

# 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 XXVII.

1937

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

DEAR FELLOW-MEMBERS OF THE ONE BODY,

While the dispensation of the mystery may have no direct relation with prophetic times, it is obvious to all who have eyes to see, that the day cannot be far distant when the last member of the one body shall have been gathered in and our testimony finished.

In a small measure we trust that our publications have been and still will be used to “make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery”, and to that end we dedicate another Volume of *The Berean Expositor* to the glory of our ascended Head and to the blessing and encouragement of the members of His body.

Till the end of our course we rejoice to know that we shall be able to take to ourselves the words: “Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me”, and in that faith we look forward to another year’s witness.

With grateful acknowledgments to all who have encouraged us to hold fast in troublous times.

Yours for the truth “rightly divided”.

CHARLES H. WELCH  
FREDERICK. P. BRININGER

*December, 1937.*

# INDEX

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, THE--	
Antioch: The centre of the second section (xi. and xii.)	7
Intimate association of Paul's Epistles with the Acts	12
Two-fold ministry of Paul (xiii.-xxviii.)	16
Separate me Barnabas and Saul (xiii. 25 - xvi. 4)	20
Saul, who also is called Paul (xiii. 4-13)	24
Opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles (xiii. 14-49)	27
BEREAN CHARTS--	
God's answer to the problem of the Suez Canal	32
Acts of the Apostles in relation to secular dates	11
Acts of the Apostles: Epistles woven into the Book	16
Two ministries since Acts xxviii.	32
Cyprus: Key of Western Asia	100
CRITICISM, A	34
FRUITS OF FUNDAMENTAL STUDIES--	
Creation implies a purpose	37
Creation bears evidence that "God is"	40
God, the moral Governor: A Rewarder	43
God, the moral Governor: Is might right?	46
The Self-limitations of Omnipotence	48
The Fore-knowledge of God	50
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
JOSHUA: Taking the land and possessing it—a difference (xi.-xiii)	54
Difference between "the inheritance" (Col. i. 12) and "the reward of the inheritance" (Col. iii. 24) illustrated from Josh. xiv. and xv.	57
JOSHUA: Shadows of good things to come (xviii.-xxiv.)	62
JUDGES: The Book as a whole (i.-xxi.)	67
JUDGES: The root cause of failure (i. - iii. 9)	70
JUDGES: Lo-ammi; A prophetic principle examined (iii.-xiii.)	75
GREAT PLAINNESS OF SPEECH--	
The dispensational boundary	79
The covenant with Abraham and Paul's early ministry	80
KERR, GEORGE, A TRIBUTE TO	6
LIGHT FOR THE LAST DAYS--	
God's answer to the problem of the Suez Canal	82

“All faiths” instead of “The faith of God’s elect”	87
Arab’s opposition to the Jews in Palestine	89
Kings of the earth, and the King of kings	90
The Kings of the East	93
The trouble in Palestine	95
Palestine, Arab and Jew	97
The ships of Chittim	98
Does Scripture say anything concerning war in the air	101
 LIGHT UPON THE PURPOSES OF PRAYER--	
Revelation and Realization	105
Revelation and Anticipation	108
Revelation and Participation	110
Root and Fruit	112
 LO-AMMI	75
 NOTES AND JOTTINGS FROM AN OLD BIBLE--	
Exodus vi. 4-8	115
The Word a Whetstone	115
Separation	116
Song of Solomon vi. 3	116
 POWERS THAT BE, THE--	
The Edicts of Julius Cæsar in favour of the Jews	117
Augustus, and the taxing under Cyrenius (Luke ii. 1, 2)	120
 ROMANS, THE EPISTLE TO THE--	
Conformity to the Image of His Son (viii. 29, 30)	123
Four links in the chain of purpose (viii. 29, 30)	127
No condemnation; no separation (viii. 31-39)	130
The dispensational section opens (ix.-xi.)	135
Israel’s privileges (ix. 4, 5)	138
The purpose according to election (ix. 6-13)	144
 THINGS ABOVE--	
Where Christ sitteth (Col. iii. 1)	150
 WHAT MANNER OF PERSONS OUGHT YE TO BE--	
Teachers and Teaching	157
Unmoveable	159
Vessels	161
Witnesses	163
 WHEN THE COMMANDMENT CAME--	
“With Abraham” and “With Christ”	165

“In Christ” and “With Christ”	166
Ephesians i. 13	167
Value of the dividing line	168
Things that differ	169
Galatians iii. 8	170
WISDOM, HUMAN AND DIVINE--	
ANAXAMINES: His conception of the “first principle”	171
XENOPHANES: His “Formless Being”	173
PARMENIDES and MOSES: The condescension of the great I AM	176
HERACLITUS: A world of change, without Him Who changes not	178
EMPEDOCLES: The need of a Mediator	180
DEMOCRITUS and ANAXAGORAS; Chance or Intelligence	182
WITH ALL THY GETTING, GET UNDERSTANDING--	
Figures involving change.—Simile, Metaphor, Hypocatastasis	183
Figures involving change.—As to Persons	186
Figures involving change.—Subject-matter and Time	189
Figures involving change.—Feeling and Argumentation	191
WORDS OF COMFORT--	
Suffering is but for a season (I Pet. i. 6)	193
Suffering for a reason (I Pet. i. 6)	194
YOUNG PEOPLE’S PAGE, OUR--	
The Holy Scriptures	197
Salvation	199
The Saviour	200
The Sin-Bearer	201
Redemption	202
Faith	204
Children of God	205
Holidays	206
School	207
I AM	208
Peace	210
Gifts	211

**A tribute to the late George Kerr,  
Clydebank, Glasgow.  
p. 101**

Those of our readers who are acquainted with the early Volumes of *The Berean Expositor* and its history, will remember the regular occurrence of the initials “G.K. and Friends” under the heading “Gal. vi. 6”. These initials were those of George Kerr, and it was with a sense of deep loss that we learned a week before our visit to Scotland this April that our old friend had fallen asleep. Tribute was paid at the Glasgow meetings to the help and strength he had been to many—quite a number owe their introduction and subsequent confirmation in dispensational truth to the labours and scholarship of George Kerr. We remember with what surprise, and yet with his own hand, in book form for the benefit of others, the articles we contributed to *Things to Come* commencing in 1909. George Kerr was not easily convinced, and therefore his loyal support was all the more valuable.

Although for the past twenty-five years he was more or less an invalid, his cheery smile and stalwart faith were inspirations to many. He now awaits that glorious day when this body of humiliation shall be changed for the body of glory. We commit his widow and family to the tender mercies of our God, and feel that we who are left will honour “G.K.’s” memory best, by endeavouring to fill the breach that his death has made, and to hold fast the good deposit, seeking by grace, as he sought, to be “approved unto God” (II Tim. ii. 15).

## The Acts of the Apostles.

### #19. Antioch: The centre of the second section of the Acts (xi., xii.). pp. 23 - 29

No student of Scripture needs to be told that a knowledge of the history of Jerusalem is essential to the understanding of the O.T. This is so whether the point of view be the chronicles of Israel's history, the prophecies of the minor or major prophets, the rise and dominion of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, or, to come to the N.T., the record of the Gospels, the Acts, many of the epistles, and lastly the book of the Revelation. This city dominates the opening section of the Acts. Whether it is the preaching of repentance to Israel, or the evangelizing of Judæa and Samaria, Jerusalem is the divinely appointed centre. However, the second section of the Acts, which we are now to consider, takes us outside the "promised land". Another city now comes into prominence. With this city the evangelization of the Gentile world, the ministry of Paul and the name "Christian" will for ever be associated.

What do we know of Antioch? With our present information, what sort of answers should we give to a general knowledge paper covering its history and geography? Antioch has been called the third city of the Roman Empire and its importance to all Gentile believers is such that no apology is needed for the present article, which seeks to bring before the reader something of the character and position of a city so intimately associated with all that we as "Christians" hold dear.

For the sake of clearness we would remind our readers that two cities named Antioch are mentioned in the Acts. The first is referred to in Acts xi. 19, xiii. 1 & Gal. ii. 11, and is a city of Syria, about 300 miles north of Jerusalem, whereas the second is in Pisidia, in Asia Minor. Both were founded by Seleucus Nicator and both were named after his father Antiochus. No place was so suited as Antioch for the great work that was about to commence. It was called the Queen of the East, the third metropolis of the world, and the official residence of the Imperial Legate of Syria was there.

In Paul's day, the population of the city numbered perhaps as many as 500,000 and was composed of native Syrians, Greeks, Jews and Romans. There were the usual slaves and artists, and the sycophants who, alas, characterized every oriental city where East and West intermingled. So cosmopolitan was this place that *Libanius* said that he who sat in the Agora of Antioch might study the customs of the world. We are indebted to the writings of Josephus, and the books of the Maccabees for information concerning the history and appearance of Antioch, all of which we must pass by owing to limitation of space. Perhaps we may be justified in quoting from M. Renan's *Les Apotres*, a passage which vividly brings before the mind the character of the city associated with the evangelization of the Gentiles.

“It was an unheard of collection of jugglers, charlatans, pantomimists, magicians, thaumaturgists, sorcerers, and priestly impostors; a city of races, of games, of dances, of processions, of festivals, of bacchanalia, of unchecked luxury; all the extravagancies of the East, the most unhealthy superstitions, the fanaticism of orgies. In turns, servile and ungrateful, worthless and insolent, the Antiocheans were the finished model of those crowds devoted to Cæsarism, without country, without nationality, without family honour, without a name to preserve. The great Corso which traversed the city was like a theatre, in which, all day long, rolled the waves of a population empty, frivolous, fickle, turbulent, sometimes witty, absorbed in songs, parodies, pleasantries, and impertinences of every description.”

Let us retrace our steps a little in order to link up Paul’s movements with this city of Antioch.

In Acts ix. we find that on two occasions Paul’s life was at stake, and that although he spoke boldly in the name of the Lord at Jerusalem, he was persuaded to go back to his home at Tarsus. On the surface and lacking further explanation, this circumstance might lie open to question. Did Paul’s courage give way? Did he too easily allow himself to be persuaded to seek refuge in Tarsus? Would it not have been more to his credit if he had braved the storm by continuing to witness at Jerusalem? All that we know of that ardent soul leads us to suppose that he would have so stayed. Yet he retired into obscurity. There is however full and legitimate explanation, though it does not come to light until the twenty-second chapter of Acts is reached.

“And it came to pass that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance: and saw Him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on Thee: and when the blood of Thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. And He said unto me, *Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles*” (Acts xxii. 17-21).

This is the Paul we know and love. At any cost he wished to remain in the place where he had sought so hard to destroy the faith; but this might have savoured of more heroics and the Lord had greater work for this chosen vessel; therefore, disregarding the misunderstanding to which his action might lay him open, he returns to Tarsus, to abide the call that he knows must surely come.

We learn that as a result of the persecution that arose about Stephen, many “traveled as far as Phenice” (a harbour on the south of Crete), “And Cyprus” (an island on the East coast of Cilicia in the Mediterranean), “and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only” (Acts xi. 19). Some of the men who traveled thus far, were men of Cyrene, a city of Lybia, in North Africa, and these, when they came to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus (Acts xi. 20). There is a difference of opinion among experts as to the true reading here. The Received Text reads *Hellenistes*, and means Greek-speaking Jews. The Revised Text reads *Hellenes*, Greeks, that is uncircumcised Gentiles. It is almost impossible to decide which is the true reading. Let us consider the alternative readings and their bearing on the narrative.

First, the Received Text *Hellenistes*, “Greek-speaking Jews”. Almost without exception, this is the reading of B, D, E, G, H, and the cursive MSS. Supporting this reading is the statement of James in Acts xv. 14. “Simeon hath declared how God *at the first* did visit the Gentiles.” For if these at Antioch were “Gentiles” Peter could hardly have been called “the first”. To this may be added Peter’s own testimony “That the Gentiles *by my mouth* should hear the word of the gospel” (Acts xv. 7).

While in their sequence in the sacred page verses 19 and 20 of Acts xi. follow the narrative concerning Cornelius, the events they describe occurred at a much earlier period, when the persecution arose about Stephen. This was before the conversion of Paul. At first these scattered believers limited their ministry “to Jews only”, but later, certain men from Cyrene and Cyprus evangelized the Greek-speaking Jews, the Grecians. Stephen had been martyred largely at the instigation of *Hellenistes*, or Greek-speaking Jews (Acts vi. 9), and it was the same class that plotted the assassination of Paul after his conversion (Acts ix. 29). It would therefore be a signal triumph of the gospel for a great company of these Greek-speaking Jews to be brought to acknowledge the Lord. The fact that Barnabas was cognizant of the Grecian plot against the life of the apostle makes it doubly interesting that he should seek Saul and bring him back from Tarsus to Antioch.

Second, the Revised Text: The margin of the R.V. reminds the reader that while “Greeks” is placed in the text, many ancient authorities read “Grecian Jews”. The main arguments in favour of the Reviser’s reading are (1) The trend of the narrative rather leads us to expect an added triumph, yet it would make no point if these conversions at Antioch were merely among the Jewish population. (2) The conversion of a number of Greek-speaking Jews at Antioch would not have excited special notice, nor necessitated that special mission of Barnabas.

“The entire context, therefore, conclusively proves that *Hellenes*, ‘Greeks’, is the right reading, and it has accordingly been received into the text in spite of external evidence against it by all the best editors” (*Farrar*).

But we should not be content to introduce a reading into the text because of the deductions of commentators. Our first concern is to ascertain what is written in the Scriptures, and then to seek explanation. If we are to allow our opinion as to the fitness of a rendering to override evidences, where will it lead us? Our own conclusion is that the ministry of the dispersion at Antioch did not go so far as the inclusion of the uncircumcised Gentile, and that as there had already arisen grave troubles at Jerusalem on account of the conversion of the “Grecians”, those in authority made no delay in sending Barnabas, “a good man” (Acts xi. 24), and one most likely to conciliate where friction might occur.

