths. Gentile oppressors and deliverers.

C | ii. 1-13. Measure Jerusalem; breadth and length.

“Jerusalem shall be inhabited.” His eye.

D | iii. 1-7. The high priest. “The Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem.”

E | iii. 8-10. My servant the Branch. “Every man under his vine and fig.”

Seven eyes.

D | iv. 1-14. The lampstand. The laying of the foundation of the house. Eyes.

C | v. 1-4. The flying roll; length and breadth.

“Zion that dwelleth with Babylon.”

B | v. 5-11. The ephah. Gentile dominion. “Build it an house.”

A | vi. 1-8. The chariots. The four spirits of the heavens. Judgment.

E | vi. 9-15. The man whose name is the Branch. Temple and throne.

It will be seen that the common theme of these visions is the restoration of Israel, showing the satanic opposition (manifested through Gentile powers and finally at Babylon), and the triumph of the Lord (manifested through Joshua and Zerubbabel, and finally through Christ, the Branch). We are not, however, dealing with Zechariah, but seek light from Zech. iv. upon the symbolism of the candlestick.

The Branch.

In Exod. xxv. 31-36 when reading the description of the lampstand we come upon the word “branches” repeatedly, in fact twelve times. The word branch here is *qaneh*. In Zech. iv. 12, where we read of “the two olive branches”, the word is *shibboleth*. In Zech. iii. 8 and vi. 12 the Branch is *Tsemach*. Now although these seem so diverse at first, they are nevertheless intimately related.

In Gen. xli. 5 we have the first occurrence of *shibboleth*, where it is translated “ears of corn”. In Gen. xli. 5 also we have the first occurrence of *qaneh*, where it is translated “stalk”. This establishes a connection between the “branches” of the golden candlestick of Exod. xxv. and the “two olive branches” of Zech. iv. In Psa. lxxv. 9, 10 *tsemach* is used of corn, “the springing”. So also in Hos. viii. 7 where it is translated as the “bud” that yields no meal, and is connected with sowing, reaping and standing corn (*see margin*). It is demonstrated, therefore, that the three words translated branch are all used of corn, and therefore cannot be widely dissimilar, but, to adopt the words of Scripture, may be as closely allied as “the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear”. We have here a sequence. First the type of the lampstand in the tabernacle, next the vision of the lampstand in Zech. iv., and finally the prophetic fulfillment of both type and vision in “The Man Whose name is the BRANCH”.

It is readily granted that we should naturally have considered the lampstand in the tabernacle as a type of Christ, the light of the world, but we should have made the same mistake that we observed is made by making the shewbread a type of Christ as the bread of life. As the light of the *world* Christ is set forth by other figures, but as the light in the *holy place* another office is implied. Prophecy is said to be a “light that shineth in a dark place” (II Pet. i. 19), until the day dawn, and the Lord comes. Zech. iv. is most certainly prophetic of the day of Israel’s restoration and the coming of the Lord. The explanation of the vision of the lamp fed from the two olive trees is given by the angel:--

“This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord of hosts” (Zech. iv. 6).

There can therefore be no two thoughts as to the symbolism of the olives. They speak of the witness and the work of the spirit in contrast with the arm of the flesh. The seven lamps are evidently “those seven” of verse 10, which are explained to be “the eyes of the Lord” that watch over His purpose. The last word of explanation in Zech. iv. 14 forces us to turn to the book of the Revelation.

“These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.”

As we have said, the pros and cons of the question of N.T. quotation involve too much investigation into the vicissitudes of the MSS., and patient searching for guiding principles for any attempt to be made here. The interested reader may look for a series when time and opportunity allow the necessary work, which is rather heavy and tedious. For the present purpose it is enough to see the use which the apostle makes of the O.T. at every turn, either to teach, illustrate, or confirm the truth he is unfolding. Habakkuk's faith rested upon the faithfulness of God, even though outward circumstances prompted the jibe of the scoffer, "Where is the promise?" During the time of trial, while the vision waited God's appointed time, Habakkuk learned, and manifested practically that "The just by faith shall live." This is the order of the words both in the Hebrew, the LXX., and in the three quotations of Paul. The very ambiguity is seized by the apostle, in one place, to emphasize the truth, "The just by faith. . . shall live," and at another, "The just. . . by faith shall live."

By keeping the passage of Habakkuk in mind we shall be saved from that rash system of interpretation that either makes faith into a work or into a fetish, that makes faith into a dead legal form instead of a warm, breathing, living organic part of the new birth. Just as man, the living soul, may be spoken of as "body, soul, and spirit," yet essentially one, so the new life is manifested by "faith, hope and love"; neither may these be separated, except mentally, without the spiritual dissolution of the new man. As we proceed through this wonderful epistle Hab. ii. 4 will unfold its three-fold fullness. We shall learn more fully the meaning of :

"The just" (ho dikaios).
"By faith" (ek pisteos).
"Shall live" (gesetai).

He who comprehends Paul's teaching concerning righteousness, faith and life, with its alternative sin, disobedience and death, will understand the basis of Paul's gospel, and can go forth to all the world with a gospel of which he need never be ashamed.

The Epistle to the Romans.

No.6.

The suppression of the truth (Rom. i. 18).

The discovery of the meaning of the term "the righteousness of God" is of the first importance, but as the apostle was as sensible of this as any of his subsequent readers of expositors, we feel that it will be better to defer an extended examination of this term until we are considering the apostle's own inspired explanations that occupy Rom. iii. and iv.

Following therefore the line of the apostle's teaching, we find that after the great thesis of the epistle has been stated in Rom. i. 17, he turns aside to establish the utter need of both Gentile (Rom. i. 18-32), and Jew (Rom. ii. 1-29), and then "the whole world" (Rom. iii. 19), and that a righteousness provided by grace has taken the place of a righteousness attained by works of law.

Rom. i. 18 to iii. 20 is one large section of this epistle devoted mainly to the establishment of the utter need of all men for the provision of grace in the gospel. It opens with the testimony of creation, and the things that may be known of God; it closes with the testimony of the law, and the knowledge of sin. Man needs something more than knowledge, he needs power to perform, and this he does not possess. Confining ourselves for the time to the revelation given of the darkness of the Gentile world, let us turn our attention to Rom. i. 18-ii. 1. The statement of verse 18 is the conclusion of the argument introduced at verse 16:

"FOR I am not ashamed of the gospel."
"FOR it is the power of God unto salvation."
"FOR herein is revealed a righteousness of God."
"FOR the wrath of God is revealed from heaven."

The necessity for righteousness is stressed by the fact of the revelation of wrath against all unrighteousness.

Wrath.

The word *orge* (translated "wrath") occurs twelve times in Romans, and of these occurrences seven are found in the first great doctrinal division (Rom. i. I-v. I I). It is an important word, and seeing that it is placed in distinct relation to righteousness in Rom. i. 17, 18, it demands a prayerful study. We observe in the first place that "wrath" is used in the outer portion of Romans only. The word is not used in Rom. v. 12-viii. 39. The word "wrath" is not used of either Adam or of man seen in Adam. Judgment, condemnation and death there are, but unaccompanied by wrath. There is no wrath either in connection with the lake of fire, or the great white throne in Rev. xx. All is calm, books are opened, everyone is dealt with in pure justice. Wrath, anger, indignation, fury, these words are of a different category.

Many times do we read that the wrath or the anger of the Lord was "kindled," as in Exod. iv. 14, or of wrath "waxing hot," as in Exod. xxii. 24, or of His anger "smoking" (Psa. Ixxiv. I), and of it being poured out in "fury" (Isa. xlii. 25). The nature of the wrath of Rom. i. 18, and of the day of wrath with which it is connected (Rom. ii. 5), is discovered in the book of the Revelation. Those upon whom this wrath is poured are the "nations," and the time is the time of the dead that they should be judged and rewarded (Rev. xi. 18; xix. 15). This wrath falls particularly upon Babylon (Rev. xvi. 19), and in direct connection with its idolatry and uncleanness (Rev. xiv. 8-10). Babylon is in view in Rom. i. 18-32. There we see that Satanic system in all its naked horror, there we see the domination of darkness and the lie. In this section we read of those who by their deeds are "worthy of death," and who "have pleasure" in deeds of evil (Rom. i. 32). This section therefore is connected with wrath.

In the inner section, which is connected not with Babylon but with Adam, it is death and not darkness and uncleanness that comes through to the race, and in some cases it is distinctly implied that some who thus die in Adam are not held to be personally "worthy of death," for it speaks of some who did not sin" after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. v. 14), and in this connection we find one who instead of "having pleasure" in the practice of evil, says that he hates the deeds he finds himself practising, while inwardly delighting in the law of God. Such is the very different point of view of these two sections.

Wrath in Romans i. -v.

- A - i. 18. Wrath revealed against unrighteousness.
- B - ii. 5. Treasuring up wrath. "Works" (verse 6).
- C - ii. 5. The day of wrath and *righteous* judgment.
- D - ii. 8, 9. Wrath rendered to Jew and Gentile alike.
- C - iii. 5. Is God *unrighteous* Who visits with wrath?
- B - iv. 15. The law worketh wrath. "Faith" (verses 14 and 16)
- A - v. 9. Saved from wrath, because made righteous.

This revelation of wrath against those who, while being ungodly and unrighteous themselves, hold down the truth in unrighteousness, is further connected with willful despising of that goodness which should lead to repentance. In two places the righteousness of this wrath is emphasized (ii. 5 and iii. 5). There is much to be learned by comparing 1 and 2 Thessalonians with this passage in Romans.

- "Wrath revealed from heaven" (Rom. i. 18).
- "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven" (2 Thess. i. 7).
- "When they *knew* God, they glorified Him not as God. . . .
- "They did *not* like to retain God in their *knowledge*" (Rom. i. 21, 28).
- "In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that *know not God*" (2 Thess. 1. 8).
- "They have *pleasure* in them that do them" (Rom. i. 32).
- "They had *pleasure* in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 12).
- "They changed the *truth* of God into *the lie*" (Rom. 1. 25).
- "They received not. . . the *truth*. . . they believe *the lie*" (2 Thess. ii. 10, 11).
- "They changed the glory of God into an image made like to *man*" (Rom. i. 23).
- "The *man* of sin. . . showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4).
- "*Wrath* revealed. . . *idolatry*" (Rom. 1. 18-25).
- "Ye turned to God from *idols*. . . saved from the *wrath* to come" (1 Thess. i. 9, 10).
- "God also gave them up to *uncleanness*" (Rom. i. 24).
- "Not in the lust of *concupiscence*, even as the Gentiles which know not God" (1 Thess. iv. 5).

If we also bring together the parallels that we find in the book of the Revelation, we shall have a full reference to that satanic system of iniquity commenced at Babel, dominating the nations of the earth from that time onward until judged at the coming of the Lord in the day of wrath.

The wrath of God in Rom. i. 18 is revealed against specific sin, viz., "Upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of those men who hold down the truth in unrighteousness." The ungodliness and unrighteousness that kindles the fierce anger of God is that which actually suppresses the truth. It is not the ungodliness of the ignorant, nor the unrighteousness of the wayward, but the conscious opposition of ungodliness to revealed truth. The mystery of iniquity has ever opposed the mystery of godliness.

Worship.

Man is disposed to place common honesty between man and his neighbour as of more importance than "worship." Many a moral person would think nothing of the charge that he was not pious, yet the deeper our insight into the basis of all things, the nearer it brings us to the footstool of God. Is there not enough in Scripture to indicate that the first sin of all had direct relation to the worship of God? (Ezek. xxviii.). Did not the tempter bait his hook with the words, "Ye shall be as God"? Did not Israel break the ten commandments when they broke the first in the worship of the golden calf? Is not the first example of living by faith that of Abel the worshipper, and was not Cain's primal sin the suppression or withholding of the demands of God's holiness? Babylonianism, author as it is of vice and cruelty, is primarily and essentially a system of false worship.

The words "hold the truth" are really "hold down" or "suppress" the truth. This word (*katecho*) occurs in the epistle we have already referred to, namely, 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7, where it is rendered in the A.V. by "withholdeth" and "letteth." A careful comparison of Rom. i. and 2 Thess. ii. will help us to realize the restraining power of Babel, this suppressing of the truth, this exchanging of the truth for the lie, this rendering of the worship due to the Creator to the creature.

Knowledge.

That this restraining of the truth is willful, and not out of pitiable ignorance (*cf.* I Tim. i. 13), is seen in the immediate context. The next verse commences with the word ., "because," and goes on to show that there has been on the part of God a revelation of Himself of sufficient clearness to make idolatry a definite perversion. With this rejection of what might be known of God came the awful descent into the slough of uncleanness that is so vividly portrayed by the apostle, and by the writers of his own day. What was true of the Gentiles was only too true, alas, of Israel also. This we shall see more clearly as we proceed. Enough for the moment if we begin to realize the utter and abject need that the world had of that provision of righteousness which is the glory of the gospel and which, as the apostle said, was the power of God unto salvation.

What the Lord revealed to the nations, how He revealed it, and their subsequent attitude we must consider in our next paper. Let us meanwhile be grateful that though children of wrath, even as the rest, grace has saved us, and instead of being dominated by the lie, we have learned the truth as it is in Jesus.

The Epistle to the Romans

No. 7

Inexcusable (Rom. i. 19, 20)

We sought to draw attention in our last article to the distribution of the word "wrath" in Romans, and to the related teaching that wrath is directed against culpable wickedness and apostasy, particularly that Babylonian phase called "the lie," and which finds expression in false worship. There is no fury, wrath, or anger to be discovered in Gen. iii., where the atmosphere is calm though sad, neither is wrath found in Rom. v. 12-viii. 39. We now turn our attention to the teaching of Rom. i. 19-32 in order to learn the history of Gentile failure and Babylonian triumph. Verses 19 and 21 both begin with *dioti* = "because." Both verses follow on from the statement in verse 18 that those spoken of "suppressed the truth." Their culpability in the matter is made evident by the fact that "they knew God." How they knew, what they knew, the limitations of this knowledge, the responsibilities of this knowledge, and the departure from it, with all that it implies, must now be the subject of our enquiry.

The knowledge of God.