When Barnabas had studied the situation at Antioch, he seems to have felt that the case demanded something freer and less cramped than any ministry that might be expected to emanate from Jerusalem: someone of the stamp of the martyred Stephen was needed. Immediately there would come to his mind Saul of Tarsus. Without hesitation he traveled north, and not without difficulty, as the original indicates he found Saul.

Twice, therefore, the Gentile church is indebted to Barnabas for bringing the apostle Paul forward.

A whole year passed while Paul and Barnabas taught much people. The results seem to have crystallized in the emergence of the new name of, "Christian". "And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch" (Acts xi. 26).

The word "Christ" is the Greek translation of the Hebrew word "Messiah". To the Greek mind it meant little or nothing. We have historical evidence that the Romans mixed up the title "Christos" with "Chrestus", for the decree expelling the Jews from Rome by Claudius (Acts xviii. 2) uses the term, and *Chrestianus* is common in inscriptions. It is most unlikely that the Jews would have given the title to the hated heretics. To do so would have meant the dragging of the very name of the Messiah in the mud of the street. The term used by the Jews was "the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5). They were more likely to perpetuate the reproach of the name of "Christian". The word "Christian" is a Greek rendering of a Hebrew word with a Latin termination, foreshadowing the worldwide movement to be associated with Antioch and the ministry of Paul. There is abundant evidence that the termination is Roman. We have such names as Cæsariani, Pompeiani, Ciceroniani, etc., etc.

Ignatius wrote:--

"Whosoever is called by any other name than this of *Christian* is not of God, and it is our duty not only to be so *called*, but to *be*."

Gregory Nazian said:--

"I honoured Peter, but I am not called *Petrianus*; I know Paul, but I am not called *Paulianus*. I will not consent to be named of men, having been born of God. If I worshipped a creature I should not be a Christian. For why is the name of Christian precious? Because Christ is God."

The Antiochians were noted for inventing names of ridicule, (see Julian *Misopogon*, where he answers their insults regarding his beard, and what Zozimus says of his emperor's visit, iii. II page 140), and there is every reason to believe that this epoch-making name originated in the darkened wit of some loose living Antiochene. But there is another side of the matter. Not even the wit of Antioch could have invented the name of "Christian" had there been no material upon which to work. That material was most certainly provided by the ministry of Paul. The first record of Paul's public witness is given in Acts ix., where we read:

"And straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus that He is the Son of God . . . . proving that this is the Christ" (Acts ix. 20, 22).

Later in Acts xvii. we learn that this was his usual procedure;--

“And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them of the Scriptures . . . . that this Jesus, Whom, said he, I proclaim unto you is the Christ” (Acts xvii. 2, 3).

Paul’s preaching left so strong an impression on the mind of Luke that instead of writing “this Jesus, Whom he preached”, a normal method of recording a past event, he records the actual words of Paul: and the Revisers, perceiving this, have inserted the words, “said he”. At Corinth we have the same insistence:--

“Paul was constrained by the word, testifying to the Jews, that Jesus was the Christ” (Acts xviii. 5 R.V.).

The Person and work of Christ are the glory of Paul’s epistles, and we can easily imagine that this blessed title, and the repeated insistence upon its meaning and worth, soon became associated with the little gathering at Antioch.

Reference is made at the close of Acts xi. to Claudius, and in chapter xii. to the death of Herod. As these references enable us to fix the date of Acts xii. with reasonable accuracy we will deal with them here, in order that the way may be left clear for the commencement of our study of the ministry of Paul in Acts xiii.

There is ample confirmation of the accuracy of the record that a famine befell the inhabitants of Judæa in the reign of Claudius. In his Antiquities, Josephus refers to it in three places, namely, iii. 15, 3; xx. 2, 5; and 5, 2. Acts xii. records the tragic death of Herod, and Josephus gives us a vivid description of his dreadful end.

We further learn for Josephus that Herod Agrippa died on 6th August, A.D.44, in the fifty-third year of his age, and in the seventh of his reign, having reigned four years under Caligula, and three years under Claudius.

“Now when Agrippa had reigned three years over Judæa, he came to the city of Cæsarea, which was formerly called Strabo’s tower; and there he exhibited shows in honour of Cæsar, upon his being informed that there was a certain festival celebrated to make vows for his safety.”

Claudius had just returned from completing the conquest of Britain. His son received the name Britannicus in honour of this acquisition to the Empire. The date of the return to Rome from Britain was January, A.D.44, and the festival held at Cæsarea “for his safety”, during which Herod died, enables us to fix the date of Acts xii. Accordingly we close this article with the following diagram which shows the Acts of the Apostles in relation to secular dates.

**- - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - -**  
**(BE-XXVII.29).**

**#20. The intimate association of Paul's epistles  
with the Acts of the Apostles.**  
**A preliminary study to the second section of the Acts.**  
**pp. 64 - 69**

The opening verse of the Acts, suggests that in that narrative intends to give a record of the things "that Jesus" *continued* "to do and teach" *after* His ascension. While Peter and Paul, Barnabas and Philip may be the active agents, they are but *agents*, the true Actor and Teacher throughout the record being Christ Himself.

We must remember that the record called "The Acts of the Apostles", did not exist as we have it until the items recorded were past history. If the fact that Paul founded the churches of Galatia is a part of the *acts* of the apostles, does it not follow that the epistle to the Galatians is an integral part of the *acts*? True, Luke does not mention the epistles, but he had no need to, for they were contemporaneous with and supplementary to the history he wrote. Seeing that Paul's visit to Thessalonica is recorded in Acts xvii. and his visit to Corinth in Acts xviii., it is not gain but loss to segregate the epistles to the Thessalonians or the Corinthians, and not allow them full place in the Acts. To assert that Paul in one set of his *acts* could teach one thing, and in the epistles written *during the same period and to the same churches*, another, is manifestly inaccurate, and therefore unacceptable to lovers of Truth. For us there is but one deciding voice in all these matters, and that is the actual testimony of the Scriptures themselves. Accordingly we set out below references to the Acts made by the apostle in his epistles, and by their testimony we shall abide.

When the time comes for examination of the chronology of the epistles written during the Acts, we shall put forward evidence that goes to show that Galatians was written first. As however that evidence has yet to be adduced, we will follow the order of the epistles in the A.V. and commence with Romans, though every student knows it was written last of this series of epistles.

**Romans and The Acts.**

EPISTLE.—"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, *separated* unto the gospel of God" (Rom. i. 1).

ACTS.—"Separate Me Barnabas and Saul" (Acts xiii. 2).

EPISTLE.—"Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but have been let hitherto), that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles" (Rom. i. 13).

"But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey unto Spain, I will come to you . . . . When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you unto Spain" (Rom. xv. 23, 24, 28).

ACTS.—“After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome” (Acts xix. 21).

EPISTLE.—“For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ” (Rom. xv. 18, 19).

ACTS.—“And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry” (Acts xxi. 19).

“And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul” (Acts xix. 11).

“He departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over these parts” (note the map. Illyricum was contiguous with Macedonia), “and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece” (Acts xx. 1, 2).

EPISTLE.—“Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; that I may delivered from them that do not believe in Judæa; and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints” (Rom. xv. 30, 31).

ACTS.—“And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly . . . . they said unto him . . . . they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses . . . . This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people . . . . they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple” (Acts xxi. 17-30).

EPISTLE.—“Greet Priscilla and Aquila” (Rom. xvi. 3).

“Timotheus my work-fellow and Lucius, and Jason and Sosipater, my kinsmen, salute you” (Rom. xvi. 21).

“Erastus the chamberlain of the city, saluteth you” (Rom. xvi. 23).

ACTS.—“After these things Paul departed from Athens and came to Corinth; and found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla” (Acts xviii. 1, 2).

“He sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus” (Acts xix. 22).

“Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers: as . . . . Lucius of Cyrene” (Acts xiii. 1).

“The Jews . . . . set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason” (Acts xvii. 5).

It is evident that the apostle had no intention of keeping the epistle to the Romans distinct from his other *acts*, but sought rather to interest them in the movement that was everywhere around them, and of which they and he formed an integral part. The epistle to the Romans therefore must be studied together with the Acts. Any attempt to divorce them should be looked upon with suspicion, especially when an attempt is made to teach one aspect of hope from the Acts, and another from the epistles of the very same period.

## I Corinthians and the Acts.

EPISTLE.—“Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth” (I Cor. i. 1, 2).

ACTS.—“After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth . . . . Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment seat” (Acts xviii. 1, 17).

EPISTLE.—“Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos” (I Cor. i. 12).

“Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed . . . . I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase” (I Cor. iii. 5, 6).

ACTS.—“A certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus . . . . And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia (Corinth was the capital. See also I Cor. xvi. 15), the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him: who, when he was come, helped them much which had believed through grace” (Acts xviii. 24, 27).

EPISTLE.—“I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius” (I Cor. i. 14).

ACTS.—“And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized” (Acts xviii. 8).

The reader will find many other allusions to the Acts, but the above are enough for our present purpose. The epistles of Paul are surely a part of his *acts*. Why rule them out? If, then, as we have shown, I Corinthians reveals many links with the Acts, it will be superfluous to “prove” anything regarding II Corinthians. Both epistles go together. Accordingly we pass on:

### **Galatians and the Acts.**

EPISTLE.—“Ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God and wasted it” (The R.V. translates it “made havoc”) (Gal. i. 13).

ACTS.—“As for Saul he made havoc” (R.V. translates “laid waste”) “of the church” (Acts viii. 3).

EPISTLE.—“I profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceeding zealous of the traditions of my fathers” (Gal. i. 14).

ACTS.—“I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers; and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day” (Acts xxii. 3).

EPISTLE.—“When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the fact, because he was to be blamed . . . . and the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation” (Gal. ii. 11, 13).

ACTS.—“Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul, and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church” (Acts xi. 25, 26).

EPISTLE.—“Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles . . . . but neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised . . . . Why compellest thou the Gentiles to Judaize?” (Gal. ii. 1, 2, 3, 14).

ACTS.—“And certain men which came down from Judæa, taught the brethren saying, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question” (Acts xv. 1, 2).

EPISTLE.—“That no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith” (Gal. iii. 11).

“Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law” (Gal. v. 4).

ACTS.—“And by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses” (Acts xiii. 39).

The epistle to the Galatians abounds with links that associate its teaching with the Acts. We have not forgotten the problems that await us in the parallel passages Acts xv. and Gal. ii., but that they are parallel, if not identical, calls for no further proof.

### **I Thessalonians and the Acts.**

EPISTLE.—“Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus” (I Thess. i. 1).

ACTS.—“At midnight Paul and Silas prayed . . . . they came to Thessalonica” (Acts xvi. 25 and xvii. 1).

EPISTLE.—“For yourselves, brethren, know our entrance in unto you, that it was not in vain; but even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with much contention” (I Thess. ii. 1, 2).

ACTS.—“And when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailor to keep them safely” (Acts xvi. 23).

EPISTLE.—“For verily, when we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer tribulation; even as it came to pass, and ye know” (I Thess. iii. 4).

ACTS.—“The Jews . . . . set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason . . . . crying, these that have turned the world upside down, are come hither also” (Acts xvii. 5, 6).

There are other allusions to the Acts, in I Thessalonians ii. and iii., but the above are sufficient for our purpose. As with II Corinthians so with II Thessalonians, to establish the relationship of the first epistle establishes also the relation of the second. For our present purpose we are not concerned to prove the association of Hebrews with the Acts, because that epistle lies outside Paul’s ministry to the Gentiles, and no good purpose will be served by merely multiplying evidence.

Following the apostle’s example where he sometimes uses the objections of an imaginary opponent, we remind ourselves of the fact that there is no evidence to prove that the title “The Acts of the Apostles” is inspired. This is true, and although we have used it to emphasize the fact that there could be no book until the “acts” recorded therein were finished, and that, for instance, the epistle written to the Corinthians was most certainly as important an “act” of Paul as those recorded in chapter xviii. of the Acts, our argument is in no wise impaired should this narrative be called by any other name. The writer himself compares it with a “former treatise” in which he had recorded “all that

Jesus *began* to do and teach”, and the implication is that “the Acts” is a second treatise of all that Jesus *continued* to do and teach, after His ascension. This strengthens our argument, for the epistles of Paul make frequent reference to the fact that, though Paul is writing, the doctrine of which he writes was received by revelation. Christ still teaches in the epistles of Paul, and to omit them from a narrative that sets out to record “all” that the ascended Lord “continued” to do and *teach*, would be a calamity. Our argument depends not upon the title of the book but upon its purpose. It is a strange mentality that can talk of the Acts as though it were an independent fact, altogether separated from the epistolary activities of the same apostle, ministering to the same churches, at the same time as that with which the record deals.

We append a chart that may be useful in visualizing this interdependence of Acts and Epistles, and this chart must be looked upon as a supplement to the one published in Volume XXV page 8.

## - - - I l l u s t r a t i o n - - - (BE-XXVII.69).

### #21. The twofold ministry of Paul (xiii.-xxviii.). pp. 104 - 108

In the opening article of this series, appearing in Volume XXIV, page 1, we set out the structure of the book of the Acts as a whole, and found it to be sub-divided as follows:

- (1) THE FORMER TREATISE . . . . . Acts i. 1-14.
- (2) THE PRESENT TEATISE . . . . . Acts i. 15 - xxviii. 31.

The present treatise, we found, fell under two heads:

- (1) THE MINISTRY OF PETER . . . . . Acts i. 15 - xii. 23.
- (2) THE MINISTRY OF PAUL . . . . . Acts xii. 24 - xxviii. 31.

Having arrived at Acts xiii., we must look at this second portion of the present treatise as a whole, when, again, we find that it, too, falls under two heads, namely the twofold ministry of the one apostle Paul.