In an age of intellectualism, the child of faith is liable to underrate true knowledge. Yet a moment's reflection will summon from the Scriptures abundant proof that the knowledge of God is the goal of redemption, and the strength of the pilgrim. Prophecy looks forward to no higher manifestation of glory than that the knowledge of the Lord shall one day cover the earth. It would occupy too much space in this article to deal with this aspect of the Word, but the reader is directed to the series entitled "Studies in the Prophets" appearing in these pages for its development. Coming therefore to the revelation of God to mankind at the beginning we find:

"That which may be known of God is manifest in them." Liddon makes the observation on the phrase *gnoston tou Theou*, that "according to the invariable New Testament and LXX. use, this phrase means that which is known, not *that which may be known about God* (cf. Luke ii. 44; John xviii. 15; Acts i. 19, xv. 18, xxviii. 22)." "And Paul is speaking of an objective body of knowledge which becomes subjective in the phanerosis" (Winer, Gr. N.T. p. 295). This knowledge becomes manifested in their consciousness; *en autois* does not mean "among them" since *nooumena kathoratai* point to internal manifestation. If by "natural religion" we mean that which the unaided understanding of man can formulate from the visible creation, then we have no right to use the term here, for this knowledge was as much a revelation from God as is the written Word.

"For God hath made it manifest to them." "That which is known of God": truly the written revelation makes God known in a way that can never be accomplished by the works of His hands, nevertheless the knowledge of God here indicated was very comprehensive. It was so far a revelation as to deal with "His invisible things," these things being further defined as "His eternal power and deity." The word translated "eternal" here is not the familiar *aionios* which means "age long," but *aidios*. Some there are who consider this word as coming from the same word as *Hades*, and render it "

unseen," so making it amplify "invisible" of the same verse, but this is mistaking the *paranomasia* for the real meaning. *Aidios* is derived from *aei* = "always," and so means perpetual or eternal.

There is a distinction to be observed between the words *Theiotes* (divinity), and *Theotes* (the Being, God, Col. ii. 9). Under *Theiotes* all God's attributes (wisdom, goodness, etc.) are included. These truths about God are seen through being mentally perceived; the *nous* (mind), as distinct from the senses of man, must see God in nature. This ever existing power and deity of the Lord has been made manifest by His works since the creation. *Apoktiseos* means here, as it does in 2 Peter iii. 4, "since the creation of the world."

God made known by His works.

One has but to turn to the book of Job to learn something of what "nature" can say to him that hath the hearing ear. There, in Job xxxvi.-xli., we have heaven and earth called upon to bear their testimony to the "eternal power and deity" of Jehovah. "Behold, God is great," said Elihu, and then come the marshaled host of witnesses. Small drops of water, the spreading of the clouds, thunder and lightning, snow and hail. Then the Almighty Himself speaks to Job. He speaks of the foundation of the earth, the bounds set for the sea, the mysteries of light, the signs of heaven, the marvels of animal life and sustenance, all this and more lead Job to confess the eternal power of God: "I know that Thou canst do every thing, and that no thought of Thine can be hindered" (Job xlii. 2).

Can we forget Isaiah xlv. 9-24, which exposes the folly of idolatry, saying :

"He planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it . . . he burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast. . . and the residue thereof he maketh a god!" (Isa. xlv. 14-17).

What a contrast with the true God:-

"Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb. I am the Lord that maketh all things: that stretcheth forth the heavens above; that spreadeth abroad the earth by Myself" (Isa. xlv. 24)

So in the days when Babylon and its system shall be revived and in full power, the so called "everlasting gospel" will be preached, which gospel is nothing more nor less than a proclamation of the Lord as Creator:

Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen" (Rev. xiv. 7, 8).

With this note the heavenly phase of Revelation opens. In chapter iv., the rainbow throne, the living creatures, and the twenty-four elders testify not to redemption, not to kingdom, not to church, but to creation:

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created" (Rev. iv. 11).

Not till that is confessed do we read, "Thou art worthy. . . . for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed" (Rev. v. 9).

Science in its modern acceptance has rid the universe of its Creator. An impersonal

force occupies the throne of deity. It is becoming well-nigh impossible for anyone to be a science teacher to-day who does not subscribe to the theory of evolution in some form. Finally Rev. xiv. 7 suggests that to dare to believe the scriptural doctrine of creation, as opposed to what a godless science will by theory advance, will be to believe the very gospel, and to constitute oneself a martyr for the truth. We use the word science in its modern acceptation. True science we must ever welcome, for it can never contradict the Word of God. Take for example one feature as an illustration. What room is there in modern science for the teaching of Gen. i. 7? Should anyone dare to affirm their belief that there was sea water above the firmament he would be classed as a fool, yet a modern scientist has recently said, in connection with the transmission of " wireless" waves, that there must be somewhere above the atmosphere a kind of sounding board or reflection whose density is equal to sea water! We all know Psalm xix. and its twofold division, also Psalm viii.:

"The heavens declare the glory of God" (xix. 1) CREATION.

"The law of the Lord is perfect" (xix. 7) SCRIPTURE.

" When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars,
which Thou hast ordained" (viii. 3).

Since the creation of the world therefore the eternal power and deity of God have been abundantly manifested by the works of His hands. So freely, so clearly has God "shown it unto them" as to leave all "inexcusable." When we hear and see the revolting idolatry carried on even to-day in such places as India or Africa, our hearts go out in pity to these demon ridden people, yet on every hand they have these evidences. God has never left Himself without witness:

"In that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 16, 17).

It will be observed that the apostle prefaced this statement by speaking of God as:

"The living God. which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things therein" (Acts xiv. 15).

Or again on Mar's hill, he said to the men of Athens :

" God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands" (Acts xvii. 24-31),

and went on to demonstrate the utter folly of idol worship.

Inexcusable.

The nations of the earth were not so favoured as Israel, for to that nation were given " the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2). None of the nations received the law of Sinai, and therefore were not held accountable to it (Rom. iii. 19; iv. 15), but to all the world the witness of creation was given, and made manifest" in them" :

"There is no speech, and there are no words,
Unheard is their voice,
Yet through all the earth has gone their voice,
And to the end of the world their sayings " (Psa. xix. 3, 4).

God was the teacher, " for God hath shown it unto them." Presently we shall hear the charge reiterated when the apostle turns to the Jew (Rom. ii. I), but for the time our attention must be fixed upon the condition of the Gentile world. Mankind had a knowledge of

God, and this knowledge was (1) attested as true by conscience, "in them," and was (2) derived from the witness of God's works. This knowledge was very marvelous, for it embraced "the unseen things of God," even His eternal power and divinity, and was perceived by the mind from the works of His hands ever since the creation of the world, and hence from Adam onwards. This witness is found scattered throughout heathendom, and leaves all the nations of the earth "inexcusable." Just what it was that came in and prevented this primitive knowledge must be the subject of our next paper. What a fall is here!

The Epistle to the Romans
No. 8
Glory and thankfulness to God for His Goodness (Rom. i. 21)

The inexcusability of mankind for their departure from God is twofold :

- (1). God revealed His eternal power and deity in them by the witness of His works.
- (2). When they knew God, they wickedly perverted this knowledge.

We have given some consideration to the truth of (1), so we now turn our attention to the teaching under the heading of (2).

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened."

" *They knew God.*"- Is there any evidence extant of this primitive knowledge?

The testimony of antiquity.

Wilkinson, in his *Ancient Egyptians*, says, "The existence of a sole and omnipotent deity, Who created all things, seems to have been the universal belief." Moor, in his *Pantheon*, speaking of Brahm, the supreme God of the Hindoo, says, "Of Him whose glory is so great, there is no image" (Veda). He " illumines all, delights all, whence all proceeded; that by which they live when born, and that to which all must return" (Veda). Monier Williams, in his *Hidden Wisdom*, quotes some lines from a Vedic Hymn:-

"In the beginning there was neither nought or ought.
Then there was neither sky nor atmosphere above.
* * * * *
Then there was neither death nor immortality.
There was neither day, nor night, nor light, nor darkness,
Only the Existent One breathed calmly, self contained.
Nought else than Him there was nought else above, beyond."

Col. Vans Kennedy, in his *Hindoo Mythology*, quotes from the *Institutes of Menu*:

"He Whom the mind alone can perceive; Whose essence excludes the external organs, Who has no visible parts, Who exists from eternity Whom no being can comprehend. "

How can we account for the revolting idolatry of Hindooism to-day, with its millions of gods of inconceivable ugliness and sensuality, in the face of this testimony from their own religious literature? Rom. i. 19-32 provides the one and only answer. Among the Babylonians there was the tradition of "the only God," and a correct rendering of Isaiah lxvi. 17 gives it prominence. Spurrell's translation reads :

" They who sanctify themselves, and purify themselves, after the ordinances of Achad in the midst of the gardens, Who eat swine's flesh, and the reptile, and the mouse."

Achad means " The Only One," and is used in Deut. vi. 4, as here, without the article, of the " Only Jehovah." The Babylonians, when they intended to assert the unity of the Godhead in the strongest possible manner, used the word " Adad" (see *Macrobii Saturnalia*). *Mallet's Northern Antiquities* reveals much the same testimony in Icelandic Mythology. God is there called:

" The Author of everything that existeth, the eternal, the living, and awful Being: the searcher into concealed things, the Being that never changeth," attributing to this deity " an infinite power, a countless knowledge, and incorruptible justice."

What blight was it that settled upon mankind, turning this primitive knowledge into myths, distorting and twisting primal truth until it became servant and witness to the lie? Rom. i. 21-28 supplies the answer. This answer is manifold, but it begins with this simple statement, "They glorified Him not as God." .

The glory of God.

The glory of God underlies both creation and redemption. It is the great factor in the nature of sin and of hope. The glory of God is a topic of great importance in the epistle to the Romans. First let us notice the testimony of the verb *doxaso* (" to glorify"). Rom. viii. 30 uses it of the redeemed, and xi. 13 uses it where Paul " magnifies" or literally " glorifies" his office. This leaves us with three references, viz., i. 21, xv. 6 and 9. These references are full of teaching when seen together. Rom. i. 21 reveals the Gentile failure; Rom. xv. 6 and 9 reveal the Gentile's blessed reconciliation. What they failed to do by nature, they will do by grace. Let us put the passages together :

" They glorified Him not as God" (i. 21).

"That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God" (xv. 6).

"That the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy" (xv. 9).

Thus by this very first item, and its use in Romans, the glorious theme of the epistle is set forth. In Rom. i. we are to read of the setting aside of the nations, but in Rom. xv. we read of their blessed and happy restoration. Turning to the word *doxa* (glory) we learn from Rom. iii. 23 that it is essentially connected with sin. "For all sinned, and are coming short of the glory of God." Faith that emphasizes the fact of resurrection" gives glory to

God," as may be seen in the case of Abraham (Rom. iv. 20), and of all of like precious faith, who can now" rejoice in hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 2).

The word" glory" runs through this epistle, and forms an integral part of its theme. The reader should examine all the passages (we give them here to facilitate the study: Rom. i. 23; ii. 7, 10; iii. 7, 23; iv. 20; v. 2; vi. 4; viii. 18,21; ix. 4, 23; xi. 36; xv. 7; xvi. 27). If such is the importance of this initial factor, it behooves us all to acquaint ourselves with just what is involved in "glorifying God," lest we in our measure come short, even though saved. Something of what is intended by " glorifying God" may be gathered from such passages as I Chron. xvi. 23-36):

"Declare His glory among the heathen: His marvelous works among all nations."

Here it will be seen that" His glory" is, by the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, expressed by " His marvelous works." This is one item in glorifying God that the Gentiles omitted. Following this comes a statement concerning His eternal power and deity:

" For great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised: He also i. to be feared above all gods. For all the gods of the people are idols: But the Lord made the heavens. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name. And let men say among the nation., The Lord reigneth."

Glorifying God declares His marvelous works, acknowledges that He is above all gods, confesses that He is Creator, and that He reigneth. When we remember the testimony of Psa. xix., we remember that there we have a similar connection.

"The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament showeth His handywork."

The parallelism here is complete:-

The heavens	----	The firmament
Declare	----	Showeth
The glory of God	----	His Handywork

It is very evident that this confession of God as Creator is directly connected with glorifying God. Into the higher and deeper connection of this glorifying of God as, for example, is indicated in the language of Christ in John xvii., we do not enter, as this is beyond the scope of the passage in Romans i. Here is the first step in Gentile departure. They did not glorify God as God. The second step was that of ingratitude, "neither were thankful."

Thanksgiving,

The testimony of creation might have been awe-inspiring, the thunder bolt, the avalanche, the hurricane might have overwhelmed man's spirit with their testimony to tremendous power, might have extracted his tardy glorifying. But God's glory cannot be separated from His goodness. As Moses learned in Exod. xxxiii. 18, 19, "Shew me Thy

glory. . . . I will make all My goodness pass before thee." So when Paul sought to prevent the men of Lystra from worshipping himself and Barnabas as gods, he not only drew

their attention to that which demanded glory, namely, that God "made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein," but that which as surely demanded thanksgiving: "In that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 8-18). Sunshine and shower, the kindly fruits of the earth, the gift of sleep, the reward of labour, the blessings of home, of parent and child, all these were from the good hand of God, yet" they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful."

In the ascription of praise that is recorded in Rev. iv. 9 "thanks" is included, as also in Rev. vii. 12. Again in Rev. xi. 17 we read:-

"We give thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast reigned."

Four times does the Psalmist say, "Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good." His Godhead demands glory, and His goodness thanks. There is more than a mere phonetic connection between God and good, Some consider that the word "Deva," the generic name for "God" in India, comes from the Chaldee *thav* ("good"), with which is allied the Hebrew *tob*. Donaldson, in his *New Cratylus*, shows that *Th* is frequently pronounced *Dh*. From the Sanscrit *Deva*, without the digamma *Deo*, comes the Latin *Deus*, and the Greek *Theos*. "There is none good but One, that is God" (Matt. xix. 17). He is good, and He does good. When He manifests His glory He shows His goodness and declares His name.

As we meditate upon these things, the early apostasy of the Gentile world takes upon it a more serious character. It is not so much that they were ignorant, but ingrate. God did not look for learning, but He did look for thanksgiving. Science, as taught, is cold, mechanical, thankless. When the botanist Linneus saw a field of English gorse for the first time, he burst into tears. Herschel, Faraday, and others are, alas, magnificent exceptions. Let us not slip into a Godless nomenclature, and speak of "the laws of nature," but let us boldly, and yet humbly, glorify God as God, and be thankful to the great Giver for His gifts, by speaking rather of "the laws of God." If we would be true Protestants to-day, "God" will be in the language of everyday life, and not banished to the realm of hymns, prayers, and religious exercises. The reader who knows "The Biglow Papers" by James Russell Lowell; may remember that in his vernacular poems the name of God is mentioned rather freely. In his justification for the use he says :

"The charge is of profanity (against himself) brought in by persons who proclaimed African slavery of divine institution. . . . I scorn any such line of defence, and will confess at once that one of the things I am proud of in my countrymen is, that they do not put their Maker away far from them, or interpret the fear of God into being afraid of Him.

The Talmudists had conceived a deep truth when they said that 'all things were in the power of God, save the fear of God,' and when people stand in great dread of an invisible power, I suspect they mistake quite another personage for the Deity."

By this reference we do not intend to take Lowell's characterizations as our standard, but suggest that his point, so skillfully introduced at the time of the slavery question, should help us to pierce that smug and false piety that divorces the glory of God from His goodness and our thanksgiving, and mistranslates ritual as worship. Here again we must pause, reserving for another paper this record of the quick following of the *mind* into the follies of human imagination, when the fool had found it in his heart to say, "There is no God."

The Epistle to the Romans.

NO. 9.

Given up (Rom. i. 21-32).

In our last paper we found that the first step that led to the giving up of the Gentiles was a failure to glorify God as such, and to give Him thanks for the evident good gifts that He bestowed. In considering the next step in this downward course, we must remember that it follows the first as does effect the cause. Man being what he is, it does not seem possible for the throne of the universe to remain empty. If God be not honoured as the great Creator and Benefactor, then man will soon listen to the serpent's voice repeating the subtle temptation of Eden, "Ye shall be as God." As it was at the beginning, so was it at Babel, and ever since. The temptation as presented led apparently to the wisdom of God, "a tree to be desired to make one wise."

With the infallible sequence of cause and effect comes conscious distance: "I hid myself"; and loss of innocence: "I was naked." Gen. Hi. is echoed by Rom. i. The first sin is repeated in all sin and in all men. There in Rom. i. we have the other side of temptation, "as God," and the worship of an image made like to man, with the dominion placed beneath his feet. "To make one wise" is repeated in the words "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." The hiding of the guilty pair and the sense of distance that came in is repeated in the "giving up" of Rom. i. 24, 26 and 28, while the loss of innocence in their conscious nakedness is but the tiny seed that produces the crop of uncleanness that makes Rom. i. 24-31 hard reading. Let us give our attention to the record of Gentile failure. Starting from the withholding of that due to God both in glorifying Him as God, and in expressing thankfulness for His bounty, we read the next stage in Rom. i. 21-23 :

"But became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things"

As we read these words, Psa. viii. comes before the mind: "O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, Who hast set Thy glory above the heavens" (verse 1). Here the Lord, the Creator, is glorified "as God." "For out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength" (verse 2). This is the true sequence. The recognition of God "as God" leads to humility. What a difference between "babes and sucklings" and "professing themselves to be wise!" The contemplation of "the things that are made," which was neglected and rejected in Rom. i., led the Psalmist to say :

"When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; WHAT IS MAN, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?" (Psa. viii. 3, 4).

Here is no empty pride or vain profession, but true humility. This however does not lead to a grovelling state of mind, nor an unholy denial of the dignity of that creation which alone bears the impress of the image of God: "For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour" (verse 5). In Rom. i. man sank lower than the beasts in his empty wisdom. When he robbed God of the honour and glory due to His name, he at the same time robbed himself. Instead of standing in the consciousness of the glory and honour set upon him by God, we read in Rom. i. of dishonour, degradation and shame.

"Thou madest him to have dominion Over the work of Thy hand. ; Thou hast put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field: the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas" (Psa. viii. 6-8).

Here is man's true dominion. O what a falling off is there in Rom. i.! Placed over the work of God's hand we find man so utterly darkened and besotted that he worships the very creation that had been placed *beneath his feet*. This idolatry, and all that it implies, degraded both God and man. The truth, and all it implies, honours both God and man.

Vanity.

At the fall of man in Eden, vanity entered and ruled. "For the creation was made subject to vanity" (Rom. viii. 20). Ecclesiastes found everything connected with Adam and separated from the risen Christ to be "vanity and vexation of spirit" (For justification of such a statement see the articles on Ecclesiastes in Vols. X.-XIII.). Vanity not only ruled without, but it reigned within. "They became vain in their imagination" (Rom. i. 21). There are two words that are translated "vain," *kenos* and *mataios*. The former refers to contents, the latter to results. It is the latter word that is used here. The word "imagination" is *dialogismos*, which is translated in Rom. xiv. i. "disputations." The fact is, these reasonings were futile, resultless, empty. They led nowhere except to complete alienation from God. "The Gentiles walk in the 'Vanity of their mind. . . . being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them" (Eph. iv. 17, 18). The apostles at Lystra, as we have already seen, refer to the idols of the Gentiles as "vanities." Jer. ii. 5 reveals the reason for Gentile blindness: .. They are gone far from Me, and have walked after *vanity*, and are become "*vain*" (see also 2 Kings xvii. 15).

There are two important lessons to be learned here. First, the more obvious one, that man cannot by mere reasoning or philosophy discover God: "the world through its wisdom knew not God." It is a primary necessity that "He who cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him"; in other words, approach to God necessitates the recognition of the glory due to Him as *God* (Rom. i. 21)- "He is" (Heb. xi. 6), and thankfulness (Rom. i. 21), for He is the "rewarder" (Heb. xi. 6). The moment the fool says in his heart, There is no God, it can be written, "Corrupt they are, they have done abominable works, there is none that doeth good" (Psa. xvi. 1). This Psalm is quoted at some length in Rom. iii., but its presence can be felt already in Rom. i.

The second lesson that we may learn is to avoid a tendency to extremes, and to the condemning of "reasoning" as such. High in the list of those enduements that lift man above the level of the brute is the possession of reason, and it is false to assert that faith is contrary to reason, or that it is unreasonable; that is to degrade faith to credulity, and revealed truth to the level of superstition. Where faith is in the ascendant, the mind is clarified, false grounds of argument are detected, and reason and faith walk hand in hand. "The entrance of Thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple" (Psa. cxix. 130). The necessary outcome of these baseless and empty speculations was the darkening of this very faculty of reason. "Their foolish heart was darkened" (Rom. i. 21). "Foolish" is translated *undiscerning* by Rotherham, and is translated in verse 31 (A.V.) by "without understanding." The darkness that settled down upon the world shut out the only light in which man may walk and please God; his reason and his mind ceased to function correctly, even as the eye loses its power and its discernment if deprived of light. It is "in Thy light we shall see light" (Psa. xxxvi. 9). This assumption of wisdom was in reality sheer imbecility. Rom. i. 22 led the Gentile world by rapid stages into a morass of the most degraded form of idolatry and immorality :

"They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things" (Rom. i. 23).

Not only is there an exact parallel in the Gentile failure with the primal sin of Eden, but there is also an absolute parallel in the downward movement of the Gentiles as recorded in Rom. i. with the downward movement of Israel as given in Psa. cvi.

Gentile (Rom. i.)

"They changed the glory of the corruptible God into an image....man...birds, beasts.... creeping things" (23).

"They did not like to retain God in their knowledge" (28).

"Wherefore God also gave them up" (24).

"Uncleanness...vile affections" (24-27).

"Inventors of evil things" (30)

Israel (Psa. cvi.)

"They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image. Thus they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass" (19, 20)

"They forgot God their Saviour" (21)

"Therefore He said that he would destroy them" (23).

"They joined themselves also unto Baal-peor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead" (28).

"They provoked Him to anger with their inventions" (29).

As we contemplate the twofold departure from the revealed truth of God, the one, the revelation of His Godhead in nature, the other, of Himself and His will in Scripture, our hopes for man in himself must surely die, and all our hope must rest in God.

The Gentiles given Up.

We now approach the solemn fact towards which all which has been written since verse 18 has been leading, viz., the giving-up of the Gentile nations by God; "Wherefore God also gave them up" (verse 24). The word *paradidomai* ("to give up") occurs in verses 24, 26 and 28. At this point it seems advisable to take notice of the structure of the passage that we may see the setting of this threefold giving-up.

Rom. i. 19-ii. 1.

- A (i. 19-22) a. Known of God.
 - b. Inexcusable.
- B. (23-31) c1. Changed the glory.
 - d1. Given up to uncleanness.
 - c2. Changed the truth.
 - d2. Given up to infamous passions.
 - c3. Changed natural use.
 - d3. Given up to reprobate mind.
- A (32-ii.1) a. Knowing the judgment of God.
 - b. Inexcusable.

This threefold giving up indicates the dispensational position of the Gentiles from the dispersion at Babel, and the call of Abraham, until the ministry of the reconciliation committed to Paul, when Israel began to pass off the scene. The Gentiles were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise throughout the dispensation of the law under Moses, throughout the kingdom under David, throughout the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom during the earthly ministry of the Lord Jesus, and throughout a part of the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles. To this period Paul referred when he said to the Athenians; "At the time of this ignorance God winked," but indicated that a change had come by adding, "but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts xvii. 30). That the reconciliation of the world was closely associated with the setting aside of Israel may be seen by reading Rom. xi. 15. Referring to the structure we observe that not only is there a threefold giving up, but also that this giving-up is preceded by a threefold change ;

1. They changed the glory of the incorruptible God, for the likeness of corruptible man, &c.
2. They exchanged the truth of God for the lie.
3. They exchanged the natural use for that which was against nature.

There is a slight alteration in the words translated "change" in these verses in the A.V. We have attempted to indicate the difference by using "change" and "exchange." First they changed the glory of God without actually giving up God altogether, but this soon led to the next step, for they exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and then worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator. It is not possible for God to take second place. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Into the third item we cannot go. The defiling character of idolatry may be gathered from its annals, and we do not feel that any good purpose would be served by elaborating this revolting subject here. At the same time we know only too well that human nature is not a whit better to-day than when it openly practised the sins condemned in Rom. i. We need to faithfully warn the rising generation, speaking very tenderly and lovingly, yet nevertheless plainly, for Babylonianism in all its forms is rising like a flood, and the book of the Revelation reveals Rom. i. in a superlative degree. We need not go so far into the future as the book of the Revelation, however, for 2 Timothy iii. 1-8 uses many of the words of Rom. i. to describe the perilous times at the close of this present dispensation. The sequence of the apostasy and its relation to the development of the mystery of *iniquity*, otherwise called "the lie," and the mystery of *godliness*, otherwise called "the truth," can be traced through Paul's epistles.

Taking the statements of Rom. i. we find them worked out in the other epistles :

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. "As God." The creature more than the Creator." | "The man of sin....as God" (2 Thess. ii 3, 4) |
| 2. "The lie." "The truth." | "The received not the love of the <i>truth</i> ...they believe <i>the lie</i> " (2Thess.ii.10, 11) |
| 3. "Given up to an undiscerning mind" | "God shall send them strong delusion" (2 Thess. ii. 11). |
| 4. "Pleasure in them that do them." | "Had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 12) |

A comparison of the list of sins in Rom. i. with that of 2 Tim. iii. 1-7 will show how completely the para recorded. The reader must supply further parallels by studying the intervening epistles.

The lie.

We must draw attention before closing to the fact that the A.V. is not strong enough in its translation of Rom. i.25. It is "*the lie*." Of this lie Satan is the father (John viii. 44), and the Babylonian delusion at the time of the man of sin is the climax (2 Thess. ii. 10, II; Rev. xiv. 5 (*cp. Companion Bible*)xxi. 27, xxii. 15). This lie could not dominate the mind of man without something having entered into that mind at the same time. We have seen that as man robbed God of His glory, he robbed himself of his highest and best. As he degraded God to the level of a creature, so he degraded himself. The explanation is given in verse 28. In this verse there is a play upon the words *dikimazo* (" to try or prove"), and *adokimos* (" disapproved ") :

"And as they did not approve to be holding God in acknowledgment, God gave them up unto a disapproved mind, to do that which is not becoming."

Vaughan, with a certain amount of liberty with the English, expresses it thus: "As they *refused*. . . . God gave them to a *refuse* mind." The glory of God is the last item of importance in the ethics and culture of material philosophy. It is the sheet anchor of all the teaching of Scripture. God knows why He placed the ten commandments in the order in which we have them in the Word. They are in the true sequence. Idolatry is "the lie" in essence, murder and adultery are but " the lie" in practice. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. "There is no fear of God before their eyes" (Psa. xxxvi. I) is the climax of the dreadful list of Rom. iii. 10-18.

Thus far we have traced the failure of the Gentiles. The apostle's object is to demonstrate the universal need of the righteousness revealed in the gospel. Consequently he has to show the parallel condition of Israel with the Gentiles before he can proceed with the opening up of the truth. This we must study together in another paper. Meanwhile, it would be good for us all to heed Eph. ii. II-13.

The Epistle to the Romans.

NO. 10

An important parenthesis and its point (Rom. i. 18-iii.20).

When we reach Rom. i. 16, 17 we cannot avoid the conviction that we are at the heart-of the gospel as preached by Paul. At verse 18 we seem to take a turn, and any further explanation of faith, righteousness, or justification seems to be suspended. From Rom. i. 18-32 we have a fearful picture of the utter failure of the Gentile world even though they had received the revelation of creation, and the monitorship of conscience. When we get into Rom. ii. the teaching becomes more involved; we seem further than ever from the theme of the epistle, and indeed the conclusions we may have reached at the end of Rom. i. seem rudely challenged by the time we reach the end of Rom. ii. Nevertheless we approach God's word not with a wonder as to whether it is perfect in every part, but with a conviction that it is, and just as it is said of the lover of the works of God: "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein" (Psa. cxi. 2), so to the earnest seeker after truth light will surely be given.

A reading of Rom. ii. leaves one with the feeling that the whole passage is an aside, a great parenthesis, and the opening verses of Romans iii. are but a continuation of the same theme. At Rom. iii. 9 light dawns, for the apostle himself definitely tells us what he has been endeavoring to set forth since Rom. i. 17. To follow the direction given by his own analysis gives certainty in place of conjecture. The object with which Paul wrote Rom. i. 18-iii. 9 is given in the following words: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (Rom. iii.9). ("Proved" is better translated "accused," as may be seen by other parts of the same word in Matt. xxvii. 37, &c.).