We draw the reader’s attention to a necessary modification of the structure given on page 3 of Volume XXIV. Instead of section *C* referring to Paul’s ministry independently of the twelve, ending with xiv. 28, it should end with xv. 39, and section *D*, referring to Paul’s ministry with the twelve, should open with xvi. 6. This

slight alteration is necessary in order to include the whole of the early Galatian controversy, chapters xiii.-xvi. 5, as one whole. Otherwise the general arrangement remains unaltered.

**Acts xii. 24 - xxviii. 31.**  
**The Twofold Ministry of Paul.**

- A | ANTIOCH. xii. 24 - xvi. 5.  
“The Holy Ghost said.” |  
A JEW withstands gospel. Stricken with blindness.  
A GENTILE (Paulus) believes.  
PAUL, “After reading of law and the prophets”, “Say on”.  
*Warning.*—“Beware lest that come upon you which is spoken in the prophets.”  
Paul’s independent ministry foreshadows xxviii. 17-31. |  
*Result.*—“Lo, we turn to the Gentiles.”  
*Conclusion.*—“the word published throughout all the region.”  
“The door of faith opened unto the Gentiles.”
- B | PAUL’S MINISTRY AFTER SEPARATING FROM THE SYNAGOGUE.  
“I must also see Rome” (xix. 21). |  
C | xix. 21-41. TEMPLE AT EPHESUS. |  
Uproar at Ephesus.  
Temple of Diana, scene of trouble.  
Paul not allowed to enter the theatre.  
Intervention of town clerk.  
Not blasphemous.  
Danger of being called in question for unlawful attitude.  
“So must thou bear witness also at Rome” (xxiii. 11).  
C | xxi. 27 - xxiii. 22. TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM. |  
Uproar at Jerusalem.  
Temple of the Lord, scene of trouble.  
Intervention of Roman Captain.  
Charge of polluting holy place.  
Paul permitted to stand on stairs.  
Is it lawful to scourge a Roman?  
Take heed what you do.  
Caesarea to Rome. Felix, Festus, Agrippa.
- B | PAUL’S MINISTRY DURING DETENTION BY ROMANS.  
xxiii. 23-xxviii. 16
- A | ROME. xxviii. 17-31.  
“Well spake the Holy Ghost.” |  
The JEWS believe not, and blindness comes on them.  
The GENTILE now the object of salvation.  
PAUL, “The law of Moses and the prophets”, “Be it known unto you”.  
*Warning.*—What the prophet threatened now comes to pass.  
Paul’s prison ministry foreshadowed xiii., xiv. |  
*Result.*—Two whole years unrestrained ministry to all that come to him.

At Antioch occurs the separation of Barnabas and Paul, and several features of this opening ministry fore-shadow the close of the Acts. For example: Paul's first miracle contrasts with Peter's first miracle. Peter *heals* a Jew; Paul *blinds* a Jew. This Jew withstands the truth, and a Gentile, who bears the same name as the apostle, believes. Resulting from the opposition of the Jews at Antioch, there is a local turning from the Jew to the Gentile and Paul utters that word of warning which anticipates the dreadful quotation of Isa. vi., with which the Jew was set aside in Acts xxviii. At the close of chapter xiii. we read:

“And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region” (Acts xii. 49).

and at the close of chapter xiv. we read:

“And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles” (Acts xiv. 27).

There is a very remarkable contrast found in Acts xiii. and Acts xxviii.

“But the Jews stirred up the *devout* and *honourable* women, and the *chief men* of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts” (Acts xiii. 50).

In contrast with this action of the devout, the honourable, and the chief men, let us read Acts xxviii.:

“And the *barbarous* people shewed us no little kindness: for they kindled a fire, and received us every one, because of the present rain, and because of the cold . . . . In the same quarters were possessions of the *chief man* of the island, whose name was Publius; who received us, and lodged us three days courteously” (Acts xxviii. 2 and 7).

It is encouraging to observe the record of the Holy Spirit in these matters; the names of the “devout”, the “honourable” and the “chief”, who expelled Paul, have gone down into oblivion, but wherever the Scriptures are read, the name of Publius is recorded with gratitude.

The ministry commencing at Antioch finds its sequel in the conflict concerning the status of the uncircumcised believing Gentile and the imposition of the decrees. This, as we shall see, constituted the middle wall of partition between the two parties in the early church. The next section commences at Acts xv. 40. Except to call attention to the fact that the synagogue was the centre of this witness, we have given no details of these chapters. In them comes the vision of the man of Macedonia and the consequent preaching of the gospel in Europe for the first time. Here also is the record of Paul's visit to and testimony at Athens, and the beginning of the fellowship between Paul and Aquila and Priscilla. Acts xix. 21 evidently constitutes a fresh section, for the words “after these things were ended” seem to imply a new movement. It is precisely here that the narrative records the fact that the synagogue was visited for the last time (xix. 8), and that the disciples were separated, and met subsequently in the school of Tyrannus. Thus

another link with Jerusalem and the Jew was snapped. Here, such is the evident comparison intended between the uproar caused at the Ephesian Temple and the uproar caused at the Temple at Jerusalem, that we give a few details.

The relation of these two sections is, moreover, strengthened when we observe that it was “the Jews which were of Asia” (Acts xxi. 27) that stirred up the people, and that the uproar arose over “Trophimus an Ephesian” (Acts xxi. 29). While the Temple of Diana at Ephesus was the shrine of an idol, and the Temple at Jerusalem was the Temple of the Lord, yet the inspired narrative seems to place them over against one another, as much as to say that, in spirit, there was now little to choose between them. The action of the Town Clerk, the Roman Captain, and other parallels, will speak for themselves.

For the time being we have left the central section, xx. 1 - xxi. 26, undeveloped. In it are recorded journeys made from Macedonia to Jerusalem, and also that, at Miletus, the apostle made known that a new ministry, associated with prison, awaited him (Acts xx. 17-38). Most significant, also is the fact, that at the opening of this division, Paul expressed the desire “to see Rome” (Acts xix. 21); and at the close, at Jerusalem, the Lord stood by the apostle and said:

“Be of good cheer, Paul; for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome” (Acts xxiii. 11).

The third sub-division *B* xxiii. 23 - xxviii. 16, is concerned with the various trials of the apostle under Felix, Festus and Agrippa, and ends with the shipwreck at Melita, and the eventual arrival at Rome.

The reader is earnestly requested to make the outline of this important part of Scripture his own. Let him remember that the time and trouble which he takes in checking the references and seeing “whether it is so” must necessarily be small when compared with the time and patience expended in discovering the outline at the first. This we have gladly done, giving the results freely, and we therefore feel that we can, without apology, ask all readers to give it more than a passing glance, for this part of the Acts is most important to us as believers of the Gentiles. It was during this period that the apostle made known the great foundation of justification by faith, upon which the truth of the mystery was subsequently to rest. The dispensation of the mystery was not given to Paul, nor did he make known that new revelation, until the Jew was set aside. Consequently the earlier epistles know nothing of it. Nevertheless, however high the building may be; however it may soar into heavenly places; it must rest solidly upon a good foundation, and it is in the Epistle to the Romans that that foundation is laid. There are dispensational features in Romans that have been superseded by others, more glorious, but Redemption, Righteousness and Resurrection remain the three R’s, whether of Galatians and the opening of Paul’s ministry, Ephesians in its highest glory, or II Timothy at its close.

**#22. The first missionary journey (xiii. - xvi. 5).  
 “Separate Me Barnabas and Saul.”  
 pp. 146 - 151**

We generally speak of Acts xiii. as being the commencement of the apostle Paul’s great ministry, but if the details are examined we shall be reminded that, actually, this new ministry starts earlier, namely at xi. 22, and, for a time, overlaps the ministry of Peter. A feature of the Acts already noted helps to confirm this. We refer to the recurrence of divine comment at different points of the narrative. This we exhibit so that the reader may be provided with all possible means of Berean-like study.

Geographical.	Theme.	Ministry.	Summary.
<i>i. 1 - ii. 46.</i> JERUSALEM. Jews only.	Commission of the Twelve. Pentecost.	Peter and the Twelve.	<i>ii. 46, 47.</i> “And the Lord added those that were to be saved” ( <i>See J. N. Darby’s New Translation</i> ).
<i>iii. 1 - vi. 6.</i> JERUSALEM.	Dispensational miracle. Hellenists come forward.	Peter and John. The seven Deacons.	<i>vi. 7.</i> “And the Word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied IN JERUSALEM greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.”
<i>vi. 8 - ix. 30.</i> Samaria. Damascus.	Stephen’s witness and martyrdom. Philip’s witness to Samaritans and Ethiopians. Saul’s persecution and conversion.	Stephen, Philip, Peter and John. Saul.	<i>ix. 51.</i> “Then had the churches rest throughout all JUDÆA and GALILEE and SAMARIA, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.”
<i>ix. 32 - xi. 20.</i> Cæsarea.	Cornelius and Hellenists evangelized.	Peter and those scattered at persecution.	<i>xi. 21.</i> “And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned to the Lord.”

END OF ACTS OF PETER.

BEGINNING OF ACTS OF PAUL.

<i>xi. 22 - xii. 23.</i> ANTIOCH. Jews, Hellenists and Gentiles.	Development in Antioch suggests that Saul be sought. Herod kills James and is himself smitten.	Barnabas and Saul.	<i>xii. 24.</i> “But the Word of God grew and multiplied.”
<i>xii. 25 - xvi. 4.</i> Asia Minor.	Saul separated. Dispensational miracle. First missionary journey. Defends gospel of uncircumcision.	Paul, Barnabas, Silas and Timothy.	<i>xvi. 5.</i> “And so were the churches established in the faith and increased in number daily.”
<i>xvi. 6 - xix. 19.</i> Europe.	Paul enters Europe; founds churches. Second and Third missionary journey.	Paul, Timothy and Silas, Aquila, Priscilla and Apollos.	<i>xix. 20.</i> “So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed”
<i>xix. 21 - xxviii. 30.</i> ROME. Gentiles only.	“I must see Rome” and “Spain”. Paul a prisoner. First ministry finished. Looking forward to the new ministry. Taken to Rome. Israel set aside.	Paul.	<i>xxviii. 31.</i> “Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.”

It will be seen from this tabulation that Acts xii. 24, 25 must be included in the new section of the Acts, which reveals the growth of the Word, in spite of Herod's actions, which are those of a potential antichrist (Acts xii. 20-22). Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, and took with them “John, whose surname was Mark” (Acts xii. 25). This disciple's mother was Mary, to whose house Peter made his way after being liberated from prison by the angel (Acts xii. 12). John Mark was the minister of Barnabas and Saul when they sailed from Antioch on their first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 5). But at Perga in Phamphylia he parted from them and returned to Jerusalem. Col. iv. 10 informs us that John Mark was “sister's son”, or “cousin” (R.V.) to Barnabas, and it would seem that this blood relationship may have prevented Barnabas from viewing Paul's objection dispassionately, which led to the separation of Barnabas and Paul on the threshold of the new journey into Europe (Acts xv. 37-39). Nevertheless it is good to record, not only for John Mark's sake, but also for the sake of the apostle who once had refused his further services, that, later, Paul could write:

“Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry”  
(II Tim. iv. 11).

These gracious words were said to one who had been called to the Lord's service almost immediately after the defection of Barnabas, and would have the effect of silencing discouraging criticism. The apostle mentions “Marcus” (exactly the same name as “Mark”) in Philemon 24, and Peter calls Marcus his “son” in I Pet. v. 13. Whether these references are to the same man we cannot tell, nor can any affirm whether or not “John Mark” is the writer of the “Gospel according to Mark”. Tradition has it that John

Mark is the Evangelist Mark, but there is no evidence on this point. It is not clear why one who served both at the beginning and the close of Paul's ministry should be the "interpreter", as Mark is called by Peter, but again, that does not constitute evidence on either side.

This introduction leads us to Antioch and the movement that commenced there. It is with this that we are concerned, and so we pass on.

**Acts xii. 24 - xvi. 5.  
Justification by faith.**

- A | xii. 24. "But the word of God grew and multiplied."
- B | xii. 25. | a | Barnabas and Saul.
  - b | John Mark taken with them.
- C | xiii. 1-3. Barnabas and Saul "separated" by the Holy Ghost.
- D | xiii. 4 - xiv. 28. |
  - c1 | Departure from Antioch.
    - d1 | *Justification by faith apart from law of Moses.*
    - c1 | Return to Antioch.
  - D | xv. 1-35. |
    - c2 | Men from Judæa raise the question.
      - d2 | *Except ye be circumcised after the manner Moses, ye cannot be saved.*
      - c2 | Men that had hazarded their lives for the Lord Jesus bring the answer.
- B | xv. 36-39. | a | Barnabas and Saul.
  - b | John Mark taken to Cyprus.
- C | xv. 40 - xvi. 4. Saul and Timothy approved by the brethren (xv. 26, 27 and xvi. 2).
- A | xvi. 5. "And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily."

At its opening Paul's ministry circled round a statement of truth and a conflict for that truth. The statement was the glorious doctrine of justification by faith (xiii. 39): the conflict was the fight against the Judaism which imposed law and circumcision as necessary to salvation. We are therefore to become witnesses of one of the most important controversies that the world has known; a controversy ever fresh in its applications; a fight for the faith in which we are called upon to engage to this day.

By this time the church at Antioch had been established for at least a year (Acts xi. 26), and the two men who played so prominent a part in its inception and upbuilding were present among the prophets and teachers there assembled (Acts xiii. 1). The passage concerning the apostle's namesake would probably flash across his mind: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (I Sam. x. 11, 12; xix. 24); and, if it did, we can well imagine his prayer for grace to finish his course, and not turn aside in the tragic manner of his namesake. He would probably remember that Saul had persecuted David, even as he had persecuted the Lord.

We observe that Barnabas stands first and Saul last in the list of prophets and teachers given in Acts xiii. 1. That order was soon to be reversed, but it is encouraging to remember that the great apostle Paul himself knew a few years' discipline before he became competent for the fight.

We know practically nothing of Simeon, that was called Niger, nor of Lucius of Cyrene. Manaen is of interest seeing that he was foster brother of Herod the Tetrarch. Both were children nourished at the same breast (*suntrophos*), yet one is found numbered with the prophets, while the other killed one of the greatest of prophets, and was banished in A.D.41.

“As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them” (Acts xiii. 2).

The words “I have called” (*proskeklemai*) are the perfect passive of *proskaleo*, and indicate that the call had already been given to Barnabas and Saul, and was now to be put into effect. Hitherto the title of apostle had not been used of either Barnabas or Saul, but from this time onward it became theirs. “When the *apostles*, Barnabas and Paul heard” (Acts xiv. 14). Paul had been chosen as an apostle on the road to Damascus: “Unto whom now I send (*apostello*) thee” (Acts xxvi. 16-18). As he tells us, he had already been “separated from his mother’s womb” (Gal. i. 15). Yet he needed more than this commission and separation fully to qualify him for the service. This confirmation was now added. The Holy Ghost called upon the assembled church to “separate Me, Barnabas and Saul”. The particle *de* is not translated in either the A.V. or the R.V. Weymouth’s translation reads:

“Set apart for Me, now at once, Barnabas and Saul. When therefore the brethren had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away” (Acts xiii. 2, 3).

While there are passages in the Acts that show that the gift of holy spirit was conferred by the laying on of hands, it is not always so. For example, Stephen was a man “full of the Holy Ghost”, yet the apostles laid their hands on him (Acts vi. 5, 6), and there is no suggestion that any gift was conferred upon Barnabas and Saul on this occasion. It seems rather to have been a means of expressing hearty agreement with their call to service, and is actually explained in the words of Acts xiv. 26, “recommended to the grace of God for the work”. The apostle evidently referred to this occasion when he wrote:

“Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God” (Rom. i. 1).

The first step taken by the apostles Barnabas and Saul for the evangelization of the Gentiles is now recorded:

“So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia: and from thence they sailed to Cyprus” (Acts xiii. 4).

Barnabas was of the country of Cyprus (Acts iv. 36) and after the rupture with Paul he took John Mark with him back to Cyprus (Acts xv. 39). While, as in the case of Barnabas and John Mark, family affection may sometimes prove a hindrance to spiritual work, there is no reason, in itself, why it should not be a help. So in the decision to make Cyprus the first sphere of labour, love of country may have had some weight.

The great mission had now been launched, and the course set. In our next article we shall be free to take up the record of the ministry accomplished on this island and to learn its most important dispensational lesson.

**#23. The first missionary journey (xiii. - xvi. 5).  
Saul, who also is called Paul.  
pp. 184 - 188**

As the little vessel leaves the shores of Syria carrying, on their great adventure, the two emissaries of a despised faith, what insignificant persons must they have appeared. There seems to have been no “send off”, except that lowly one in the atmosphere of prayer and fasting (Acts xiii. 3). As they traversed the miles of sea, slowly reducing the distance from the place of their initial ministry, there could have been little realization of the tremendous issues that hung, humanly speaking, upon their faithfulness and courage.

The strongest might have felt the task too great: still more such a man as Paul. His bodily presence is described by the Corinthians as “weak” and as we hope to prove, he reminds the Galatians that he was with them on this very journey, during a bout of sickness (Gal. iv. 13). Before the journey is accomplished and the apostle is back again at Antioch, he is to meet with the opposition of sorcery, the contradiction and blasphemy of the Jew, persecution at the hands even of the honourable and the devout, despiteful handling by the combined attack of Jew and Gentile, and the ordeal of stoning and being left for dead: yet is he sustained and preserved. The grace of God, to which they had been recommended (Acts xiv. 26), proved all-sufficient, and the door of faith had been opened to the Gentiles.

No particulars are given of the work done upon the island. The verb *kateggellon* used in Acts xiii. 5 suggests a “continuance” of preaching in the synagogues of the Jews, a number of which may therefore have been visited at Salamis. The island is about 150 miles long, and the distance between Salamis and Paphos is 100 miles. It appears from the narrative, and from the relative positions of Salamis and Paphos, that, excepting the promontory east of Salamis the whole of the island (Acts xiii. 6) was traversed and the gospel preached. Yet not until the arrival at Paphos does the inspired chronicler find reason to record details, so that we do not know whether any or all of the fifteen other towns of considerable note (Pliny) were visited. Paphos, now called Baffa, was, at the time of the apostles, a port, where were the seat of the Roman Deputy and the site of one of the more famous temples dedicated to the worship of Venus. The Deputy is one

named Sergius Paullus. Here it will be profitable to pause and see how the record bears witness to the trustworthiness of Luke as an historian.

The critics used to maintain that Sergius Paullus must have been Pro-praetor, not Pro-consul (Deputy), as Luke avers. There were many changes in the administration of Roman Government: at one time a country would be Imperial; at another it would be a Senatorial province. Amid all the changes Luke never falters, his every statement having been proved accurate. So here. Recently a coin has been dug up in Cyprus, bearing the inscription: "In the *Pro-consulship* of Paullus."

In 1912 Sir William Ramsay brought to light an inscription referring to Lucius Sergius Paullus, the younger, whose father was a Roman official. Galen, a heathen physician, writing about 100 years after Acts xiii., speaks of one, Sergius Paullus, as well versed in philosophy, while Pliny the Elder, in his Natural History, three times refer to Sergius Paullus as a person interested in intelligent research, and as Pliny wrote about 20 years after the incident in Acts xiii., there is every likelihood that he refers to the same man. It may therefore have been that having wide interests he could tolerate Elymas, and at the same time proffer an invitation to the preachers of the Word. In any case, we can but rejoice that he heard, saw and believed, a marked contrast with those spoken of by Isaiah, whose eyes were shut, whose ears were closed, and whose heart was hardened (*see* Acts xxviii. 25-28).

At first it may cause surprise that so prudent a man as Sergius Paullus, should permit a sorcerer to be near his person, but we must not introduce into ancient times modern attitudes. Even so, with all our boasted civilization, the reader will discover a vast amount of superstition among all classes to-day. The horse-racing fraternity, whether they gamble in pounds or pence, are proverbially superstitious. The newspaper find ready readers intent on knowing all about their horoscopes and lucky days. Jewellers' shops exhibit a series of "lucky stones" suitably set in silver or gold, and clairvoyants find among their clientele cute business men.

This sorcerer was a Jew who bore the name Bar-Jesus, but who assumed the title Elymas, which is, perhaps, derived from the Arabic *Elim*, and Hebrew *Elemoth*, both meaning a wizard. Greek and Roman literature is full of references to the credulity of this skeptical period. Rome greedily welcomed the Syrian fortune-tellers, and to adopt the language of Juvenal, "The Orontes (the river upon which Antioch stood) itself flowed into the Tiber".

"The Jewish beggar-woman was the gipsy of the first century, shivering and crouching in the outskirts of the city, and telling fortunes, as Ezekiel had said, of old 'for handfuls of barley, and for pieces of bread'." (*Conybeare and Howson*).

Pompey, Crassus and Cæsar sought the aid of oriental astrologers, and the great satirist, Juvenal, pictures the Emperor Tiberius "sitting on the rock of Capri, with the flock of Chaldeans round him" (Juvenal x. 93).

Concerning the hold of these sorcerers upon the public, Tacitus, the great historian, says, with scathing sarcasm, that they “will always be discarded and always cherished” (Tac. Hist. i. 22). Pliny tells us that at Paphos there were two schools of soothsayers, one of which professed connection with Moses, Jannes and Jotapes, who were Jews, and *tauto recentior est Cypria*, “a much more recent Cyprian one”. We have already mentioned that Pliny wrote of Sergius Paullus, and there is a possibility that in the words quoted he refers to the school of Elymas the Sorcerer. However that may be, there is no doubt that whether Elymas was officially connected with the Deputy, or whether he was only a mere hanger-on, there would be a financial aspect of the association that would cause him to view with jealousy, and oppose with ferocity, any new claimant for favour.

It is significant that Sergius Paullus called for Barnabas and Saul, not they for him. It will be remembered also that it was the Gentiles who asked Paul to preach to them in Acts xiii. 42. Thus it will be seen that the time for direct evangelizing of the Gentile irrespective of the Jew had not yet come.

The opposition of the sorcerer Bar-Jesus, and Paul’s denunciation of him, is closely parallel with the experience of Peter recorded in Acts viii. This is no accident. The parallels that are discernible in the Acts between Peter and Paul would fill several pages of this magazine, and would make a contribution to our understanding of their specific ministries. For the moment we must be satisfied with observing a few points in connection with the two sorcerers, Simon Magus, and Elymas.

Acts viii. 9-24. PETER.	Acts xiii. 6-12. PAUL.
Consequent upon gospel in Samaria. SIMON the SORCERER. Attack by imitation: “Thou art in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity.” Simon, a type of Israel with opportunity still left for repentance: “Pray for me, that none of these things come on me.”	Consequent upon gospel in Cyprus. ELYMAS the SORCERER. Attack by perversion: “Thou child of the devil and enemy of all righteousness.” Elymas, a foreshadowing of Israel in Acts xxviii., stricken with blindness: “Immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness.”

At this point, the inspired writer tells us that Saul possessed a Gentile name, *Paul*. It cannot be mere accident that the first convert in this new mission bore the same name as the apostle himself, Paullus and Paul of course being identical. There are many examples both in the Scriptures and in secular history of the possession of a double name. We think of Abram, Joseph and Daniel. Esther was known to the Persians as Hadassah. Hillel was known to the Greeks as Pollio. Peter was also called Cephas. Augustine in his sermon says:

“Paul suffers what Saul had inflicted; Saul stoned, and Paul was stoned; Saul inflicted scourgings on Christians, and Paul five times received forty stripes save one; Saul hunted the church, Paul was let down in a basket; Saul bound, Paul was bound.”

It was, and still is, the custom, for a Jew to have a Hebrew and a Gentile name. In our own Whitechapel it would be easy to find someone known familiarly in the street as Bill

or Tom who, within the family circle, would be Isaac or Moses. The custom has indeed provided a joke in an illustrated Yiddish paper. Moreover, the names adopted by the Jew are contemporaneous with his times. In *Persian* and *Babylonian* times we have "Nehemiah" and "Belteshazzar": under *Greek* influence we have such a name as "Philip". In *Roman* times we have "Justus", "Niger" and "Pricilla". In the *Middle Ages* we find Jews bearing the name "Basil" or "Leo". (For a fuller treatment of the subject see *Zunz Namen der Juden*). Jerome refers to the Roman custom of adopting the name of a country that had been conquered, such as Scipio, who, having conquered Africa, took the name Africanus. Certainly there is intentional emphasis upon the Gentile convert's name here. There is every likelihood that, as Paul was a freeman, his family took the name of some Roman family immediately associated with this freedom. So, from this time onward, the apostle is known as Paul; never again is he called by the old Hebrew name, which, with his old self and past, was dead and buried.

## **#24. The first missionary journey (xiii. - xvi. 5).**

### **Justification by faith.**

#### **The opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles (xiii. 14-49).**

**pp. 224 - 230**

The remaining part of the story of this journey centres chiefly in Antioch of Pisidia, and in it occurs the first record of an address by Paul. We have no inkling as to the mode of guidance in the itinerary, but as the nearest land was the mainland of Asia Minor, and as travelers in those days had little option regarding the chartering of vessels, the most natural thing was, that finding a vessel about to leave for Perga in Pamphylia, the apostles should accept the fact as sufficient guidance, believing, most assuredly, that a "work" had been mapped out for them, and that guidance as well as grace was theirs.

At Perga a sad thing happened.

"John departing from them returned to Jerusalem" (Acts xiii. 13).

"He went not with them to the work" (Acts xv. 38).

*Ergon*, work, *ergazomai*, to work, occur seven times in the narrative:

"Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the *work* whereunto I have called them" (Acts xiii. 2).

"Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I *work* a *work* in your days, a *work* which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you" (Acts xiii. 41).

"And thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the *work* which they fulfilled" (Acts xiv. 26).

"Known unto God are all His *works* from the beginning of the world" (Acts xv. 18).

"But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the *work*" (Acts xv. 38).

From these references it would appear that “the work” actually began when the apostles, by themselves, evangelized the cities of Asia Minor, and it must also be noted that on the return journey Cyprus was not included. Moreover, when Paul proposed to visit “every city where we have preached the Word of God” (Acts xv. 36) he apparently had no intention of revisiting Salamis or Paphos in Cyprus, for he went through Syria and Cilicia and on to Derbe. Pamphylia, as its name means, was “the-all-tribe” land. Cyprus was under one governor, and was tolerably peaceful, but Pamphylia and the countries beyond were likely to inspire the traveler with dread. For years Pamphylia had been a stronghold of pirates and robbers, and in the lower regions of the country malaria was rife. The apostle’s words: “In journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers” (II Cor. xi. 26) would well describe the dangers that intimidated John Mark. We, in our own land, have no experience of a flooding river such as would menace the safety and life of a traveler in Asia Minor. To a wavering disciple the vast central plain of Asia Minor, rising higher than Ben Nevis, with inland seas of salt to make the journey even more harassing, would also be daunting.

The facts that Paul made no stay in Perga at his first visit, but preached there on his return (Acts xiii. 13, 14; xiv. 25) suggests that the apostle had taken ship for Cyprus at the “opening” of the sea, that is in March, and so would arrive at Perga about May. Earlier in the year, the passes would be blocked with snow, and later the approaching winter would render the journey unsafe. In the month of May the inhabitants of Perga moved from the plains to the hills. Within recent times these *yailaks*, or summer retreats, have been described by travelers. If therefore Paul found the majority of the inhabitants of Perga on the move, it would account for his silence, and, possibly, also for John Mark’s sudden fright. Moreover we find that the apostle often passed by smaller towns for the great centre of commerce or government, leaving to the church formed by his efforts the work of evangelizing the surrounding district. Whatever the cause, Antioch in Pisidia was the apostle’s goal.

Antioch was a Roman colony and a centre of great importance.