It is evident that the charge against the Gentile is opened in Rom. i. 18--32, and that the two-fold accusation against Jew and Gentile occupies Rom. ii. 1--iii. 8, and the concluding evidence against the Jew-"those who are under the law" (iii. 19)--occupies verses 10-18, bringing us to the great conclusion: "all the world guilty before God." As soon as we pass this point, the thread laid down in Rom. i. 17 is seen to be resumed, and we immediately have before us one of the most illuminating passages of Paul's epistles so far as justification by faith is concerned: "even a righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ" (Rom.iii. 22). Although we have not as yet seen more than the drift of Rom. ii., we have at least set the bounds of our inquiry.

A - Rom. i. 17. Justification by faith.

B - Rom. i. 18--32. The accusation against the Gentile. -List of offences.

C - Rom. ii. 1-iii. 9-. Circumcision and uncircumcision.

B - Rom. iii.-9-19. The accusation against the Jew. -List of offences.

A - Rom. iii. 20, &c. Justification by faith.

The members denominated "A" are merely to set bounds; we do not attempt anything further here. The passage that we have before us as the subject for study is "C"-Rom. ii. 1-iii. 9--. Now for the trial of faith. The writings of our fellow-labourers in this epistle yield nothing as to structure or outline. *The Companion Bible* says nothing. Our own attempted sub-divisions were unsatisfactory. Accordingly we took a clean sheet, confessed to the Lord our ignorance, but at the same time the conviction that no one part of this epistle would be found unruly or out of order, and the light came. The fullest section, and that which sets forth the perfectness of the argument, is that under notice, and this will be the better appreciated when its place and purpose is understood. This

understanding will be furthered by devoting our attention to the introductory and concluding members :

- A – ii. 1. – a. – *Krino*. – Inexcusable, whoever judges.
 - b. – *Krino*. – Judging another condemns self.
 - c. – *Krino*. – The one judging practices same things.
- B – ii. 2. *Krima*. – Judgment of God according to truth.
 - C – ii. 3-25 (Details omitted until next paper).
 - C – ii.25- iii. 1 (Details omitted until next paper).
- A – iii. 4-7 a. – *Krino*. – God will overcome when judged.
 - b. – *Krino*. – God is not unrighteous when judging the world.
 - c. – *Krino* – God judges sin, though He overrules it for good.
- B – iii. 8, 9 – *Krima* – Judgment of God is just.

The summary of this outline is as follows:

- A – When man judges he sets a standard whereby he himself shall be judged.
- B – God's judgment is according to truth, and not appearance or privilege.
 - C – No respect of persons with God. Jew and Gentile.
 - C – No advantage or disadvantage. Circumcision or uncircumcision.
- A – When God judges He is found to be above all suspicion.
 - B – God's judgment is just.

We are told that the visitor to the labyrinths of the catacombs retained hold of a silken thread by which he could retrace his steps without fear of becoming lost. In the chapter before us there are almost endless opportunities for getting "lost." The apostle touches upon a sphere that is removed from our responsibility, and while certain passages will prevent us from coming to an adverse conclusion concerning the heathen world which has never known either the law of Moses or the gospel of Christ, the silken thread attached to Rom. iii. 9 and 19 will keep us to the reason for the teaching of Rom. ii. so far as this epistle is concerned, and prevent us from overturning the definite teaching of Rom. iii. 20 for the less definite suggestions of Rom. ii. 12-16. It is evident from Rom. i. 18-32 that nothing more was necessary to bring in the Gentile guilty before God. The apostle's problem, however, was to bring about the same conviction in the breast of the Jew. We are not left to our own conjectures to discover Israel's great impediment, for the apostle has spoken most clearly on the subject.

" I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth" (Rom. x. 1-4).

Israel's boast in Rom. ii. is that they "knew His will"; that they "approved the things that were more excellent."

They esteemed themselves as guides to the blind, and lights to them which are in darkness." They had a "form of knowledge and of the truth in the law," *but they were in fatal ignorance!* When we see this, what is there to choose between the Gentiles who

"Became vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened, who, professing themselves to be WISE, became FOOLS. . . . and did not like to retain God in their KNOWLEDGE" (Rom. i. 21-28),

and the Jews whose vain-glorious boasting ended equally in death? The deadly enemy of Paul's message before Acts xxviii. was Judaism, or the false claims of the law. After Acts xxviii. Judaism passes, and a "vain deceitful philosophy" challenged the high glories of the prison epistles. In both cases the apostle shows its utter vanity, and sets Christ crucified, risen, and ascended over against it as "the end" and "the fullness."

It will be seen by the words quoted from Rom. ii. 17-20, that the Jew not only made great claims for himself, but spoke with emphatic judgment against the Gentile. This, which the Jew thought his strong point, proved his overthrow, for the apostle brings to light a solemnizing truth, namely, that the clearer our judgment is against the shortcomings of others, the higher, necessarily, the standard must be by which we ourselves shall be judged. This, moreover, is aggravated by the fact that the Jew, while condemning the Gentile for breaches of the law, himself was responsible for similar breaches, and, like David before Nathan, uttered his own doom. The apostle here is stripping the false covering of privilege, both by his argument in Rom. ii. 1-3, and by the definite statement which is axiomatic the world over: "there is no respect of person with God" (Rom ii. II).

At the beginning and ending of this section we have a three-fold reference to judging (the verb *krino*), followed by a statement concerning the judgment (*krima*) of God: "Whoever judges another is inexcusable." The apostle had been "an Israelite," and having been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel he was swift to anticipate the cavils of his Jewish antagonist, which might be presented somewhat as follows:

You say Paul, that whosoever judges another is inexcusable and condemns himself. You stress the *whosoever* to the breaking down of distinction and privilege, but do you not see that by so doing you must therefore include God Himself? He too must stand before the bar and be judged.

Instead of meeting this specious argument with a swift and passionate denial, the apostle quietly assents to the main contention. In Rom. iii. he says, in effect:

Within certain limits I agree that your words contain a deeper truth than you are aware. God Almighty could withhold any account of any of His matters. In some things He does, but not in the matter of judgment. David acknowledged that God would ever become victorious when His judgments were questioned. Not because of His MIGHT, but because His judgments are RIGHT.

So concerned is God that no suspicion should lurk anywhere concerning His righteousness, that He is at pains to justify Himself in connection with passing over the sins of the past. He will not have His forbearance misinterpreted (Rom. iii. 25). The God of Israel challenges them, saying: "Are not My ways equal?" (Ezek. xviii. 29). The point of the case is that although God's judgments will be subjected to the most patient scrutiny, yet will He always triumph, and Israel will immediately collapse, "For thou that judgest doest the same things" (Rom. ii. I). In God's case He is not unrighteous Who taketh vengeance, for how then could He judge the world?

In case any reader should object to this rather free use of the Name and Person of God in this argument, we would direct his attention to the end of Rom. iii. 5 ("I speak as a man").

"The judgment of God is according to TRUTH" (Rom. ii. 2).

This stands in contrast with *prosopolepsian* of verse II, the respect of persons which is denied. God has further manifested the utter impartiality of His judgment in the fact that

"He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance (*margin, offered faith, i.e., good faith*) to all, raising Him from among the dead" (Acts xvii. 31).

"The judgment of God is RIGHT" (Rom. iii. 8).

The A.V. reads, "whose damnation is just." It is an entire repudiation of the casuistry of the Jew contained in the false charge: "Let us do evil that good may come" (Rom. iii.

8). If it was a slander to say that Christ's apostle taught such a doctrine, the fact that the context is occupied with the vindication of God's judgment from the least suspicion of advantage, or of the engineering of human faithlessness, should cause us equally to abominate the mere approach to such a thing. That God does overrule evil is abundantly testified throughout Scripture and experience, but that is an entirely different matter. Before we conclude this examination it is necessary to become acquainted with the central section (Rom. ii. 3-iii. I). This we must take up in our next article.

What a solid basis for our redemption! True it flows from the love of God; true it is all of grace and not of merit, yet marvelous to remember He has so wrought that "He might be *just*, and the *justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26). Then what of that spirit of judgment? that keenness to see error? that "nose for heresy?" What kind of standard are we setting for ourselves? Should any interpose with a plea of privilege, parallel to that of the Jew, we would remind such that in addition to Rom. ii., Col. iii. 25 tells us that: "There is no respect of persons," and that "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done."

Redemption. New Series.

#8. A fresh enquiry into the meaning of redemption. pp. 25 - 31

Whether we listen to the Evangelist, read the everyday Christian writer, or ponder the deeper theological volumes, we shall find that redemption is used interchangeably with atonement, salvation, reconciliation, or any and all of the blessings of life, peace and forgiveness that flow from the sacrifice of Christ.

The one offering and the many.

The confusion (for such we believe it to be) is in measure due to the fact that one side of truth has been apprehended at the expense of the other. In the O.T. we find a series of offerings, including offerings that have as their primary feature acceptable and fragrant surrender, as in the whole burnt offering, offerings that as a sacrifice for sin are burned to ashes outside the camp, the annual offering of the day of atonement, the daily offerings of the morning and evening sacrifice, the Passover lamb offered at Israel's deliverance. These and the rest not mentioned are all included in the one great antitypical offering of Christ "once for all".

By the same offering He offered Himself as a sweet smelling savour unto God, died under the curse of the law, was made sin for us who knew no sin, made peace through the blood of His cross, and became the great propitiation. It is fundamental to see that all O.T. typical sacrifices are embraced in the offering of the cross. It is nevertheless the starting point of much error to confuse these varied aspects of His one great work.

Redemption distinct from atonement.

For the time being we leave unquestioned the word atonement, using it to cover the whole range of offerings instituted by Moses and offered "for sin", "for cleansing", and "for acceptance". The point we wish to make clear at the moment is that redemption is to be considered as belonging to a class by itself, and is not to be confounded with the remaining offerings which for present convenience we classify under the heading atonement. The distinction we seek to prove may be visualized if we briefly consider the history of the offerings connected with Israel, proofs of a more definite character being given later.

For our purpose, Israel's history commences in Egyptian bondage. One offering, and one only, is connected with their *redemption* from the house of bondage; that is the Passover lamb. No priest is connected with this offering; no altar is sprinkled with its blood; no hands are placed upon its head; no atonement is made by it for sin; no acceptance is said to follow. This one offering is the only sacrifice connected with Israel offered in Egypt. Before another sacrifice is offered they must leave Egypt, and pass

through the Red Sea. All the other offerings, however they may differ in their individual purposes, are grouped together in that they deal with the sin of God's redeemed people. They are all associated with an altar and a priesthood, and have the sanctuary of God in view.

The failure rightly to divide the Word of truth, and to try the things that differ, increases in importance and disastrous effects as the truth under consideration increases in importance. No doctrine of Scripture is so fundamental as that of sacrifice, and consequently no greater opportunity occurs for erecting false theories than here. Over and over again one takes up a treatise that, starting with redemption, runs off into atonement. Proofs started with redemption and belonging only to redemption are mistakenly carried over, and triumphantly applied to reconciliation. It is indeed regrettable.

What is redemption? *Padah* and *Pesach*.

Having indicated what we believe to be a scriptural distinction, we will now proceed to proofs. Let us examine the words used for redemption, and the nature of the redemption effected. Three words demand attention, viz., *gaal*, *padah*, and *pesach*. In earlier papers we have seen that *gaal* indicates that redemption which is carried out by a kinsman, and the reader is referred to Volume XII, pages 109-115. There we found that the book of Ruth provides a full presentation of what is involved in the Kinsman-Redeemer, and that Christ as God manifest in the flesh, could alone satisfy all the scriptural statements on the subject. Passing therefore to the next word we will examine the Hebrew word *padah*.

The primary meaning of *padah* is "to sever, separate, or divide". In Exod. viii. 23 we read, "I will put a *division* between My people and thy people". "Division" is *p'doth*, the margin reads "a redemption", while the LXX gives *diastolen*, which occurs in Rom. iii. 22 as "difference". Again in Isa. xxix. 22 we read, "The Lord, Who redeemed Abraham". The LXX translates redeemed by *aphorisen* = "hath separated", which occurs in Matt. xiii. 49; Rom. i. 1; II Cor. vi. 17, etc. If we take a glance at the context of Isa. xxix., we shall find that immediately following the section xxix. 22-24 comes the woe pronounced upon those who *made a league with Egypt* (Isa. xxx. 1-17). Redemption involved separation and division from Egypt, and Abraham's separation is brought to mind as a word of warning. One other use of the word will suffice. In the name *Padan-Aram* it denotes that tract of country *separated* so markedly by the two rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and so called by the Greeks *Mesopotamia*, the land lying in the midst of the rivers.

The third woe we must consider is *pesach*. This word followed by *al* ("over") means to pass or leap over. In I Kings xviii. 26 we read, "and they leaped upon the altar". In Isa. xxxi. 5 we read, "As birds flying (or hovering) passing over He will preserve it". Spurrell's translation reads, "As hen birds fluttering springing forward and rescuing". In I Kings xviii. 21 the prophet cries, "How long *halt ye* between two

opinions?" and in II Sam. iv. 4; v. 6-8; ix. 13; xix. 26, either verb or adjective, the word is translated "lame".

The Passover was God's great stepping over of Israel, wherein He made a division and a difference (*padah*) between them and the Egyptians, and this effected by the Passover lamb typified that this redemption was that of the great Kinsman-Redeemer (*gaal*).

The testimony of Heb. ii.

The Lamb of God is Christ, and He in order to redeem became flesh and blood. As Kinsman-Redeemer His first great work was redemption, not atonement. Heb. ii. brings the Lord Jesus forward under three great aspects:--

1. Made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death not with sin in view, but with the redemption of the forfeited dominion given to Adam. "All things under His feet leading many sons to glory" (Heb. ii. 5-13).
2. Made like the children of flesh and blood, He came with the object of destroying the devil, with particular reference to His hold upon DEATH, and of delivering from its bondage those who were all their lifetime held in its fear. Again, sin is not in view.
3. Made like unto His brethren in all things, this time to deal with SINS, and therefore He is presented as a PRIEST, and makes a PROPITIATION for the sins of the PEOPLE.

Here the distinction is faithfully observed. *Redemption* touches (1) inheritance, (2) bondage; this we have shewn in earlier papers, and this is taught here in Heb. ii. 5-16. *Atonement* touches the sins of a redeemed people, and is connected with a priest. No unsaved person is related to atonement; this is exclusive to the redeemed.

The kinsman and the passover.

When God would teach by type the truth of the resurrection, He had one of two ways open before Him:--

1. To perform a miracle every time the sacrifice was offered.
2. To arrange the typical offering so that it would set forth with sufficient clearness the fact of death and resurrection, without any miraculous interposition.

The second way is the way adopted. One bird is killed in an earthen vessel over running water, and in order to set forth resurrection another living bird, together with hyssop, cedar-wood, and scarlet, is dipped into the blood and set free. The blood moreover was sprinkled (presumably with the hyssop) upon the leper who was to be cleansed, and the death and resurrection of the substitutes applied to him (Lev. xiv. 1-7).

The firstborn son in Scripture occupies a unique position—a position not only of privilege, but of responsibility. This can be seen manifested in the concern of Reuben for Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 30). Israel was the Lord's son, even His firstborn, and He warned Pharaoh that if he would not let Israel go, He would slay Pharaoh's firstborn. The

Passover lamb was not selected “for sin”, but “a lamb for *a house*”, and if a household were too small to be thus represented, they were to join with another. The house was connected with death, “There was not a house where there was not one dead” (Exod. xii. 30), which was as true of Israel as of Egypt, only that in Israel’s case the lamb died instead of the firstborn. It will be seen therefore that the Passover lamb really sets forth the Kinsman-Redeemer, the great Firstborn. Had the title of Christ “the *Prototokos*” (Col. i. 15) been read from this standpoint of the exodus and the Kinsman-Redeemer, much profitless and harmful speculation would never have seen the light.

The Passover is the great type of redemption in the Scriptures, “Thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord God redeemed thee thence” (Deut. xxiv. 18). Just as the sprinkling of the living bird with the blood by means of the hyssop spoke of resurrection, so the sprinkling of the doorposts with the blood by means of the hyssop spoke of redemption and deliverance.

Redemption and its object.

The Hebrew words *gaal* and *padah* occur some 170 times in the O.T. We read of redemption from Egypt, bondage, enemies, troubles, evil, destruction, death, and the grave. We have to the best of our ability searched the Scriptures, and have to record that out of all the places where *padah* and *gaal* occur, but one passage definitely associates *redemption with iniquity*, and that passage is Psa. cxxx. 8. There is no place where redemption is ever said to be for or from sin or sins. Now this statement of itself is so opposed to popular teaching and loose thinking that we doubt not that many readers will feel impelled to put the matter to the test before going further. If they do, it will transfer the responsibility to themselves that they keep redemption to its scriptural sphere.

There are several Greek words that stand as equivalents for *padah* and *gaal*; they are *rhuomai*, *lutroo*, *lutrosis*, *apolutrosis*, *agorazo*, and *exagorazo*. We must remember that these occur in the translation called the LXX, and though valuable beyond description, can never alter the original doctrine settled in the Hebrew originals. The LXX uses some of these Greek words in translating both redemption and atonement, and therefore great care must be exercised in deciding which is in view in any one N.T. passage. Examining their associations we find a people redeemed from the hand of their enemies, from the curse of the law, from vain conversation, but rarely redeemed from sin or sins. The resurrection is spoken of as the redemption of the body, the inheritance is spoken of as a purchased possession redeemed, the dominion of sin is broken by the deliverance from this body of death. Deliverance is moreover spoken of as from darkness, wrath, temptation, evil.

Titus ii. 14 quotes Psa. cxxx., where we read of redemption from all iniquity. Heb. ix. 15 speaks of redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant. Eph. i. 7 links redemption with forgiveness of sins, and Rom. iii. 24 with justification. These four passages are the only ones that actually associate redemption with sin or iniquity. The great provision for sin is expressed by atonement, and not by redemption. Titus ii. 14, with its emphasis upon the future coming of the Lord and the peculiar people, places

this passage in line with that redemption of Israel out of Egypt when they too were made a peculiar people (Exod. xix.). Heb. ix. 15 and Rom. iii. 24 have one thing in common, namely, “the sins of the past”. Eph. i. 7 associates redemption and forgiveness, but other scriptures reveal that forgiveness arose out of atonement made for a *redeemed people*. The bondage, the enemy, the evil, the curse, from which Israel were redeemed, are all so many scriptural titles of *death*.

Redemption and death.

Where the O.T. departs from mundane things like bondage, or enemies, it translates these not into terms of sin, but of *death*--

“I will ransom them from the power of the GRAVE; I will redeem them from DEATH” (Hosea xiii. 14).

“None can by any means redeem his brother that he should not see corruption Like sheep they are laid in the grave, death shall feed on them but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave” (Psa. xlix. 7-15).

“Deliver him from going down to the pit. I have found a ransom” (Job xxxiii.24).

“I know that my redeemer liveth and though worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God” (Job xix. 25, 26).

Redemption goes back beyond our own personal sins to the one sin of Adam that involved us all in death. “By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin” (Rom. v. 12). Redemption is found in Gen. iii.—“The seed of the woman”. Atonement is found in Gen. iv.—“The offering of Abel”. Gen. iii. speaks of the curse, of an enemy, of death. Gen. iv. speaks of sin, of acceptance. In Gen. iii. it is the Lord Who slays the animal and provides the protection, symbolizing the promise already given of the Seed who, while bruising the serpent’s head, should be bruised in the heel. That is redemption, and the issue is “the way of the tree of life’. In Gen. iv. it is man that brings the offering to God, and it is accepted or rejected according as it set forth the atonement of Christ or not. The issue here is acceptance.

Throughout Scripture redemption and atonement are kept distinct. While we have seen that the Passover lamb sets forth the work of Christ as redeemer, we still have to look for some scriptural expression that shall visualize for us just what part of the exodus reveals the inner meaning of redemption. The moment we describe in one word the passage of Israel out of Egypt, we use the scriptural word we are in search of.

(To be continued).

#9. A fresh enquiry into the meaning of redemption. pp. 55 - 58

It has been the policy of *The Berean Expositor* not only to seek the truth, but to so write that true "Bereans" may have the fullest opportunity of "searching and of seeing whether these things are so". The word *exodus* is, as we know, the name given to the second book of Moses in the Greek translation known as the LXX. It is therefore no part of O.T. Scripture. It occurs however in the N.T. Peter speaks of his "decease" in II Pet. i. 15, and uses the word *exodus*. Heb. xi. 22 speaks of Joseph mentioning the "departing" or *exodus* of Israel. The passage however from which light comes is Luke ix. 31, its first occurrence. This has reference to the transfiguration of the Lord. Moses and Elijah were seen together with the Lord, and the subject of their conversation was "His *exodus* which He should accomplish at Jerusalem".

Both Moses and Elijah were personally interested in the idea of the *exodus*, for singularly they both experienced it symbolically. Is it merely a coincidence that both Moses and Elijah passed through divided waters at a crisis in their lives?

"Lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it: and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea" (Exod. xiv. 16).

"They two stood by Jordan. And Elijah took his mantle, and wrapped it together, and smote the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, so that they two went over on dry ground" (II Kings ii. 7, 8).

The passage through the Red Sea was a symbol of death and resurrection. Paul says that there Israel were "baptised into Moses" (I Cor. x. 2). This same Paul taught that the symbol of water baptism had the same message. It baptized into Christ, and if into Christ then into His death and resurrection (Rom. vi. 3-5).

Redemption from the house of bondage was by the blood of the Passover lamb, and led down through the waters of the Red Sea up to the shore beyond, where Israel could sing the song of triumph. Redemption we learned put a "division" between Israel and the Egyptians. Where Israel passed through unhurt "the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned" (Heb. xi. 29). This marks the great division of the earth in connection with redemption. Israel are redeemed and come forth from their typical death. For them the blood had been shed. The Egyptians are drowned. They do not share the miraculous triumph over the symbolic grave. To them the Passover lamb was a self-confessed "abomination". For Israel there could be burnt offerings, sin offerings, and atonement, but not for the Egyptians. These offerings were for the redeemed and for the redeemer alone. Coming back to Gen. iii. and iv. we notice that the one who had no acceptable offering was Cain, equivalent to the Egyptian, the seed of the wicked one.

The believer and death.

“The wages of sin is death.” For the moment we will not press any particular meaning into the word “death”, but are sure that whatever a person may believe as to “eternal death”, “spiritual death”, and the like, that actual, literal, physical death cannot be eliminated from the wages of sin. Adam lived 930 years and he died. He returned to the dust from which he was taken (Gen. iii. 19). Death passed upon all men. Sin reigned unto death. In Adam all die. As we have said, conceding for argument’s sake that physical death is the smallest part of the results of sin—it is a part. Now if redemption was accomplished by Christ bearing the penalty attached to sin, and if physical death be but a part of that penalty, then if as the Calvinist sings:--

“Payment He cannot twice demand,
First at my bleeding Surety’s hand,
And then again at mine,”

no believer should ever die. We need no testimony or theory other than our own painful experience, that “There is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked As is the good, so is the sinner” (Eccles. ix. 12). Death, physical death, which came by Adam’s sin, is the common end of saint and sinner. What then is the blessing of redemption? *Life from the dead*. It is an *exodus*. It leads down into the symbolic grave of the Red Sea on its path to glory.

The Lord did not die to save us *from dying*, He died to save us *from death*. There is much teaching connected with this fact that must occupy our attention, but which lies outside the immediate scope of our enquiry. The great work of the kinsman Redeemer is expressed in I Cor. xv. 22, “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ, shall all be made alive”. The “all in Adam” are those for whom the great “division” and “stepping over” (*padah* and *pesach*) by the kinsman (*gaal*) has been made. It is impossible to predicate both *universality* and *division* of redemption, one or the other must be false. The doctrine of the two seeds, whether seen in Cain and Abel, or in Israel and the Egyptians, fits the whole case and cannot be ignored. Reconciliation and atonement cannot be deduced from redemption; they belong to an entirely different sphere. As related themes, we must deal with the teaching of the various sacrifices offered under the law, but such a study demands a section to itself.

A word may be necessary in conclusion on the occurrence of the word “redemption” in Heb. ix. 12, 15, because at first sight it would appear that the setting of these words contradicts our findings. The redemption of Heb. ix. 12 is an “aionian redemption”, and is connected with “the blood of the aionian covenant” (xiii. 20). Now this covenant is vitally connected with an “aionian inheritance” (ix. 15). An inheritance that was forfeited could only be regained by redemption, and inasmuch as transgressing the terms of the covenant was the occasion of the forfeiture, we have the strange expression, “the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant” (ix. 15), and in the

circumstances the apparent exceptional use of the word redemption is justified. This is seen the more clearly when we remember:--

1. Redemption deals with Adam, his sin, his forfeiture, his death, all of which pass through to his seed.
2. Israel in type set forth this in their failure to keep the terms of the old covenant. Consequently their recovery to favour, to inheritance, and to the blessings of the new covenant are also due to a redemption, but this time, for distinction, the inheritance is called aionian, the covenant aionian, and the redemption aionian.

A similar difficulty may arise over the occurrence of redemption in Rom. iii. 24. The previous verse says, "For all sinned, and are coming short of the glory of God". The two tenses "all sinned" and "are coming short" take the mind back to Adam's "sin", and then to individual "sins". *Sin* needs redemption: *sins* need propitiation; hence in verse 24 we have redemption followed by the "mercy seat" in verse 25. This observes the same order that we have pointed out already. The "mercy seat" is for none but a redeemed people.

It is only natural that the presentation of a new aspect of truth should be beset by difficulties. These arise both from lack of clarity on the part of the writer, and from the pressure of accepted teaching on the part of the reader. A pioneer will often make mistakes, but small retractions do not prove that the whole course is wrong. Our readers are not "babes" but *Bereans*, and we desire to be free to share our discoveries in divine truth while their freshness is unsullied by too much handling and paring. "We have redemption through His blood"—let us glorify Him by seeking a true understanding of this purchased of His cross.

#10. The way out and the way in. pp. 89 - 91

We have on different occasions found that a truth has been expressed in *The Berean Expositor*, but that owing to a somewhat compressed style of writing, which our limited space necessitates, such teaching has passed unheeded largely because we have not stayed long enough to give it prominence and expansion. In our last paper we sought to draw the distinction which is observable in Scripture between redemption and atonement, but feeling that the second aspect may not have been expressed fully enough, we give it space here.

The exodus.

Proof was given that redemption is the great exodus of the Lord's people. It leads them *out*, out of bondage, out of death, out of darkness, out of spiritual Egypt. We saw that redemption in its primary character is unconnected with altar, priest or tabernacle. Now if redemption is expressed by the Greek word *exodos*, the atonement may be expressed by the Greek word *eisodos*. This latter word occurs in Heb. x. 19-22:--

“Having therefore, brethren, boldness respecting the *eisodos*, the entrance into, the holiest by the blood of Jesus let us draw near.”

The same order may be observed in the epistle to the Ephesians, chapter i., exodos; chapter ii., eisodos.

REDEMPTION.—“In Whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins” (i. 7).

The word “forgiveness” (*aphesis*) is translated in Luke iv. 18 “deliverance” and “to set at liberty”. There is another word which should be reserved for the idea of “forgiveness”, which is used in Eph. iv. 32. Redemption leads out, it sets at liberty, it delivers.

ATONEMENT.—“Ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ” (ii. 13).

Here we have the complement to redemption. That leads us out, this leads us in.

Following redemption the Spirit seals with a view to the purchased inheritance. Following atonement the Spirit gives access and builds us up into a holy temple. It is not only helpful in a general sense, but it is also a scriptural principle, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. We will therefore give the testimony of Peter as well as of Paul.

REDEMPTION.—Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from (*ek*) your vain conversation but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (I Pet. i. 18, 19).

ATONEMENT.—“Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us (*pros*) to God” (I Pet. iii. 18).

Here we have once again redemption *from* and atonement *to*. The word “to bring” in I Pet. iii. 18 (*prosagoge*) is translated “access” in Eph. ii. 18. The same order and effect is observed in Titus ii. 14:--

“Who gave Himself for us, that He might *redeem* us FROM (*apo*) all iniquity, and purify *unto* Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”

John’s Gospel opens with the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and his Epistle opens with the cleansing power of the blood for all who have fellowship and the propitiation for their sins. The Gospel is in order that sinners may believe. The Epistle is in order that saints may know: redemption and atonement once again. Reconciliation does not arise out of redemption, but out of atonement. Moreover (in spite of the usual indiscriminate use of the term) atonement is not for unsaved sinners. None but the redeemed could have an interest in the atonement. Israel had first to be delivered from the thralldom of Egypt before they could learn of the way into the holiest.