“They came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down. And after the reading of the law and the prophets the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on. Then Paul stood up and beckoning with his hand said . . . .” (Acts xiii. 14-16).

As the synagogue plays such an important part in the early spread of the gospel, we take this opportunity of describing its officers and order of service, and giving other particulars that illuminate the Scripture record.

A synagogue could only be formed where there were at least ten men, preferably students of the law. The fact that the Lord used the number ten in His parables is reminiscent of this fact.

The Talmud says:

“What is a great city? That in which were ten men of leisure. If there be less than this number, behold, it is a village.”

These men of leisure, *Batlanin*, were so described from their being unencumbered with worldly things. They “were at leisure only to take care of the affairs of the synagogue”. Of these men, three bore the magistracy and were called “The Bench of Three”. These were called “Rulers of the Synagogue”. Then there was the Chazan, or Bishop, of the congregation: “He oversees how the reader reads (*cf.* Paul’s concern ‘give attention to the reading,’) and whom he may call out to read the law.” This office is the origin of the “Overseer”, *Episkopos*, or Bishop, of the early church. There were also three Deacons, or Almoners, on whom rested the care of the poor, and who were called *Parrasin*, or Pastors. The reader will see how natural it was for the apostles to appoint the seven deacons in Acts vi.

Another officer was the “Interpreter”, for the law was still read in the Hebrew even though none of the congregation understood it. Beside the Sabbath meetings, meetings were held on the second and fifth days of the week. To this the words of Acts xiii. 42 may refer, for “the next sabbath” is *to metaxu sabbaton*, and *metaxu* means “between” and so might refer to these weekly meetings that came between the Sabbath days. It is however only just to say that Josephus uses the word in the sense of “after” (Bel. v. 42). The Companions Bible reads “one of the weekly gatherings”.

Entering the synagogue we should find ourselves in a building unadorned, and differing from the heathen temples around them by the complete absence of any sculptured figure. On one side, behind a lattice window, sit the women. In the centre is the reader’s desk, and toward the side facing Jerusalem, is the Ark which contained the sacred scrolls. All round the building are seats so that “the eyes of all that are in the synagogue” can be “fastened” on the speaker. The chief seats are reserved for the rulers of the synagogue.

The service being begun, the minister calls out seven to read the law. First a priest, then a Levite, if present, then five Israelites. Thus in some editions of the Hebrew Bible one can still see, marked in the margin of the Law, 1st Priest, 2nd Levite, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th. The first lesson is then read. This is called the *Parashah*. Read in Hebrew, it is translated verse by verse by the Interpreter. After the *Parashah*, a short portion from the *Haphtorah*, which is a selection from the prophets, is read, the translation this time being at the end of every three verses. Then comes the *Midrash*, or sermon. This is not delivered by one set minister, but any qualified stranger or visitor could be invited by the ruler of the synagogue to give a word of exhortation.

This is just what happened at Antioch, where Paul readily and eagerly responded to the invitation of the rulers of the synagogue. The modern conception of a sermon, where a text is made the basis of an address more or less remotely connected with it, is not the *Midrash* of the synagogue. The *Midrash* arose naturally out of the reading of the law and the prophets.

In the present list of Jewish lessons, Deut. i. - iii. 22 and Isa. i. 1-22 form the forty-fourth in order, and Bengel makes the happy suggestion that this was the lesson on the day of Paul's visit to the synagogue at Antioch. Farrar draws attention to the occurrences of two words used in Paul's address, one of unusual form, *etrophophoresen* (Acts xiii. 18), "carried them as a man carries his little son" (LXX Deut. i. 31), and the other, *hupsosen*, employed, most unusually, to convey the sense of "He brought them up" (Acts xiii. 17; Isa. i. 2). The fact that these two words are found, respectively, in the first of Deuteronomy and the first of Isaiah, combined with the circumstance that the historical part of Paul's exhortation turns on the subject alluded to in the first of these two chapters, and that the promise of free remission is directly suggested by the other, makes Bengel's suggestion extremely probable, i.e., that these were the two chapters which had just been read.

In some respects Paul's address differs from that of Peter recorded in Acts ii., while in others it is similar to it. Where Peter limits his remarks to the people of Israel and Jewish proselytes, Paul addresses his audience as "men of Israel", "ye that fear God", "children of the stock of Abraham" and "whosoever among you feareth God". Whereas Peter when preaching to Cornelius said "the word which God sent unto the children of Israel" (Acts x. 36), Paul said to the whole congregation, "To you is the word of this salvation sent" (Acts xiii. 26).

The apostle begins his address with a resumé of Israel's history and focuses attention on David. He then comes to his point.

"Of this man's seed hath God according to His promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus" (Acts xiii. 23).

He then pauses to bring in the witness of John the Baptist, afterwards proceeding to show that the very hatred of the Jew was but a fulfilling of the Scriptures they read every Sabbath day. Pilate's testimony to the Saviour's innocence is also adduced, and the fulfillment of all that was written, even to the particulars of His burial, is impressed upon them. Then, once more, he stresses his point: "But God raised Him from the dead" (Acts xiii. 30), and lays before them the further witness of those who saw the risen Lord over a period of many days. He returns to the glad tidings that God had fulfilled the promises to the fathers.

After yet further proofs of the resurrection, the apostle comes to his glorious conclusion:

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 38, 39).

Here Paul reaches the great doctrine of his early ministry, "Justification by faith without the deeds of the law", a doctrine that finds its exposition in both the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Romans. A structure of the exhortation follows.

**Acts xiii. 16-41.**  
**Paul's exhortation in synagogue of Antioch.**

- A | 16-21. Resumé of Israel's history. Lo-ammi periods.
- B | 22. David. After own heart.
- C1 | 23. A Saviour. Jesus.
- D | 24, 25. Witness. John Baptist.
- C2 | 26. Salvation.
- E | 27-29. Fulfillment, by rulers at Jerusalem, and by death and burial.
- F | 30. God raised Him from the dead.
- D | 31. Witness. Seen many days.
- C3 | 32. Glad tidings.
- E | 32. Fulfillment, by promise.
- F | 33. He hath raised up Jesus again.
- B | 34-37. David. Sure mercies.
- C4 | 38, 39. Forgiveness. Justification.
- A | 40, 41. Beware. Lo-ammi period threatened (fulfilled at Acts xxviii.).

Some explanation will be demanded of the insertion at the opening and close of Paul's address of the words "Lo-ammi". We have dealt with this feature in the series, "Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth" (p.207), where it treats of the Book of Judges.

The years that Israel were in servitude were "Lo-ammi" years, and therefore not reckoned in the divine calendar. What had already happened to Israel happened again, when, as recorded in Acts xxviii., they once more went out into another Lo-ammi period, which still obtains, and has already reached nearly two thousand years.

We must remember that it is quite inaccurate to teach that Paul turned from Israel as a whole to the Gentiles as a whole, in Acts xiii. 46, for in Acts xiv. 1 we find him as usual in the synagogue. The explanation is that the turning from the Jew at Antioch was local and prophetic. It foreshadowed that great turning away of Acts xxviii., as we have shown by the balance of teaching of the whole section xiii.-xxviii.

The closing verses of this witness at Antioch are:

"And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region" (Acts xiii. 48, 49).

It should be noted that the A.V. has given an unfortunate turn to the meaning of the word in translating *tasso*, in this verse, "ordained". The word means to set in order, and while by no means denying the sovereign grace of God, looks also to the fact that whereas the Jews "judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life", the Gentiles who heard rejoiced at the message and glorified God for His grace.

We have dealt with Paul's doctrine of justification, apart from the law of Moses, in Volume XVIII, page 83, and as this article has already reached its limits, we must refer the reader to that article for further notes on this great subject.

## **Berean Charts.**

### **Two Ministries since Acts xxviii. pp. 126 - 128**

#### **- - - Illustration - - - (BE-XXVII.126).**

The Gospel of John differs from the Synoptic Gospels in that it was written after Acts xxviii. and in full consciousness of Israel's rejection:

“He came to His own, and His own received Him not; but as many as received Him to them, . . . .” (John i. 11, 12).

If we examine the parable of the marriage of the King's Son, in Matt. xxii., we find that it deals with three invitations to the marriage. First during the earthly ministry of the Lord, then again to the same people during the Acts, and a third time after the rejection of Israel and the burning up of their city in A.D.70. It is in connection with this third invitation to the wedding that John's Gospel has its place.

At the present time there is a small inner circle who respond to the prison ministry of the apostle Paul, and a large world-wide company who find their gospel and hope in that according to John. The one ministry is building up the perfect man, the other is gathering the guests for the marriage, while during the Acts the company that constitute the Bride was in formation.

That John's Gospel was not written for Jewish readers is manifest. No Jew needed to be told that the Passover was a “Feast of the Jews”. No Jew was ignorant of the feud that existed between them and the Samaritans; no Jew needed the interpolation of the meaning of “Rabboni” in the record of the resurrection.

While the dispensational position of the two companies differs as the Body differs from the Guests, and there is no idea that John taught anything concerning the mystery; yet seeing that he wrote after Paul's message had been given to the church, he was obliged, in the nature of the case, to minister the same aspect of the offices and glory of Christ that now fills our vision, rather than the Christ of the early Acts. This is clear from the comparison suggested between Paul's revelation of Christ as the “Image”, and John's revelation of Christ as the “Word”. These would run together, whereas Christ as the “King of the Jews” would not. So also the other items which are set out for comparison. John is the only other writer to mention the period “Before the foundation of the world”, and he more than the other evangelists stresses the ascension. The other sheep are clearly

not of Israel, and provide a sphere for the “Pastors” who have a place in the church of the One Body.

The full force of the relation of these two ministries will only be felt by those who make the subject their own. The chart and these notes are but suggestions for those who have ears to hear.

**A Criticism.**  
**“Weighed in the balances and found wanting.”**  
**pp. 215 - 218**

In *The Berean Expositor* for June 1911, we published an article entitled “The Dispensational Place of the Lord’s Supper”. We knew at the time that such an article would shut many doors of service, and create a good deal of opposition and criticism. For all this, however, we were, by grace, prepared. From time to time there have been published articles and booklets *exposing* the error of our ways, which is quite natural. For over twenty-five years, however, we have awaited a criticism of our attitude to the Lord’s Supper, written by one who held the following qualifications and beliefs:

- (1) An unshakeable belief in the inspiration of Scripture.
- (2) Freedom from sectarian bias.
- (3) Knowledge of the Greek originals.
- (4) Knowledge of dispensational truth.

Such qualifications are certainly very limiting, for while there are still some left, thank God, who believe the inspiration of all Scripture, and still some who are free from sectarian bias, there are not many who combine with these the two other qualifications indicated. We felt that a criticism penned by one who possessed this fourfold qualification would (1) either so completely expose our “error” as to demolish the position we have occupied all these years, or (2) the method and nature of the criticism would be so evidently self-contradictory as to leave our position unassailable. Such a criticism at last has been published, from which we give extracts:

“If we have difficulty with the figures of speech used in connection with the Lord’s dinner, let us examine them, rather than alter what is clear and unmistakable.”

To this, every true Berean must be in hearty agreement. But, the statement leads on to the idea that the words “New Covenant” in II Cor. iii. 6 and in our Lord’s own reference are “figures of speech” and need “altering” if we are not to be misled.

“Paul speaks of being the dispenser of a new covenant, not of the letter, but of the spirit, for the letter is killing, yet the spirit is vivifying (II Cor. iii. 6). *But Paul really had no covenant.* He simply called it that because it replaced the old covenant, and *there was no name which would so clearly express what he meant . . . .* It is the same with the ‘new covenant’ in which blessing will come through His blood alone. Even that was figurative, *for it is not a real covenant*” (Our italics).

Here, therefore, is the criticism for which we have waited a quarter of a century. To undermine the fundamentals of our position, any criticism must deal with the New Covenant. Any other item is but the outside fringe of the subject, but this is vital. For an opponent to admit that inspired Scripture actually means “The New Covenant” by the words *He Kaine Diatheke*, would of course be fatal. We are consequently told that neither our Lord nor Paul really intended what those words meant to every Jewish reader. “*Paul really had no covenant.*” “*It is not a real covenant.*” We must also modify our

acceptance of verbal inspiration, for it seems that God had some difficulty in finding suitable words in which to convey His truth; “*There was no name which would so clearly express what He meant*”; and yet “what He meant” is not what He said so clearly.

This attitude of mind we expect from a modernist, but our critic is a believer in verbal inspiration! Moreover, if our critic be right, we must set aside one of our most valued helps to the study of the Greek Testament, namely, the Greek Concordance, for that Concordance brings together Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20; I Cor. xi. 25; II Cor. iii. 6 and Heb. viii. 8. This is a grave state of affairs and one that makes some protest imperative. Neither *The Berean Expositor* nor its Editor are mentioned in the article we have before us, but the truth for which we stand is one, whoever the human instrument may be through whom it is distributed and made known.

The version of the N.T. published by the writer whose criticism we have been considering contains the following notes to the passages where the words “New Covenant” occur.

“Matt. xxvi. 28. See Ex. xxiv. 8; Lev. xvii. 11; Jer. xxxi. 31-34. Mark xiv. 24. The new covenant is with the nation of Israel (Jer. xxxi. 32; Ezek. xxxvi. 24-30; Heb. viii. 7-12; x. 15-17) even as the old one was. The first was dedicated with the blood of calves and he-goats (Ex. xxiv. 8), but the new with the precious blood of Christ (Heb. ix. 15-27). The first was conditional on their obedience, the second on His.

Luke xxii. 19, 20. Compare Matt. xxvi. 26-28; Mark xiv. 22-24; I Cor. xi. 23-26; I Cor. xi. 25. At this time the believers among the nations were still subordinate to Israel. They were still partakers of their spiritual things, hence they were considered as coming under the blessings of the new covenant. The later revelations, contained in the Perfection Epistles, gave them an independent standing outside the new covenant which Jehovah made with Israel.

II Cor. iii. 6. No comment relevant to our discussion.