The one offering of Christ, the once shed blood is both our redemption and our atonement, both our way *out* and our way *in*, but that does not mean that we are to be careless in the use of these solemn terms, or to allow false argument to be built up from their confusion. Gen. iii. and iv. present a similar sequence, Gen. iii. indicating redemption, and Gen. iv. atonement.

We do not intend making this a lengthy article, nor dealing with any other feature. We shall have to give attention to the teaching of both Old and New Testaments respecting the atonement, and the related offerings, but that we must do in another paper. Let us remember with gratitude the *exodos* and the *eisodos*, the leading *out* and the leading *in*, that are ours through the blood of Christ. We trust that the reader will, moreover, realize that we are here using the word “atonement” in a very general way, as a convenient term to set over against “redemption”.

#11. Atonement: a covering by cancellation. pp. 118 - 124

The essential difference between redemption and atonement has been discussed in preceding articles. It will, however, be convenient to include the study of the doctrine of atonement as a branch of the wider theme of redemption. This we now propose to do. A glance at the concordance reveals a long column of references under the word “atonement” for the O.T., but one reference only for the N.T., and if our concordance notifies us of the changes made in the R.V., we shall find that even that one N.T. reference disappears.

Atonement: is it a N.T. doctrine?

The alteration of the word “atonement” in the A.V. of Rom. v. 11 is justified on the ground of correct interpretation and the avoidance of false connections. The ordinary reader would naturally assume that Rom. v. 11 referred back to the O.T. equivalents. The Greek word translated atonement here is *katallage*, but whilst the LXX version uses more than twenty Greek words to translate the Hebrew word “atonement”, it never uses *katallage*. Apart from this possibility of making a false connection, *atonement* is quite as good a rendering as reconciliation, for the English word at the time of and preceding the A.V. bore the meaning *at-one-ment*, a meaning abundantly proved by more than one passage in Shakespeare. What does seem to be a pity is that the word was employed in the O.T. It is too deeply imbedded to think of removing or altering it, so we must rid our minds of anything that pertains merely to the English word, and seek the meaning warranted by studying the original. Before we do so, however, we must answer the question that arises, Is atonement a N.T. doctrine?

Now we can easily trip here. It does not follow that those who say that the atonement is not a N.T. doctrine deny the sacrificial work of Christ. What they mean is something like this: "The conception of the O.T. *atonement* is not full enough to set forth the actual work of Christ. That merely *covered* sin, He puts it away." If the Hebrew conception does really mean a mere covering up, then we are sure that Christ's work was something infinitely more blessed and perfect. We do not, however, believe this is a true presentation of the O.T. doctrine, and therefore reject it. On the other hand it does not follow that because the one word "atonement" is expunged by the R.V. that the doctrine itself is not found in the N.T. This we would prove in two ways. (1) by the presence of the actual word, and (2) by the presence of the results that alone follow it. By the presence of the actual word we mean of course the Greek equivalent, and not the English.

We must anticipate our O.T. investigation so far as to say that "mercy-seat" is from the Hebrew *kapporeth*, from *kaphar*, which is rendered "atonement" 72 times. Now the Greek translation of *kapporeth* is *hilasterion*, which is found in Heb. ix. 5. We read in Rom. iii. 25 that "God has set forth (Christ) as a propitiation through faith in His blood", and the word propitiation is *hilasterion* ("mercy-seat"). Moreover, *hilaskomai* and *hilasmos* are Septuagint renderings also of *kaphar*, and these occur in I John ii. 2 and iv. 10 where the epistle is not speaking of redemption, but *cleansing* by blood; of those who walk in the light, and who have an Advocate with the Father. Hence the word "propitiation" in these two passages speaks of atonement and atoning blood. So *hilaskomai* is used in Heb. ii. 17, where the R.V. alters the A.V. rendering to "propitiation". Here we have a series of definite references to the O.T. doctrine of atonement. But more than that, when the Lord used the word "ransom" in Matt. xx. 28, He used a word which is used several times to translate *kopher*, viz., *lutron*. So also the words *katharizo* and *katharismos* have undoubted reference to the atoning work of Christ, being used by the LXX to translate *kaphar*, and are used in such passages as the following:--

"When He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down" (Heb. i. 3).
"How much more shall the blood of Christ purged your conscience"
(Heb. ix. 14).
"If we walk in the light we have fellowship and the blood cleanseth"
(I John i. 7).

In each of the above passages one would be justified, with the O.T. rendering in view, to put the words "make atonement" where "purge" and "cleanse" occur. Moreover, *hagiazō* is used to translate *kaphar*, and brings in the many passages which speak of sanctification in connection with the blood Christ. To these examples must be added the *effects* of atonement such as "access", "fellowship", "acceptance", "made nigh", etc., which run through the teaching of the N.T. Surely we need go no further to find our answer to the question, Is atonement a N.T. doctrine, and does it describe adequately one phase of the work of Christ? If Christ be a propitiation, if He gave His life a ransom, if His blood cleanses and sanctifies the redeemed, then undoubtedly the O.T. doctrine of atonement as surely as the O.T. doctrine of redemption finds its fulfillment in the sacrifice and priestly ministry of Christ.

What does the O.T. word “atonement” mean?

There is hardly a student of Scripture worthy of the name who does not know that the Hebrew word translated atonement means “to cover”. It may therefore be deemed a waste of time to ask the question again. Yet when we say “to cover”, are we sure that we all mean the same thing? “To cover” may mean “to hide”, or “to conceal”; it also may mean “to shelter or protect”. It further means “to be sufficient for”, “to comprehend” and “to include”, “to compensate for damage done”. Which of these meanings do we intend when we say that atonement means “to cover”? That question can only be answered by an examination of the original words and their varied usage.

The words translated “atonement”.

Every occurrence of the word atonement in the O.T. is a translation of *kaphar*, or one of its derivatives. Both the noun and the verb occur together for the first time in Gen. vi. 14, where the words are used in a non-doctrinal sense, and are therefore all the more valuable.

“Make thee an ark of gopher wood thou shall pitch (*kaphar*) it within and without with pitch (*kaphar*).”

The LXX renders the words in question: “*asphaltoseis autem te asphalto*”, which words are easily recognized as our English asphalt or bitumen. We need be no students of divinity to understand why Noah was instructed to use “pitch”; it was simply to *keep the water out*. Another non-doctrinal use of the word is found in I Sam. vi. 18, where it is translated “village”, and answers to the Arabic *khephre*, which is observable in Caper-naum, and Chephar-haammonai in Josh. xviii. 24. Yet another use of the word is found in Song of Sol. i. 14, and iv. 13, where *kopher* is translated “camphire”. This is an odoriferous shrub named henna in almost universal use in Egypt and many parts of the East for “staining” the skin and the nails. We have therefore the idea of *protecting* from a deluge, as in the pitch used on the ark, a *shelter* or home as in the village, and a *stain* as in the henna plant.

We now come nearer to the doctrinal meaning of the word by noticing the way in which *kopher* is used in connection with the law. We have “a sum of money” laid upon a man for the ransom of his life (Exod. xxi. 30); a “ransom” described as “atonement money” (Exod. xxx. 12, 16); a “satisfaction” for a life forfeited (Numb. xxxv. 31, 32); a “bribe” (I Sam. xii. 3 and Amos v. 12). In none of these passages is there the idea of “covering” in the sense of concealing, but “covering” in the sense of *compensating* for damage done, and in the sense of a “bribe” covering the eyes of the judge as Deut. xvi. 19 declares: “for the gift doth blind the eyes.” The plural form *kippurim* is translated atonement or atonements in all passages, and for the sake of exactness, users of Young’s Analytical Concordance should note that the second entry in some editions (Exod. xxx. 10) is inserted in error; there are only eight references. To complete the score of translations we must add:--

HOAR FROST which covers the ground (Exod. xvi. 14).
BASONS, that probably had lids (I Chron. xxviii. 17), and
LION from its habit of lurking in dens or coverts (Jer. xxv. 38).

The feminine form *kaphoreth* is translated “mercy seat” in each of its 27 occurrences. So far we have considered the usage of the noun. The verb *kaphar* is translated in the A.V. as follows: To appease, pacify, put off, cleanse, disannul, pitch with their various verbal modifications, such as “make reconciliation”, which we have not chronicled. These translations account for 29 occurrences. The remaining 72 are translated by the word “atonement”. The only passage, apart from Gen. vi. 14, that uses *kaphar* before the law given in Exodus is Gen. xxxii. 20, “I will *appease* him with the present”. We are all, alas, too truly human to pretend that we do not understand Jacob’s action and motive. He had prayed for deliverance from the hand of Esau, for he knew he had wronged him in days gone by. So he took for his brother Esau a present of goats, sheep, camels, cows, and asses. When Esau asked Jacob, “What meanest thou by all these droves that I met?” Jacob replied, “These are to find grace in the sight of my lord” (Gen. xxxiii.8). When Esau would have refused the gift, Jacob urges him saying:--

“If I have FOUND GRACE in thy sight, then receive my present at my hand, for therefore have I seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God, and thou wast pleased with me” (verse 10).

Here is Jacob’s own interpretation of what he meant when he said, “I will appease him with the present”. Any attempt to use the idea of “covering” (except perhaps as Rotherham renders the passage, “I will cover his face with the present”, and so shelter myself from his anger) yields no congruous meaning. The at-one-ment or reconciliation was the result; the present the basis or cause. This is an example of the idea of a covering being applied to the person. We have atonement applied to sin as well as to the sinner: “Deliver us, and purge away our sins” (Psa. lxxix. 9). Surely the Psalmist did not merely mean “cover up our sins”? Rather, has he not expressed his meaning in verse 8: “O Remember not against us former iniquities”? In some cases the idea of “covering by a full and equivalent compensation”, in short “an eye for an eye”, is to be found, as in Numb. xxxv. 31-33:--

“Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer the land cannot be *cleansed* of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him who shed it.”

What sense is there in saying: “The land cannot *be covered* of the blood” unless we intend covering by compensation, and so canceling? This comes out prominently in another case. Suppose a man is found in the country, slain. No one knows who the murderer is. Yet blood has been shed. The elders of the city that is nearest to the spot are obliged to offer an heifer, and to wash their hands over its dead body, affirming their innocence, and praying that innocent blood be not laid to their charge. The passage concludes: “And the blood shall be forgiven them” (Deut. xxi. 1-9). The word in verse 8, “be merciful” is *kaphar*, and in verse 9 we read as an explanation: “so shalt thou *put away* the guilt of innocent blood.” Therefore “covered” sin is sin “put away”, for God says so. That this “putting away” was no mere “covering up” the false prophet knew

when he was put to death (Deut. xiii. 5), and the idolators knew when they were stoned (Deut. xvii. 6, 7). To put away the evil is interpreted in Deut. xix. 21 as “life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot”. Is this “covering up” sin? Is it not “covering” in the sense of canceling by an equivalent? This is the way in which the word is used in Isa. xxviii. 18: “Your covenant with death shall be *disannulled*.” Does this mean “covered up” or does it not mean “cancelled”?

Amplifications of atonement.

Did not the Psalmist have the meaning of the atonement in mind when he said:--

“Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity” (Psa. xxxii. 1, 2)?

Sin covered is sin *forgiven* and *not imputed*. Then again, is not atonement in view in the passages which speak of “blotting out” sin? Upon the occasion of the golden calf Moses said: “Peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin if not, *blot me*, I pray Thee, *out* of Thy book” (Exod. xxxii. 30-32). Again, when David prayed: “Blot out my transgressions”, and “Hide Thy face from my sins, and blot out mine iniquities” (Psa. li. 1, 9), there is a twofold reference to the “covering” by atonement, viz., “blot out” as to sins, and “hide” as to God’s face.

Moreover verse 14 shows that David had traveled beyond the type, and was looking forward to Christ, for the law provided no atonement for the murderer. In Isa. xliii. 25 “blotting out” is explained by “not remembering”. In Isa. xlv. 22 a little revision is necessary:--

“I have dissipated thy transgressions like a cloud, and thine iniquities like a vapour” (Spurrell’s Trans.).

So complete is this “blotting out” that it is used of the utter destruction caused by the flood (Gen. vii. 4). Another parallel is found in Isa. xxxviii. 17: “Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back.” If the eyes of the Lord are in *every place*, beholding *the evil* and the good, where can “behind His back” be but annihilation? No mere “covering up” can hide from His presence. Micah vii. 19 says: “Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.” Now no sea is so deep that He cannot see its bottom. The context speaks of “pardoning iniquity”, and “passing by transgressions” as synonymous expressions. One more example will suffice:--

“As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us” (Psa. ciii. 12).

Sin therefore if atoned for is said to be covered, not imputed, forgiven, blotted out, cast behind God’s back, and removed as far as east is from west. These passages do not occur in the N.T., but in the O.T. They were uttered by men who knew the true meaning of atonement, and from them we learn and not from modern speculators. The subject is

too sacred, too profound, too vital for anything trifling or speculative. We desire the rock of truth beneath our feet, and thank God we have found it.

The atonement, with the meaning that emerges from the great number of examples we have surveyed, is affirmed of the burnt offering, guilt offering, sin offering, the blood itself, the ram for the installation of the priest, the meal and peace offering, the half shekel, the appointment of the Levites, the incense, the punishment of a sinner, the offering of the spoils of war, and the blood of a murderer. Are we acquainted with all these urges, their contexts, their self-explanations? Until we are, what is the worth of our opinion? These and other features we hope to deal with in subsequent papers. Let us rejoice in that precious blood which not only redeemed us (Eph. i. 7), but made us nigh (Eph. ii. 13), and praise and adore Him who so loved us as to shed that blood as a propitiation for our sins.

#12. The five offerings of Leviticus. pp. 150 - 152

We have seen in previous articles the necessity for keeping the conception of redemption distinct from that of atonement, although in reality both the redemption and the atonement of Christ were wrought by one and the selfsame offering. Drawing nearer to the question of atonement itself, we shall find that it has a five-fold significance, and that this five-fold aspect is set forth with great care and elaboration in the opening chapter of the book of Leviticus.

It is possible that some of our readers will be aware of the fact that atonement is not predicated of the meat offering, nor of the peace offering in Lev. ii. and iii. We find, however, that it is connected with the meat and peace offerings in conjunction with the burnt offering in Ezek. xlv. 15-17.

The five offerings as a group.

Each offering has its own peculiar mission, and sets forth some one distinctive aspect of the work of Christ, but we shall appreciate the distinctions when we see how they all blend into one harmonious whole.

- A | The burnt offering. All claims of God and man perfectly met.
- B | The meat offering. Inherent holiness. All frankincense.
- C | The peace offering. Communion. God and man partake.
- B | The sin offering. Inherent sinfulness. Ashes.
- A | The trespass offering. The claims of God and man. The double tithe.

To establish the inter-relation suggested in this arrangement will necessitate a patient study of the separate offerings, but a brief anticipation of our findings may not be out of

place. The burnt offering is entirely devoted to God. All except the skin (which typifies righteousness) is consumed upon the altar. This symbolizes the perfect accordance with the will of God that was ever manifested in the Lord Jesus Christ, and how throughout His life on earth he met every claim of God and neighbour.

The meat offering is often associated with the burnt offering (*see* Numb. xxix. 6, 13 and 14). There is no blood shed in this case. Fine flour, oil and frankincense speak of inherent sinlessness, the addition of salt and the exclusion of both honey and leaven emphasizing its spiritual character. Before the question of sin is dealt with we have these positive relations set forth. On the other hand we have man's need and its remedy.

The trespass offering is the burnt offering plus sin. In both cases that which is due to God and man is met. But in the trespass offering there is the addition of the "fifth part", a making of amends. So with the sin offering. This deals with inherent sin, What I *am* rather than what I *do*; it is the meat offering plus sin. When both aspects of the divine demands have been met, common ground is found in the central offering, "The peace offering", where all parties concerned (God, the sinner, and the priest) find ground for peace and communion.

The spiritual reader will be awakened to the possibilities of real light and teaching from a contemplation of these most important offerings a careful consideration, and to devote a separate article to each one. There is, however, a necessary preliminary study that can be done here, which is to investigate wherein these five offerings differ the one from the other.

Things that differ.

THE BURNT OFFERING.—This like the meat offering and the peace offering is a *sweet savour*. In this it differs from both the sin offering and the trespass offering. It is offered "for acceptance". This is one of its peculiar distinctions. It was the offering of life-blood. In this it differed from the meat offering. It was wholly burnt; no part was eaten by either offerer or priest. The skin alone was reserved. It made "an atonement *for him*", whereas in the sin offering it makes "an atonement for him as concerning *his sin*", and issues in "forgiveness".

THE MEAT OFFERING.—This also was a sweet savour offering, and so contrasted with both sin and trespass offerings. It differs from all the others in the nature of the offerings themselves. Flour, oil, frankincense and salt. No blood was shed, no life given. It was not wholly burnt. Some part was reserved for Aaron and his sons.

THE PEACE OFFERING.—It was a sweet savour offering, and so grouped with the two former, but its chief feature is found in the emphasis upon communion. God, the offerer, and the priest all find common food together.

THE SIN OFFERING.—This is not a sweet savour offering. It was not burnt upon the altar, but in the place of ashes outside the camp. It was specially for sin as distinct

from trespass. (The reference in Lev. iv. 31 will be dealt with in the article dealing with the sin offering).

THE TRESPASS OFFERING.—The chief distinction is in the element of restitution, the making amends by the payment of the principal, and the addition of a fifth part.

We learn from these points of difference something of the fulness of the sacrifice of Christ for us. Both our sin and our trespass have been dealt with before God, and the full acceptance that inheres in a complete whole-hearted obedience to the claims of God and our neighbour is ours by virtue of the same offering. In Christ both sinful man and a Holy God find common ground, “He is our peace”. Seeing that these typical sacrifices promise so much light upon the foundation of our salvation, we trust that none will think the time ill-spent that patiently and prayerfully weighs over these weighty words of God in the balances of the sanctuary.

#13. The whole burnt offerings. pp. 189 - 191

Having looked at the five offerings of Leviticus as a whole, we must now consider each separately. The scriptural title for this offering is *olah*, or the “ascending” offering, referring apparently to the fact that this offering is wholly consumed upon the altar, and that its fragrance ascends in the smoke. While each offering has some peculiar feature that marks it off from the rest, there is one feature common to them all, and that is expressed by the word “satisfaction”. This, however, is true if we have a broad view of the word satisfaction, for in the case of the burnt offering and the meat offering sin is not in view.

It is natural but not scriptural to limit the satisfaction rendered by the Lord Jesus to the Father as related to human guilt, but was there no satisfaction in His spotless purity, His humble and wholehearted submission? When the closed heavens at length opened, and there was heard the voice of God saying, “This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased”, it was uttered at the close of His *private* life, and the opening of His *public* ministry, long before He died the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God. The *burnt* offering and the meat offering speak only of satisfaction intrinsically. The *sin* offering and the trespass offering of satisfaction for sin. The *peace* offering of satisfaction that is mutual. The first occurrence of the burnt offering is found in Gen. viii. 20, 21:--

“And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a SAVOUR OF REST.”

Noah's offering was one of thanksgiving and dedication, and not an offering for sin. The same may be said of the offering of Isaac, where the burnt offering is mentioned six times. Its inner meaning is expressed in the words:--

“Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from Me” (Gen. xxii. 12).

It is this aspect of sacrifice that comes first from God's point of view. Man, quite apart from sin, should render to God all that the burnt offering implies, although such an offering on his part is now absolutely impossible. Man must begin at the other end; trespass and sin must first of all be dealt with. Christ is presented in Lev. i. under three figures. He is the offerer, the offering, and the priest. The whole of His work was vicarious and “for us”. While in the O.T. sinful man brings the offering himself, in the N.T. fulfillment it is God Who provides the Lamb, and it is Christ Who offers Himself.

Acceptance.

In verse 2 we read: “Ye shall *bring* your *offering* of the cattle,” etc. Now the Hebrew word “bring” is *qarab*, which means “to draw near”, and the Hebrew word “offering” is *qorban*, which means “what is brought near”. Both words have the same triliteral root *orb*. So in the A.V. we find the verb sometimes translated “bring”, and sometimes “offer” as it is in Lev. i. 2, 3, 10. An essential element in all the offerings is this one of drawing near, and of giving access. Not only access, but acceptance is involved. In verse 3 the A.V. reads: “He shall offer it of his own voluntary will.”

The Hebrew word *ratsah* is sometimes rendered “self will” and “our will”. But just as the noun and verb *qorban* and *qarab* were seen to be allied, so in verse 4 the verb *ratsah* (translated “it shall be accepted”) reflects upon the noun in the preceding verse. Verse 3 should be rendered: “He shall offer it for its acceptance.” So then this wondrous offering may be said to be both for *access* and *acceptance*. Those who have, by grace, access, and who are accepted in the Beloved, make it their aim that they may be acceptable in their service. This is provided for in the burnt offering, for it was offered at the consecration of priests, levites, and kings, for the purification of Nazarites, and before battle. The three items that specially mark the burnt offerings are:--

1. It was a sacrifice of sweet savour.
2. It was offered for acceptance.
3. It was wholly burnt upon the altar, except the skin.

These offerings are called “The food of God” [see Lev. xxi. 17 (margin) and 21], and in the structure given on page 150 we sought to express the value of this offering by saying:--

“A | The burnt offering. All claims of God and man perfectly met.”

This is expressed very clearly in Eph. v. 2 where we read:--

“Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.”

and that such a high ideal of practical love is attainable Phil. iv. 8 testifies:--

“I have all things and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.”

Three degrees.

In the law of the burnt offering provision is made for the differing degrees of wealth among the various offerers. The burnt offering could be either a bullock, a lamb, or fowls. Bullock and bull are used interchangeably in the A.V., but it is well to remember that the true concept is a bull, for the term “bullock” to-day often means an animal that is not complete, and which is simply retained for fattening purposes. The three animals used in the burnt offering represent varying degrees of appreciation on the part of the believer, for while there is a great difference between the conception of the work of Christ as set forth by the bull and that set forth by the sheep, or that set forth by the doves and pigeons, *the result Godward* never changes. This is most blessed fact. While the appreciation of Paul may be represented by the bull, and the appreciation of the weakest child of God be set forth by the dove, yet *in Christ* and *before God* Paul is not one whit more accepted or safe than the weakest and the lowest. This can be seen if we set out the law of the offering in Lev. i.:--

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------|---|
| A1 | | Lev. i. 3-9-. THE BULLOCK. | Put his hand on.
Accepted for him.
Animal flayed.
Parts exposed and detailed. |
| B1 | | -9. THE RESULT. | A burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire,
of a sweet savour unto the Lord. |
| A2 | | 10-13-. THE SHEEP. | No hand laid on.
No mention of acceptance.
No flaying of the animal.
No detailed parts. |
| B2 | | -13. THE RESULT. | A burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire,
of a sweet savour unto the Lord. |
| A3 | | 14-17-. THE DOVES. | No hand laid on.
No mention of acceptance.
Not all on the altar; some part cast beside the altar.
Not divided into parts at all. |
| B3 | | -17. THE RESULT. | A burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire,
of a sweet savour unto the Lord. |

(To be continued).

Sign of the Times.
p. 15

Read in the light of Isa. viii. 19, 20, and I Tim. iv. 1-3, we can see that forerunners of Rev. xvi. 14 are preparing the way. Therefore "lift up your heads" (Luke xxi. 28).

"The Daily Chronicle, 15th November, 1926.
SIR A. CONAN DOYLE'S CHALLENGE.

3,000 of Albert Hall Audience Who Have 'Been in Touch with Dead'.

'I ask all those who are sure that they have been in touch with their dead to rise and to testify.'

This challenge by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle to spiritualists assembled yesterday morning at the Service of Remembrance in the Albert Hall was responded to by about 3,000 people, men and women of all types.

'I thank God there are so many', said Arthur. 'I will make a prophecy that within five years' time, to such an appeal made from this platform, there will not be one man or woman in the hall who will not rise.'

For the first time the Albert Hall had been engaged by the spiritualists for their annual Armistice service, and about 8,000 were present."

p. 31

Christian people who have entertained the unscriptural hope of peace on earth apart from the personal presence of the Prince of Peace, would do well to heed the uncompromising testimony, not of a popular preacher, but of a soldier, quoted below from the article on *War*, by Sir Ian Hamilton, in the New Encyclopedia Britannica:--

"Is War Inevitable?"

"Because good Europeans hate war in 1926 it does not follow that they hated war in 1914 or that they will hate it in 1964. Because Sir Bedivere has flung Excalibur far out into the mere let no one imagine that the glamour of the sword is for ever quenched. Against that spiritual symbol the shield of Locarno, welded by the spectre of the falling franc, will form a poor protection. To-day pacifists speak to the converted, but their young sons have been born with the old instincts.

Those who have seen with their own eyes and suffered in their own bodies know the ugly truths of war, but they cannot convey their knowledge to the young generation.

Nothing will stop war save the Second Advent of Christ."

The following extract from a report published in *The Daily Chronicle*, of the sixth Hailey Stewart Lecture, 1926, indicates the necessity for the believer to stand fast to the teaching of Scripture concerning the keystone doctrine of the resurrection:--

Sir O. Lodge's confession.

Never visits his son's grave in France.

Death an adventure.

"I have never been to see my boy Raymond's grave in France. He has asked me not to. He says, 'I take no interest in that grave. I never was in a grave in my life'."

Sir Oliver Lodge, the famous scientist, made the above dramatic statement delivering the sixth Hailey Stewart lecture at the Memorial Hall, London, last night, his subject being "Death and the Hereafter".

"Think about the grave as little as possible", proceeded Sir Oliver.

"If people would get over that trouble about interment, and about lying there for centuries waiting for a general resurrection—all that kind of medieval superstition—they could begin to regard death as more like what it is, an adventure, an episode that is bound to be welcome when it comes, and as something not to be afraid of."

Say ye not a confederacy” (Isa. viii. 12).
“Keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. iv. 3).

Never before in Europe. London’s First.

FELLOWSHIP OF FAITHS
Thursday, JULY 21ST. Exactly 5.15 to 6.45 p.m.

CITY TEMPLE

(HOLBRON VIADUCT, E.C.4),

PEACE & BROTHERHOOD

As taught by

SEVEN LIVING WORLD RELIGIONS.

Ten Minute Addresses by

Buddhist	Hon. Dr. W. A. de Silva, of Ceylon.
Christian	Dr. Sherwood Eddy, of America.
Confucian	(A message from Dr. Wei-Chang Che’ n, of China).
Hindu	Maharajadhiraja Bahadur of Burdwan, of India.
Jew	Dr. Moses Gaster.
Mohammedan	Abdul Majid and Maulvi A. R. Dard.
Theosophist	Dr. Annie Besant.

The Rev. Dr. F. W. Norwood, Presiding.

Devotional Music: Moslem Call to Prayer by the Muezin of London Mosque.
Hindu Song by Dilip Kumar Roy. Christian Hymn.

Words in Season.

#9. Onions and garlick, or this manna! (Num. xi. 5, 6). pp. 92 - 94

There is a word that by its use conveys a most important lesson for all who would go on to the full goal of our redemption, and stand “perfect and complete in all the will of God”. That word is variously translated “desire”, “covet”, and “lust”. While it is true that in some aspects that which is sensual and unclean is intended, the believer is apt to miss much vital teaching by avoiding the word altogether as having no immediate application to himself. A few examples will help us in this matter, and so before proceeding further we will notice them:--

“The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other” (Gal. v. 17).

It is very evident here that the word “lust” does not imply anything sensual or unclean, but simply “desire”, for it is used of both the flesh and the spirit:--

“The lusts of other things entering in, choke the word” (Mark iv. 19).

Here again “lust” means desire or coveting:--

“We should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted” (I Cor. x. 6).

The passage refers to the wilderness journey of Israel, and their desire for the things left behind in Egypt.

These examples will suffice to show that in avoiding this word “lust”, we are closing our ear to very salutary warnings from the Word of truth. We cannot do better for the moment than look more closely at these three passages, and seek to discover their meaning. Take Mark iv. 19 first. It occurs in the parable of the *Sower*, and therefore has a primary interpretation respecting the mysteries of the kingdom. As this parable occurs in three of the Gospels, it will help us further to note any variation in the wording:--

“The care of this age, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful” (Matt. xiii. 22).