Heb. viii. 8 . . . . . To speak of the Greek scriptures as ‘The New Testament’ is most misleading, because, as a matter of fact, the new covenant is found in the ‘Old Testament’. Jeremiah gives it in full (Jer. xxxi. 31-34). It has never been in force yet, and ‘New Testament times’ will not come until after the time of affliction when Jehovah calls Israel and Judah back to himself . . . . .

Heb. ix. 15. This new covenant is for Israel and Judah only. The nations have no part in it at all . . . . .”

With all that is here quoted, most of our readers will be in complete harmony, but it seems impossible to retain these comments, and at the same time to explain away the literality of the New Covenant, when it conflicts with one’s own views of the Lord’s Supper, without involving something deeper than mere inconsistency.

We cannot do better than quote from the closing paragraph of the article referred to where, speaking of other matters, the writer says:--

“The grave feature of this method of handling God’s Word is this: It definitely denies (quite unconsciously, no doubt), what God has said, and then actually reasons away vital

elements of the mystery by illogical deductions . . . . May God give us grace to cling closely to His Own disclosures, to distrust our own deductions.”

In the light of the previous quotations by the same writer, what meaning is there in the expressions “definitely denies” “reasons away” and “cling closely to His Own disclosures”? Our application of them compels us to believe that both our Lord and the Apostle Paul actually *meant* the New Covenant when they *used* the words, and while we cling closely to such a belief, we must maintain that the introduction of a New Covenant memorial feast into the Mystery is unscriptural.

We thank our critic for the unintended testimony he has given to the strength of our position, but we are sorry that his attack should have (quite unconsciously no doubt) questioned what God has said, discredited the concordant method of study, and substituted human reasoning for simple acceptance of what is written.

## **Fruits of Fundamental Studies.**

### **#1. Creation implies a purpose.**

**pp. 41 - 44**

Nearly twenty years ago, the series of studies entitled “Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth” commenced, the first article appearing on Page 1 of Volume VI. After a few introductory studies dealing with the principle of right division, the meaning of the “ages” and kindred subjects, the Book of Genesis was opened, and from that time to this, the studies have proceeded, giving attention to structure and theme, type and shadow, but of necessity passing over many allied subjects without comment. We have no intention of discontinuing the series, for we believe nothing can compensate for a first-hand acquaintance with “all Scripture”, and we are sure that these studies have proved a great help to many. We feel, however, that the time is ripe for using the material thus assembled; and we can now with freedom select our passages, knowing that the books as a whole have been analysed, and that the structures are at hand whenever they are wanted.

Beginning with God as Creator and man as creature, yet made in the image of God, it is evident that God and His relation to man, and man and his relation to God must be very near the starting point of all our attempts to apprehend His Word and ways. Arising out of this relationship, many questions present themselves for consideration, which must be answered if we are rightly to understand the great doctrines of the faith. The question of how far God’s omnipotence is above or subservient to right, and the question of how far His omnipotence allows freedom to man, demands an answer. Does foreknowledge mean foreordination? Can a moral agent be responsible if he is not free? These and kindred themes arise out of the simple facts and relationships of creation, Creator and creature. The presence and the problem of sin, the meaning of “good and evil”, the Divine method of the removal of sin and the reconciliation of the sinner, are subjects that meet us at every turn, in the record of historic facts, in the institution of type and ceremony, and in the foreshadowing of prophetic word and deed.

Creation being the starting point, let us use what space we have in this article to get a Scriptural idea of what is meant by the word “create”. The popular idea of “something out of nothing” may be a fit subject for philosophical debate, but if our guide is the Scriptures we shall be spared the necessity of pursuing this theme, for there is not a single passage from one end of the Scriptures to the other that raises the question, “Where did matter come from?” The Scriptures begin, not with the creation of “the stuff of the worlds”, but with the creation of “the heaven and the earth”.

While, therefore, modern teaching concerning the atom and the fact that solid objects are nothing more than “bundles of force”, enable one to see that the visible, tangible creation may after all be but the expression in terms of physics of the mind, will and power of the invisible God, this theme, though intensely interesting and attractive, finds little basis in the Scriptures themselves. The same thing is true of God Himself. The

Bible does not open with an abstract argument for the existence of a First Cause; He is presented to us at work. It is not possible for any man to prove the negative statement, “There is no God”, for to be able to do so would demand the omniscience of God Himself. For the atheist to prove that there is no God, he must have traversed all space and all time, for unless he has investigated every nook and corner of the universe, and seen with eyes that not only take in the visible but the invisible, he cannot be sure that the necessary evidence to prove the existence of God is not somewhere to be found, even though he has not yet found it. The argument from design, as exemplified in Paley’s famous illustration, we must consider later. For the moment, let us concentrate our attention on the word translated “create” in the Hebrew Scriptures. The word is *bara*, and its first occurrence Gen. i. 1. Let us see how it is used elsewhere.

“And God *created* great whales” (Gen. i. 21).  
“So God *created* man . . . . in the image of God *created* He him, male and female *created* He them”(Gen. i. 27).

It is evident that the word *bara* in these occurrences does not bear the meaning “to create out of nothing”.

Associated with *bara* there are two other words: *asah*, “to make” and *yatsar*, “to form”. We find the three words used together in Isa. xliii. 7: “I have created (*bara*) for My glory: I have formed (*yatsar*); yea, I have made (*asah*) him.” While Gen. i. 27 uses the word *bara*, “create”, Gen. ii. 7 uses *yatsar*: “And the Lord God *formed* (*yatsar*) man of the dust of the ground.”

Coming back to Isaiah, we read in xlv. 18:

“For thus saith the Lord that created (*bara*) the heavens, God Himself that formed (*yatsar*) the earth and made (*asah*) it; He hath established it, He created it not in vain, He formed (*yatsar*) it to be inhabited.”

The Scripture uses the word “create” both of the heavens and of the earth, but seems to change here to “form”, “make” and “establish” when the purpose of habitation is in view.

In this same chapter of Isaiah we read:

“I *form* the light, and *create* darkness: I *make* peace, and *create* evil: I the Lord do (*asah*) all these things” (Isa. xlv. 7).

Here it is evident that “to make” (*asah*) includes both “creating” and “forming”. So, in the N.T. we read:

“We are His workmanship (*poiema*, from *poieo*, to make) having been created (*ktizo*) in Christ Jesus” (Eph. ii. 10).

God is spoken of in the O.T. Scriptures as “The Creator” (*Bara*) in Eccles. xii. 1 (where the word is plural), Isa. xl. 28 and Isa. xliii. 15. He is referred to as “The

Maker” in the following passages: *Yatsar*—in Isa. xlv. 9, 11; *Asah*—in Job iv. 17; xxxii. 22; xxxv. 10; Psa. xcv. 6; Prov. xiv. 31; xvii. 5; xxii. 2; Isa. xvii. 7; li. 13; liv. 5; Jer. xxxiii. 2; Hosea viii. 14; and *Paal* (“to work”) in Job xxxvi. 3.

Creation is spoken of in the Scriptures as the outcome of God’s wisdom, His word, His understanding, His power, and the work of His hands.

“He hath made the earth by His *power*, He hath established the world by His *wisdom*, and hath stretched out the heaven by His *understanding*” (Jer. li. 15).

“By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His *mouth*” (Psa. xxxiii. 6).

“*Mine hand* also hath laid the foundations of the earth, and *My right hand* hath spanned the heavens; when I call unto them, they stand up together” (Isa. xlvi. 13).

It will be seen that whereas philosophy has endeavoured to probe into the *origin* of things, the Scriptures are more concerned that we should perceive the *intention* of things. Creation is brought before us as the product of wisdom, understanding and power, but these three, unregulated by purpose, would work in vain.

Many subjects arise out of the fact of Creation which we cannot attempt to deal with in these pages, but some at least must be considered. Among them we must note:

- (1) THE ARGUMENT FROM THE EVIDENCE OF DESIGN FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.
- (2) THE CREATION AS AN EXAMPLE NOT ONLY OF THE MIGHTY POWER BUT OF THE SELF-LIMITATION OF THE OMNIPOTENT.
- (3) THE LIGHT OF REVELATION ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST AS THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS.

These three subjects at least we must include in our studies, besides giving a passing glance at other related themes.

Let not the reader think such considerations are of little practical importance. The whole fabric of the Christian faith rests upon the solid basis of the relationship between the Creator and the creature, and wrong views entertained here at the beginning are bound to influence the whole of the super-structure.

## #2. Creation bears evidence that “God is”. pp. 70 - 73

We have already seen in our opening study that creation implies a purpose, and as we proceed it becomes clear that this purpose necessitates a Person.

It is one thing to be confident that one is right, it is another thing to be able to convince others. For ourselves we are convinced that creation and its implications are at the very root of revelation, redemption and ultimate restoration. We recognize, however, that the reader has the right to ask for evidence before acknowledging the truth of this statement. We are writing for those to whom the testimony of Scripture is final, and we therefore pass over without comment the philosopher’s pursuit of the Absolute, and content ourselves with the fact that Scripture does appeal to the works of creation as sufficient evidence of a Creator. This being granted, the rest follows.

Let us take a simple argument first:

“He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see?”  
(Psa. xciv. 9).

Could anything be more direct and simple than these questions? Yet is there any argument invented by man that can abate their force? For the moment, however, we are not so much concerned with the power of the argument, but simply with the establishing of the *fact* that such argument is Scriptural.

The basic doctrine of Christianity is perhaps, justification by Faith, and it is therefore interesting to find that this doctrine is introduced into the experience of man and into the pages of Scripture by a reference to Creation.

“And He brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them. And He said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness” (Gen. xv. 5, 6).

Should anyone object that while Genesis is the first book of the Bible, Abraham’s experience in Gen. xv. actually occurred after the experience of Job, we would point out that the answer in the Book of Job to the question: “How shall man be just with God?” (Job ix. 2) is the overwhelming answer of Creation. “Who can read the opening verses of Job xxxviii. unmoved? “Where wast thou when I laid the foundation of the earth?” (verse 4). And as we read on through the remaining chapters to the end, we discover that a view of the magnificence of creation was all that was necessary to humble Job and to convince him of his need of righteousness.

As the Psalmist writes: “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handywork” (Psa. xix. 1).

We gave an instance above of the close association between the doctrine of Justification by Faith and the evidences offered by creation, and we now seek to show that the apostle Paul was not only conscious of this fact, but definitely used it in his ministry.

When the idolaters of Lystra would have offered sacrifice to Barnabas and Paul, Paul prevented them saying:

“We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea and all things that are therein; Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness” (Acts xiv. 15-17).

When the apostle stood on Mars Hill, his testimony before the learned Greeks was much the same:

“As I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him I declare unto you. 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, neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things . . . .” (Acts xvii. 23-25).

At the time of the end, when the world shall have become to a great extent Antichristian, the gospel of creation shall be preached to all that dwell on the earth:

“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” (Rev. xiv. 7).

The association of the Creator with “judgment” that is found in this proclamation, and in Acts xvii. 31, must be reserved for separate study, but we call attention to it in passing because of its importance. He Who is Creator must also be Moral Governor, and from this follows the necessity for Law.

The Epistle to the Romans, that great exposition of Justification by Faith, contains the most emphatic and searching statement concerning the witness of creation that we have yet considered:

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness” (Rom. i. 18).

This statement is not limited to those who have received the revelation of the Scriptures; it is applied to those who, though they have never heard a verse of Scripture, have before them the evidence of creation, which is sufficient for its purpose.

“Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them” (Rom. i. 19).

The phrase “That which may be known” indicates the limits of creation’s testimony. No man by observing the works of God’s hands would ever arrive at the gospel of redeeming love, but they provide sufficient evidence to make idolatry inexcusable.

“For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse” (Rom. i. 20).

These passages are more than sufficient to establish the fact that the Scriptures appeal to the works of creation as evidence for the existence of God.

Many of our readers will be acquainted with the writings of Archdeacon Paley. Paley’s deduction of the existence of a watchmaker from the design of a watch has been attacked by various sophistries, but it remains as unassailable to-day as when it was first put forward. Dr. Chalmers makes some interesting remarks in this connection. He bases his argument not so much on the bare circumstances of matter, but on the wisdom manifested in its disposition. The sheer bulk of matter that constitutes what we speak of as the Universe might have remained for ever a universal chaos, but the order and adaptation of that universe is an argument that is beyond refutation. For example, the phenomenon of refraction in optics is governed by a certain “law”, but the situation and nature of the two different humours in the eye, together with the lens and the retina and the muscles which regulate the degree of convergence of the refracted light—these are not laws but dispositions, without which the laws themselves could never have brought about the required result.

The whole observable creation presents in multitudinous variety this principle of disposition, this adaptation to an end. Such adaptation demands intelligence, and the almighty intelligence demanded by creation is sufficient evidence to establish “His eternal power and Deity”, and to render all without excuse. The first demand made upon any who would “come to God” is that they should believe “that He is” (Heb. xi. 6); and the faith that thus believes does not rest upon fancies or imaginings, but upon the solid foundation of creation.

So far we have considered the evidence afforded by creation for the existence of God. In our next study we must continue to the logical and Scriptural conclusion.

### #3. God, the moral Governor. pp. 108 - 111

In our last paper we arrived at the conclusion, drawn from the evidence of design and purpose in creation, that “God is”, and that ignorance of this basic fact is inexcusable. Most of our readers probably realized, when we quoted from Heb. xi. 6, that we stopped short of its conclusion. We take up the matter now, and give the complete quotation:

“He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him” (Heb. xi. 6).

The connection between God’s existence and God’s moral governorship is evidently fundamental, and it is this question that we are to consider in the present paper. *“He is . . . . He is a Rewarder.”*

We must not allow ourselves to be side-tracked at this point into an argument concerning “law” and “grace”. Reward in the sense of Rom. iv. 4 can have no place in the scheme of salvation by grace. This, however, is but one aspect of the subject. The intimate association between “reward” and moral government is set forth, for example, in the two following passages in the Apocalypse:

“And the nations were angry, and Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that Thou shouldest give reward unto Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear Thy Name, small and great: and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth” (Rev. xi. 18).

“Behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be” (Rev. xxii. 12).

In the general use of the word to-day, “reward” is often placed over against “punishment”, but this does not convey the full truth. “Reward” in the full sense of the word includes “punishment”. We find, for instance, the following passage in a writer as late as 1874: “Hanging was the reward of treason and desertion.”

And in II Sam. iii. we read: “The Lord shall reward the doer of evil according to his wickedness” (II Sam. iii. 39).

It is, therefore, clear that the term “reward” must not be used merely as an antonym for “punishment”, but rather as conveying the idea of an “award” of impartial justice.

The word “recompense” is used in the same way:

“Behold, your God shall come with vengeance, even God with a recompense” (Isa. xxxv. 4, see also Isa. lix. 18; lxvi. 6).

“Reward”, “recompense”, “punishment”, are terms that are meaningless apart from moral government. The initial requirement of faith is to believe that God is, and flowing

immediately from the recognition of His Being, is the recognition of His sovereign right to rule.

In this connection, we would draw attention to the use of the word “worthy”, which occurs seven times in the Book of Revelation.

### “Worthy.”

- A | iii. 4. They shall walk in white, for they are *worthy*.
- B | iv. 11. Thou art *worthy* to receive glory.
- C | v. 2. Who is *worthy* to open the book?
- D | v. 4. No man was found *worthy*.
- C | v. 9. Thou art *worthy* to take the book.
- B | v. 12. *Worthy* is the Lamb to receive power.
- A | xvi. 6. Given them blood to drink, for they are *worthy*.

We cannot conceive of any reader requiring proof that in these passages the “worthiness” ascribed to the Lord is moral, and not mechanical. If this be so, what shall we say of the last reference? No difference in meaning or in choice of language is apparent between the opening passage (iii. 4) and the closing passage (xvi. 6). Both passages associate “worthiness” with choice, intention and performance. In the first passage those addressed are exhorted to “remember”, to “hold fast”, to “watch”; and those who have not defiled their garments are said to be “worthy”. It would be an obvious perversion of the passage to introduce the idea that those addressed are not responsible for their actions, that their will is not free to choose between defilement and its opposite, or that the reward of walking with the Lord in white is not contingent upon their actions. So, in Rev. xvi., the Angel is heard ascribing righteousness to the Lord, Who has poured out upon the earth the vials of His wrath, turning the sea, the rivers and the fountains of waters into blood. The reason is given:

“For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink; FOR THEY ARE WORTHY” (Rev. xvi. 6).

Flewelling writes:

“If we really did believe that men are the helpless victims of impulse, there would be neither rhyme nor reason in punishing crime. In fact there would be no crime, there being no moral responsibility.”

This is as serious as it is true. If a man believes a theory that compels him to deny freedom of choice in moral agents, then whatever he may say superficially, he is logically bound to deny “the exceeding sinfulness of sin”. The fact that rewards and punishments follow the actions of men proves two things: first, that God is the moral Governor of His creatures, and, secondly, that man is a responsible moral agent.

We shall be obliged to deal more fully with this matter of punishment and of free moral agency under another heading. For the moment we are only concerned with the fundamental fact that the Creator of man is the righteous Ruler of man, and that this

relationship permeates His attitude towards man, whether sinner or saint, and whether under law or under the terms of the gospel.

God as Creator governs the world by absolute laws. God as the moral Governor of moral agents governs them by contingent laws. It is, for example, an absolute law that magnetic ore should attract a piece of iron. No one thinks of praising or rewarding the North Magnetic Pole for always attracting the needle in the mariner's compass. Thanks are certainly due to God Who thus endowed insensate nature with such a useful power, but that is another thing entirely. On the other hand, we find a completely different law at work when we turn from the mariner's compass to the mariner himself. The mariner can either resist or obey the laws that govern his being. The moral Magnetic Pole exerts its influence upon his conscience, but unlike the magnetic needle, he can refuse to obey. This possibility of refusal indicates the power of choice, and is the essence of moral responsibility. In this sphere we must admit contingency; in this sphere God can say "If you . . . . . then I".

Should the reader ever have to do with the advocates of determinism (who deny freedom of choice to the moral agent) he will discover that their theory is not applied in their everyday life. If you steal their money you will not find them excusing you by explaining that you are not responsible for your actions. In other words, the theory does not work.

"Contingency is the privileged possessions of personality alone . . . . We choose only as we see the before and after, and conceive the possible relations of events"  
(Flewelling).

Contingency has been described as "That which is, or may be, but which might not have been, or might be different from what it is". This element of contingency is apparent in Gen. ii. & iii., and is in strong contrast with the principles governing Gen. i. In Gen. i. we have God dealing with creation. In Gen. ii. we have the Lord God dealing with man. In Gen. i., "God said . . . . and it was so"; it is impossible to introduce any contingency here. When God said, "Let there be light" and, "Let the earth bring forth", there could be but one result—"There was light" and "It was so". But when the Lord placed man in the garden and commanded him to abstain from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, there was no inevitable sequence. Man was under no compulsion either to obey or to disobey. The fact that the Lord God appended to the commandment a warning as to the penalty that would follow its infringement makes it clear that this is a different sphere from the sphere of Gen. i. The mind cannot imagine the introduction of a penalty in Gen. i. 3 or 11.

Let it be true of us, whatever others may teach, that we come to God, believing that "He is" and that "He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him".

#### #4. God, the Moral Governor. Is might right? pp. 144 - 146

When we begin to think about the great basic fact of God as the Moral Governor of His creatures, several items of far-reaching importance present themselves. The subject that we are to consider in this article is so important, involving as it does the believer's appreciation of the atonement itself as well as the whole realm of morals, that we must spare no pains to make the matter clear.

Our enquiry may be put in the form of the question: *Is righteousness arbitrary?* That is, Is a thing right because righteousness is an eternal truth, or is it right because God has said so? Is righteousness a matter of *enactment* merely? If right be right simply because God so wills it, and wrong be wrong for the same reason, then—since whatever God's will has made His will can unmake—if it pleased Him, He could by the arbitrary enactment of His will make all that is now right, wrong, and all that is now wrong, right. This very statement carries with it its own refutation. Scripture will not permit us to entertain such an idea. It assures us that the omnipotence of God is under the control of righteousness and truth. Were it not so, mere unregulated omnipotence could turn the universe into a nightmare.

Scripture tells us that God “cannot deny Himself” (II Tim. ii. 13). This involves a self-limitation of His power, for *ou dunati* means “He is not able”. And since no creature, great or small, has the ability to stay the almighty power of the Lord, the only cause for such holy ability must be sought in the nature of God Himself. Righteousness is no arbitrary enactment that Will can alter; it is resident in the heart of God Himself, and is the abiding character of His throne (Psa. xlv. 6). Scripture tells us that God “cannot lie” (Titus i. 2). The A.V. here is rather free in its rendering of *ho apseudes Theos*, but it is nevertheless true to fact. An honest man, placed before an open safe, if tempted to steal, would say: “I *cannot* do this.” The impossibility of the action is not due to any lack of physical power, but exists because the presence of moral integrity within the man brings about this noble inability. God is the “God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He” (Deut. xxxii. 4).

Let us be glad and rejoice that the Almighty God admits the impossible: “It was *impossible* for God to lie” (Heb. vi. 18). Impossible, not because of anything that mortal or angelic opposition could accomplish, but because of His own inherent integrity. With the knowledge that we have received from the Scriptures concerning the nature of God, we should be obliged to reject the testimony of even an angel from heaven, if we were told that God had somewhere decreed that 2 plus 2 = 6, or that somewhere in the universe the three angles of a triangle were equal to three right angles, or that two straight lines could enclose a space. These mathematical axioms are independent of time and place. They are and ever must be unalterably true. It is because man has been given these elementary axioms as the foundation of thought that any advance in the recognition of

truth is possible. This we hope to consider more fully when we come to the creation of man in the image of God. It is blessedly true for us, *who know God*, that a thing is true simply because He says so, but this is because we have learned to know Him as the God of truth.

The influence of a wrong conception of God's sovereignty is every evident in the theology of Calvinism, of which it has been said:

"Calvinism is not accidentally, but essentially immoral, since it makes the distinction between right and wrong a matter of *positive enactment*, and thereby makes it possible to assert that what is *immoral for man* is *moral for God*."

The apostle, in Rom. iii., repudiates the principle of "Let us do evil that good may come" not only for himself, but for the Lord he served (Rom. iii. 4-8). God *overrules* evil, and for this we cannot be too grateful, but to teach that He definitely plans evil that good may come, or that He will beat down all criticism simply by the weight of his omnipotence, is utterly false.

"Is God unrighteous Who taketh vengeance? . . . . For then how shall God judge the world?" (Rom. iii. 4-6).

This is the attitude of Scripture and of all who believe its teaching.

If omnipotence were all, God could have saved sinful man without an atoning sacrifice, yet we know that He spared not His only Son, but freely gave Him up for us all, in order that He might be *just* and the *Justifier* of the believing sinner.

The scriptural doctrine of omnipotence is that God can do all things, except that which His own *rational* and *moral* nature forbids and that which would violate His purpose in making man in His own likeness. Those who emphasize God's omnipotence are sometimes apt to deny His right to create a moral creature with the power of saying "Yes" or "No".

We hear little of the condescension of God, and His voluntary self-limitation, but without these things neither creation nor salvation would be possible or rational.

## **#5. The Self-limitation of Omnipotence.** **pp. 188 - 191**

We can quite understand that some of our readers will not feel together comfortable about a title which speaks of the “limitations of omnipotence”, even though they are “self-limitations”. It may be well, therefore, to show how such an idea permeates the whole scheme of salvation before we turn our attention to the wider issues raised.

That the Lord Jesus Christ possesses the title “Omnipotent” none can question. The word *Pantokrator* is translated in the A.V. “Almighty” nine times, and “Omnipotent” once.

“I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, Which is, and Which was, and Which is to come, the Almighty” (Rev. i. 8).

In structural correspondence with this verse we have verses 17 and 18, which remove any doubt as to whether verse 8 refers to the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Fear not; I am the First and the Last. I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death” (Rev. i. 17, 18).

The titles “Alpha and Omega” and “Beginning and Ending” are exchanged for “the First and the Last”, while the title “Almighty” corresponds with the possession of the “keys of hell and of death”.

In Rev. xix. 6, when the “Marriage of the Lamb is come”, the proclamation is made: “The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.” In Rev. xi. it is Christ Who is to reign (verse 15), and once again the title “Almighty” is given to Him:

“We give thanks, O Lord God Almighty, Which art, and wast (The best texts omit the words ‘and art to come’, for He is now conceived of as present), because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power and hast reigned” (Rev. xi. 17).

There is no need to multiply proofs that the title “Almighty” belongs to Christ. Neither is there any need in these pages to prove that for our sakes “He made Himself of no reputation”. We glory in the fact that He Who was rich for our sakes became poor. Without the self-limitation of omnipotence, neither Bethlehem nor Calvary would ever have known the presence of the Son of man.

With this reassurance, we must now go on to consider the question of omnipotence in relation to creation and the sphere of moral government. The Lord has limited His omnipotence in order that righteousness and holiness may work their wondrous way and love have its fullest scope without compromising the throne of glory.

It does not need a very great knowledge of Scripture, or very much logical ability, to realize that Creation presupposes power, and power to such a degree as to be rightly called Omnipotence. We do not intend to enter further into this aspect of the subject, which is vouched for both by Scripture and by common-sense. There is, however, another aspect that appears to have escaped the attention of the majority—the fact that, in the very act of creating a world, God necessarily entered into responsibilities as its Moral Ruler and Upholder. Before creation, God was self-sufficient. He needed nothing. Creation came into being by His good pleasure, and love is revealed to have been at the bottom of it all. Even if creation had been purely mechanical, the “upholding of all things by the Word of His power” would have made a very real demand upon the Creator. The Scriptures, too, are full of references to His tender care over the works of His hands. The Creator is something far more than an all-powerful Wizard. Creation is “the work of His hands”, and is upheld by His omnipotent care. The sun, and moon, and stars are held in their courses by a watchful beneficence. Day and night, spring-time and harvest never fail. The very hairs of our head are numbered, and the fall of the sparrow is noted.

Creation, however, does not stop here. There is also a moral realm, a realm in which creatures of God’s hand, made in the image of their Creator, are endowed with reason, with intelligence, with the power of choice. Have we ever stopped to think what an undertaking such a creation must inevitably be? When God brought into being a world wherein evil was possible (and this He did when He created man and placed him in the Garden of Eden), what possibilities of rebellion, of wounded love, of ingratitude did He not stoop to endure? Infinite foreknowledge would make it plain that such a universe would make demands that only infinite love could meet. Creation involved the fore-ordination of the Lamb.

When we read of God Himself that “it grieved Him at His heart”, we cannot nullify the statement by saying: “It is a Figure of Speech.” Even Figures of Speech have a meaning. If God does not “grieve” as man does, there is evidently something that corresponds. If God has no “heart” in the human sense of the word, the figure must represent a reality.

We read in Ecclesiastes:

“God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions” (Eccles. vii. 29).

God had so made man that he could obey or disobey, and here we see his God-given power exercised for his own ends.

As we think over these things we begin to realize more fully that the Creator is not an abstract, unfeeling Deity, but One Who in the fullness of time came to be known as Father.

We may have little in common with the celebrated American philosopher William James, but we sympathize with him when he says:

“In fighting *against* the God of the Absolutist, I am fighting *for* the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

A God near, and not afar off. A Person, not merely an unfeeling power. C. C. J. Webb writes:

“A God Who cannot be limited by His character were a wholly indeterminate Being, a mere directionless impulse and therefore ineffective and impotent.”

Power in itself may heed no limitations, but power working by love will stoop and deny itself, for such is the very essence of love, and love is of God.