“The cares of the age, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts concerning things that are left, entering in, choke the word, and it becomes unfruitful” (Mark iv. 19).

“And are choked with the cares and riches and pleasures of life, and bring no fruit to perfection” (Luke viii. 14).

It will be observed that while cares and riches are mentioned in all three passages, there are several variations that are illuminating. For example, the cares of the age of Matthew and Mark become the cares of life, and as the word is *bios*, the cares also of livelihood. Luke adds the word “pleasures”, and Mark adds the word “desires” or

“lusts”. Now Mark’s full expression is very suggestive: “desires concerning things that are left.”

A somewhat parallel passage is Luke xii. 26, “If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why are you careful (anxious) concerning the things that are left?” Eph. ii. 3 makes a distinction between the saved and “the rest”, as does also I Thess. iv. 13. the desires and cares for the things that are “left” choke the word, and prevent fruit to perfection. Paul says in Phil. iii. and iv.:-

“Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before I press Mark them which walk who mind earthly things Be careful for nothing.”

This feature leads us on to the quotation from I Cor. x. 6, where Israel lusted after evil things. We find the record in Numb. xi. 4, 5:-

“The mixt multitude fell a lusting We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick.”

They remembered! Paul sought to forget. They, in type, minded “earthly things”, the tasty produce of Egypt, the things that are left “entered in”, and brought ruin with them. Their very remembrance spoilt their taste for the bread of heaven:-

“There is nothing at all beside THIS MANNA!” (Numb. xi. 6).

The Psalmist gives one tragic comment upon this “lusting” or “desiring”:-

“They lusted exceedingly in the wilderness And He gave them their request, *but sent leanness into their soul*” (Psa. cvi. 14, 15).

The fullest light is let in when we turn to the third reference cited above, viz., Gal. v. 16, 17:-

“Now I say, walk in spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the desire of the flesh. For the flesh desires the contrary of the spirit, and the spirit the contrary of the flesh, for these are opposed to each other.”

Here then are two sets and two sources of “lust” or “desire”, flesh and spirit. They are contrary the one to the other. The spirit desires the things of God; therefore to “desire the things that are left”, the things of the flesh, the things that were left behind beyond the Red Sea in Egypt, is to fail both in fruitfulness and in perfection.

We must return to this subject again, meanwhile may we receive with meekness the Word of God that reveals the hidden spring of so many perplexing things in this life, viz., *desire*.

Specially for Young People.

#1. Talks on the way. pp. 113 - 117

At the London meetings conducted by the Editor, six meetings in the year are devoted to the instruction and help of the Young People who attend. These are held on the second Sunday of the months of January, March, May, July, September, and November, in which, of course, all ages are welcome. It has been felt that a wider circle of Young People, or those who have such under their care, would appreciate notes of these meetings. We accordingly commend them to the earnest prayerful use of all readers.

The way that seemeth right

Life is a journey. The Scriptures are full of references to this journey. Figures of the pathway, the guide, the provision, the dangers meet one everywhere. Psalm xxiii. has much to say about the way, so has Moses in the Pentateuch, the Lord in the Gospels, and Paul in the Epistles. Let us learn something for our help and blessing concerning “the way”.

The way.

The whole scheme of Christian doctrine and practice is called “the way”, especially in the Acts of the Apostles.

“If he found any of THE WAY (*see margin*) bring them bound unto Jerusalem” (Acts ix. 2).

“Divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of THE WAY before the multitude” (Acts xix. 9).

“At the same time there arose no small stir about THE WAY” (Acts xix. 23).

“I persecuted THIS WAY unto the death” (Acts xxii. 4).

“After THE WAY which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my father” (Acts xxix. 14).

“Felix having more perfect knowledge of THE WAY, deferred” (Acts xxiv. 22).

Added to the simple expression “the way” we find in the Acts several explanatory terms, such as:--

“The right ways of the Lord” (xiii. 10).

“The way of salvation” (xvi. 17).

“The way of the Lord” (xviii. 25).

“The way of God” (xviii. 26).

These titles are expanded and expounded in the epistles, but before we turn to their teaching we must realize the character and end of “man’s way” so that we may the better appreciate “the right ways of the Lord”.

Man's way.

The book of Proverbs provides a comprehensive commentary upon the way of man. Conceit is taken from man by the impossibility he finds even of understanding his own way, to say nothing of clear sighted analysis or unbiased judgment.

“Man's goings are of the Lord: how can a man then understand his own way?”
(Prov. xx. 24).

The sense of this passage is obscured by the failure of the translation to differentiate between the two words used for “man”. The LXX more truly gives the extremes—“a full-grown man” and a “mortal”. The sense is better expressed thus:--

“The steps of a powerful man are from the Lord;
Then a common man, how shall he discern his way?” (John Miller's Translation).

That man is unable correctly to discern his way, Proverbs teaches most clearly:--

“There is a way that seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death” (xiv. 12 and xvi. 25).

This proverb is repeated and therefore its truth is doubly impressed. The word “seemeth right” is literally, is right to his face or before him. This is in direct contrast with the “end” which is literally “its after part”. To be taken up with “things seen” blinds the mind to that “afterward” that is the inevitable wage of sin. Prov. xvi. 26 which follows (according to the A.V) speaks of man labouring for himself, the following translation being terribly suggestive:--

“The labouring soul labours for it” (*i.e.* death). (John Miller's Translation).

It is a solemn thought that the whole way of man and all his labour is for nothing else than death. Nevertheless this is most certainly true. There are but two ways. Call then the way of man, and the way of God, the way of lying, and the way of truth, the way of death, and the way of life. Prov. xv. 19 has one of these contrasting pairs:--

“The way of a slothful man is as an hedge of thorns; but the way of the righteous is raised up as a causeway” (*see margin*).

There are fourteen references to the “slothful” or the “sluggard” in Proverbs, and the child of God could spend the time taken in their consideration on many other things with less profit. Faith, though it be not “works” is not slothful. For a connection between sloth and thorns as applied to the believer see Heb. vi. 7-12. Those who think their own ways to be right, Proverbs says are “fools”:--

“The way of a fool is right in his own eyes” (xii. 15).

Study the context of such passages that speak of being “wise”, or “right”, or “clean”, or “pure”, in our “own eyes”, as Prov. iii. 7; xvi. 2; and xxx. 12. While the fool thinks his own way right, Scripture says:--

“The foolishness of man perverteth his way: and his heart fretteth against the Lord” (Prov. xix. 3).

This perversion may be seen in Prov. xxi. 8:--

“The way of a man is forward and strange: but as for the pure, his walk is right.”

“The man who has been *twisting about* as to his way, has also been *getting further off*: but the pure man is *straightforward* in his work.” (John Miller’s Translation).

Here is wandering that ends in utter loss, a twisting that never proves to be “a short cut”. The way of truth is a “right” way, it leads to life; all others whatever their outward seeming end in death. Not only does man pervert his own way, and sow his path with thorns, but

“The way of the wicked seduceth them” (Prov. xii. 26).

There is a fascination about evil; a will-o’-the-wisp lures men on to ruin, and nothing but grace can enlighten the eyes to see it in its true colours, or to confess it. This word “seduce” in the *preterite* is used in Isa. liii. 6:--

“All we like sheep have *gone astray*; we have turned every one to his own way.”

Here is a complete endorsement of Prov. xii. 26. Their “own way” was parallel to “going astray”, and in the blessed sequel we find it is expressed as “iniquity”, which the Lord Jesus bore as the great sacrifice for sin. This “straying”, this seduction of self by the way of wickedness, though apparently right, ends in death:--

“The man that *wandereth* (same word as ‘seduce’) out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead” (Prov. xxi. 16).

Contrast this with the words of Prov. xv. 24:--

“The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from hell (*sheol*) beneath.”

It is ever the same. God’s way is a way of light and life; and man’s a way of darkness and death. We have not yet seen the verse that tells of darkness. Here it is:--

“The way of the wicked is as darkness: they know not at what they stumble” (Prov. iv. 19).

This passage must be read with verse 18, which says:--

“The path of the just is as dawning light, advancing and brightening toward perfect day.” (John Miller’s Translation).

What we have learned.

From these passages of heavenly wisdom we learned at least the following facts about the way of man:--

1. Man's own powers of observation and reasoning, and even conscience unguided by inspired truth, are not sufficient to convince him that his own way is utterly wrong.
2. Man's own way, though self-approved, is nevertheless a way of self-deception, a way of darkness, and a way of death.
3. Man really has become through sin an utter fool; he sows his own path with thorns, and renders upward progress impossible.

The apostle, in Rom. iii., puts the same truth in the following words:--

“There is none righteous, no, not one they are all gone out of the WAY destruction and misery are in their WAYS, and the WAY of peace have they not know.”

This is the testimony of all Scripture. It is found as early as Gen. vi. There in verse 12 we read:--

“And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his WAY upon the earth.”

This corruption of the way proceeded from within:--

“And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen. vi. 5).

A consideration of the way of man leads us to the inevitable conclusion that man of himself is hopeless and undone. Walking in darkness, going down, down to death, yet under the false conceit that his ways are right. It is bad enough to be on a wrong road *and to know it*, but man is on a wrong road and is deceived into thinking it is right!

“This their way is their folly: yet their posterity approve their sayings”! (Psa. xlix. 13).

Yet if you read on in the Psalm it will be found that such folly is fatal, for “death shall feed on them”. Shall we not, in view of this solemn testimony, put up the prayer of the Psalmist?

“Remove from me the WAY of lying: and grant me Thy law graciously. I have chosen the WAY of truth O Lord, put me not to shame” (Psa. cxix. 29-31).

Over and over again we read concerning Israel that they had “turned out of the way”. This was their initial national sin after the great covenant of Sinai.

“Thy people which Thou hast brought forth out of Egypt have corrupted themselves: they are quickly turned aside out of the WAY which I commanded them” (Deut. ix. 12).

So in Deut. xi. 27, 28. A “blessing” if they obey, a “curse” if they do not obey, but “turn aside out of the way”. As we have seen when looking at the initial meaning of sin, sin is a negation: “all UNrighteousness is sin”, “Whatsoever is NOT of faith is sin.” So the false way, the way of death is really the negation of the way of truth, and the way of life. Man’s way is the negation of God’s way.

“Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, It is a people that do err in their heart, and HAVE NOT KNOWN MY WAYS” (Psa. xcvi. 10).

Here for the moment we conclude. Our next subject must be blessed contrast, the way of God. May the awful revelation of the path that man is treading, until grace translates him, be used of God to the eternal blessing of many who are out of the way.

#2. Christ the way. pp. 154 - 156

In the former talk we found that in Scripture the gospel is called *the way*, and that man’s way and God’s way are totally different in their character and goal. We now consider particularly Christ as the Way, and for this we turn at once to John xiv. 5, 6:--

“Thomas saith unto Him, Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way? Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me.”

We have already learned that man is out of the way, has gone astray, and Thomas but expresses the plaint of us all, “How can we know the way?” The answer is *Christ: He* is the way. There is an exclusiveness about this way that we do well to recognize: “No man but by Me” shuts us up to one way only. This feature is by no means confined to the passage under notice:--

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before Me are thieves and robbers I am the door; BY ME if any man enter in, he shall be saved” (John x. 7-9).

Christ is the only door. Again, in John vi. we read that Christ is the true bread of life: “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead *I am the living bread*” (John vi. 49-51). Peter likewise declares, “There is *none other name* under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts iv. 12).

An important point.

The expression, “The way, the truth, and the life” needs a little attention if we would not miss its fulness. As it stands we have three separate facts, each and all true. Christ *is* the way; Christ *is* the truth; Christ *is* the life; and chapter and verse can easily be found

in proof. At the same time, the passage contains something more. This may be a good opportunity for introducing to young people that important auxiliary, a knowledge of *Figures of Speech*. There is a figure which is called *Hendiadys*—a cumbersome name until understood. *Hen* is Greek for “one”; *dia* is Greek for “through”; *dys* is from *duo* (“two”), and so it is “The one-by-means-of-two” figure, two words being used, while one thing is intended. The familiar expression “bread and butter” in everyday English is an example of this figure. We do not mean a separate piece of butter in the same way that we do when we say “bread and cheese”; what we really mean is “buttered bread”, with an emphasis upon the “butter”. This adjective therefore is put forward and made into a noun. John xiv. 6 is an example of *Hendiadys*, or “one-by-means-of-three”, and means, “I am the way, yes, the true and living way”.

We must find space later on to give a few words of explanation concerning the most important Figures of Speech, but will not digress here. The figure emphasizes the two important facts that Christ, the way, is both *true* and *living*.

True.

The ordinary English usage of the word true limits it to that which is the opposite of “false”, and this of course is a frequent meaning in the N.T. There is, however, another very important usage arising out of the fact that in the Old Testament there are so many types and shadows. When we read in Heb. viii. 2 of “the *true* tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man”, the passage does *not* imply that the tabernacle pitched by Moses was *false*, but that it was but a type of shadow. This is actually said to be the case in Heb. ix. 24: “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the *true*, but into heaven itself.” So, when we read in John that Christ is the “true light” (i. 9), the “true bread” (vi. 32), the “true vine” (xv. 1) and the “true way” (xiv. 6), they are viewed as the real in contrast with the type and shadow.

Living.

Not only is Christ the true or the antitypical way, He is also the “*living* way”. The question of the angel at the sepulchre: “Why seek ye the living among the dead?” is applicable here. This way is “living” because it has essentially to do with resurrection, “Thou wilt show me the path of life” (Psa. xvi. 11). John not only speaks of Christ as the living way, but tells of “living water” (iv. 10); “living bread” (vi. 51); and the Son of the “living God” (vi. 69). A dead way or a merely typical way can never lead us back to the “living God”.

A new and living way.

In Hebrews the “living God” is mentioned four times, and we read in x. 19, 20 of “A new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us”. The utter failure of the typical way is the theme of Hebrews:--

“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 time then present” (Heb. ix. 8, 9).

“For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God” (Heb. vii. 19).

“For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins every priest standeth ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God” (Heb. x. 4, 11, 12).

The once offered sacrifice and the ever living High Priest is the one true, new, and living way whereby we may draw near unto God. All other ways are either false or shadows. All other ways must fail, for they are not “living”; Christ alone is the One who can say, “I am He that *liveth* and *was dead*”.