Let us worship Him, the almighty and self-sufficient One, but let us remember that we never could have worshipped Him as such, had He not in His love as well as His power, made the world and man as they are.

## **#6. The Foreknowledge of God. pp. 230 - 233**

In the teachings of men there are two main schools of thought concerning the foreknowledge of God. One school teaches that with God there are no limitations of past, present and future. His knowledge is underived and immediate. He knows infallibly all that will come to pass without necessarily being in any way the cause of it. This view leaves man a free moral agent who can rightly be rewarded or punished for his deeds. The alternative view is tantamount to fatalism. It suggests that whatever God foreknows He Himself has planned to be so, and inasmuch as God knows all things, the evil as well as the good, this doctrine makes Him morally responsible for all human sin. If every human action is inevitably fixed, “law” and “gospel” are indifferent terms, and invitation and warning meaningless mockery. The revealed meaning of sin is denied, for sin is the missing of a mark, the transgression of a law. If God from all eternity has predetermined all that is to come to pass, then all is in obedience to His will, and sin cannot exist. Wherever we find a denial of the freedom of the moral agent, we shall find, either latent or expressed, this emptying of the meaning of sin, and the attributing of God of the authorship of moral evil.

Professor Hamon in his book “The Universal Illusion of Free Will” writes:

“Scientifically, man is the inevitable product of the surroundings in which he lives and in which his ancestors lived. Logically, he is not responsible for his actions, for he could not help wishing them, the conditions once given . . . . we ought no more to consider the man who acts responsible, for he is as much an automation as the tiger and the falling rock. *General irresponsibility*, such is scientific truth.”

What a conclusion to reach! This indeed is the fruit that grows from a denial of freedom of choice to the moral agent.

Professor Gunther writes:

“In reality the world has no place for duty from the scientific point of view. The cosmic process goes on inexorably. How ridiculous and aimless it must be in view of this conception of things, to direct a man how he shall act. As if he could make the slightest change in the exorable march of cause and effect.”

“In a world like this there can be no ‘ought’ and the ten commandments appear foolish.”

It is a big step from Professors of Science, to the infidel Editor of *The Clarion*, but in effect they say the same thing:

“The tramp who murders a child on the highway could not help doing it. The actions of a man’s will are as mathematically fixed as the motions of a planet in its orbit”  
(*Blatchford*).

If this teaching were confined to the scientist, the philosopher and the infidel, we should not need to give it any further attention. It is, however, the teaching of some who claim to “preach the Word” and who believe that by this teaching they glorify God. One thing, however, is true of all men whatever they may believe doctrinally. *Nobody of normal intelligence acts upon the supposition that man is not free and responsible.* The man who has spoken strongly in favour of determinism, denying the freedom of human will, will most rightly, although most illogically, resent any attack upon his person or property. His doctrine has no practical value, and he would indignantly brush aside the excuse of the murderer or the thief if he pleaded irresponsibility or claimed predetermination as the cause of his deeds.

To use the word “will” and at the same time to say that the will is not “free” is a contradiction in terms. A will completely determined by some outside power ceases to be a will at all; it would have to be called by some other name. The will represents conscious action, and as such must be free. We do not and cannot speak of the will of a motor car or even of a plant. Consciousness, personality and freedom of choice are essential. However bound a man may be by sin and its consequences, he is still the object of appeal, of invitation, of warning, and is addressed being free to choose.

While in many respects we hold the writings of John Calvin in high esteem, that part of his creed that deals with the doctrine of eternal decrees, predestinating some to salvation, and others just as irrevocably to damnation, justly merits the censure of Aubrey L. Moore, who writes:

“Calvinism is not accidentally, but essentially immoral, since it makes the distinction between right and wrong a *matter of positive enactment\**, and thereby makes it possible to assert that what is *immoral for man* is *moral for God*.”

(\* - This question has been dealt with on pages 144-146)

This is but another way of saying that “Might is Right”, a doctrine that has drenched the earth with blood and tears. Whatever else of the teaching of Kant may be set aside, his “categorical imperative” remains. “I ought” implies “I can”.

Let us now turn to the passages which assert the foreknowledge of God.

The words *proginosko* and *prognosis* occur seven times in the N.T. as follows:

- A | Acts ii. 23. The delivering up of Christ as a Sacrifice for sin.
- B | Acts xxvi. 5. Manner of life known beforehand.
- C | Rom. viii. 29. \
- Rom. xi. 2.     } Elect according to foreknowledge.
- I Pet. i. 2.     /
- A | I Pet. i. 20. Christ as the Lamb of God.
- B | II Pet. iii. 17. Ye know these things beforehand.

Of these seven passages, the two labeled B and B call for no comment here since they speak of human foreknowledge, which no one asserts carries with it any predestinating power. The two references A and A speak of Christ, and the three under C speak of the believer and the people of Israel. It is with these last three references that we are chiefly concerned here. We must, however, give some attention to Acts ii. 23 because of the clear distinction there made between God’s foreknowledge of human action, and man’s responsibility in spite of the fact that his action is foreknown.

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

A passage in some respects parallel to this is that found in Luke xxii. 22:

“And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined; but woe unto that man by whom He is betrayed!”

The “determinate counsel” of God, in Acts ii. 23, is distinguished from His “foreknowledge” and is sharply contrasted with the “wicked” actions of men. To say that God foreordained that man should act wickedly is to overthrow the faith. Moreover, like all evil, it is illogical. What God ordains cannot be wicked, for it is His will, and only that which transgresses His will can be called *anomos*, “lawless”. The foreknowledge of God does not deprive man of his freedom nor determine his acts beforehand.

In Rom. viii. 29 “foreknowledge” is differentiated from “predestination”. Only those are predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, whom He foreknew. The same principle is plainly taught in I Pet. i. 2: “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.”

He Who foreknew the acts of all men could predestinate each to a particular sphere, but to imagine that all men are predestinated either to salvation or to damnation by an arbitrary decree, does violence to the whole tenor of revealed truth. We are obliged to await events before we know, but God is under no such limitation. He knows the end

from the beginning, and consequently can make His plans with infallible certainty. Such knowledge may be beyond our understanding, but it is not contrary to the moral law that pervades the Word of God.

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

### **JOSHUA.**

#### **#12. Taking the land, and possessing it--a difference (xi.-xiii.). pp. 15 - 18**

The confederacy of the five kings of the Amorites, recorded in Josh. x., is followed by another confederacy, recorded in chapter xi. These two confederacies must be carefully distinguished from each other, and typify two different phases of the conflict of the ages.

Adoni-zedec, "Lord of righteousness", leads the first confederacy (Josh. x.); Jabin, "Intelligence", leads the second (Josh. xi.). The overthrow of the first, in Gibeon, is accompanied by signs in the sun and moon suggestive of the Second Coming of Christ. The second confederacy assembles at Merom ("High Place"), a word that comes very significantly in the prophetic passage in Isaiah:

"The Lord shall punish the host of the high ones (*marom*) that are on high (*marom*)"  
(Isa. xxiv. 21).

Kings of the earth are not the only enemies that are to be dealt with in that day, and "the high ones that are on high" are typified by this second confederacy of Josh. xi. The wording of Josh. xi. 4, 5, is so like that of Rev. xx. 7-9 that the parallel cannot be other than intentional.

"And they went out, they and all their host with them, much people, even as the sand that is upon the sea shore in multitude, with horses and chariots very many. And when all these kings were met together, they came and pitched together at the waters of Merom, to fight against Israel" (Josh. xi. 4, 5).

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together into battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from heaven and devoured them" (Rev. xx. 7-9).

In the twenty-third verse of chapter xi. we read:

"*So Joshua took the whole land, according to all that the Lord said unto Moses; and Joshua gave it for an inheritance unto Israel according to their divisions by their tribes. And the land rested from war.*"

Yet the thirteenth chapter opens with the words:

"Now Joshua was old and well stricken in years; and the Lord said unto him, Thou art old and stricken in years, and *there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed.*"

A superficial reading of these two verses has led quite a number of critics to conclude that there is a mistake here. It is assumed that every city must have been actually taken or destroyed and every individual Canaanite slain, before it could be truly said: "Joshua took the whole land." But this is not a true interpretation. The taking of the land by Joshua is said to be "according to all that the Lord said unto Moses". In Josh. xxiii. we read:

"Ye have seen all that the Lord God hath done unto all these nations because of you; for the Lord your God is He that hath fought for you. Behold, I have divided unto you by lot these nations that remain, to be an inheritance for your tribes, from Jordan, with all the nations that I have cut off, even unto the great sea westward. And the Lord your God, He shall expel them from before you" (Josh. xxiii. 3-5).

It is evident from this passage that the taking of the land, the giving of the land for an inheritance, and the dividing of the land by lot, must not be confused with actual "possession". After the statement of xi. 23 where we read "Joshua took all the land", we read in xiii. 1 that there was very much land still to be "possessed". Surely we can perceive the truth here. The Lord had given the land, Joshua had subdued all his opponents, and even though much yet remained to be "possessed", the whole land was theirs. Is there no parallel here with the fact of "all spiritual blessings in heavenly places" being ours in Christ, and its relation to our experimental "possession" of them? Yet, is it right for a member of the Body to limit the gift of God by his own experiences?

The statement, "According to all that the Lord said unto Moses" takes us back to Exod. xxiii.:

"I will send My fear before thee, and will destroy all the people TO WHOM THOU SHALT COME, and I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee."

This is what the Lord had said unto Moses, and this was fulfilled. The promise continues:

"I will not drive them out from before thee IN ONE YEAR; lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee. BY LITTLE AND LITTLE I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land" (Exod. xxiii. 27-30).

Instead, therefore, of any discrepancy existing between Josh. xi. 23 and xiii. 1 all is exactly in line with the promise of God.

Joshua, whose age is remarked upon in xiii. 1, was reminded that he need not wait until all the land was "possessed" before it was "divided" (verse 7). There are parallels in N.T. doctrine to the principle manifested here that should be carefully traced. For example, the "old man" was crucified with Christ, as Rom. vi. 6 testifies, and there are those who teach from this passage the complete eradication of sin in the believer. This is confusing the gift of the land in the promise of God, and the actual possession of it at any one time. If Joshua had assumed the complete eradication of all his foes, he would

speedily have been taught the truth by bitter experience. It is true of us, as it was true of Israel, that it is “little by little”, “until thou be increased”, even though in Christ we are already “new creatures”, and “seated together” in the heavenlies.

In both xi. 23 and xiv. 15 we read that “the land rested from war”. The conquest was achieved and full possession awaited the children of Israel.

We must not omit from our review of all that the Lord had said unto Moses, the passage that speaks of the possibility of Israel failing to drive out the Canaanites.

“If ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you; then it shall come to pass that those which ye let remain shall be pricks in your eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell. Moreover it shall come to pass, that I shall do unto you, as I thought to do unto them” (Num. xxxiii. 55, 56)

When, therefore, we read that the land was taken according to *all* that the Lord had said to Moses, we must remember that He had said many things. Had Israel gone on conquering, had they pressed onto their inheritance, they would have enjoyed a far vaster tract of country than that which eventually became theirs, and this would have been according to what the Lord had said unto Moses. When they failed to press on to the full end of their calling, the failure to possess all that was given to them was still according to what the Lord had said unto Moses. And when they not only failed to possess all, but actually became affiliated with the Canaanites of their land, their total loss of all things, instead of invalidating the promise of God, only fulfilled another part of what the Lord had said to Moses.

Grace is a wonderful word, and runs through the epistle to the Ephesians like a thread of gold, yet so is Faith, and that too interpenetrates the same epistle. The assurance of Col. i. 22 does not make the warning of Col. i. 28 unreal or unnecessary.

The twelfth chapter of Joshua sums up the conquest of the land, and on both sides of Jordan the land is said to be “possessed” (xii. 1, 7, 8). This constituted an assurance and a pledge of the fuller “possession” mentioned in chapter xiii. Thirty-three kings are enumerated, two from the east side of Jordan, and thirty-one from the west. Eleven, the number of misrule (being one less than twelve), and three, the number of Divine perfection and resurrection, are here brought together in the figure 33.

The way is now clear for us to consider the third and largest section of Joshua—chapters xiii.-xxiv., which deals with the possession and dividing of the land.

## JOSHUA.

### #13. The difference between “the inheritance” (Col. i. 12) and “the reward of the inheritance” (Col. iii. 24) illustrated from Josh. xiv. and xv. pp. 52 - 58

The reader may not have very vividly in mind the fact that the structure of Joshua is concerned very largely with “the land” and its division and possession, and as we are now entering upon the third great sub-division of the book. An abbreviated outline of the whole structure may perhaps be appropriate.

#### Joshua as a whole.

- A | i. 1. DEATH OF MOSES.
- B | i. 2 - vii. ENTRY INTO THE LAND.
  - (a) Divided.
  - (b) Espied.
  - (c) Entered.
- C | viii.-xii. CONQUEST OF THE LAND.
- B | xiii. - xxiv. 28. POSSESSION OF THE LAND.
  - (a) To be possessed.
  - (b) I have divided.
  - (c) Of the Amorites.
- A | xxiv. 29-33. DEATH OF JOSHUA AND ELEAZAR.

In our last article we drew attention to the difference between “taking” the land, and “possessing” it. Something of the truth implied in this distinction can be seen by comparing together the following passages:

“So Joshua took the whole land” (Josh. xi. 23).

“How long are ye slack to go to possess the land, which the Lord God of your fathers hath given you?” (Josh. xviii. 3).

Here we have a glimpse of an important principle found not only in the Old Testament but also in the New. Christ has conquered. He is the great Overcomer. Nevertheless slackness on the part of the believer robs him of much that he might otherwise enjoy.

Immediately following the words quoted above from Josh. xviii., comes the command to Israel to choose “three men for each tribe”, to be sent by Joshua to go through the land, and describe it upon their return. It is not surprising, when we know something of the construction of Scripture, to find that between the statements of Josh. xi. 23 and xviii. 3 comes the record of one who had previously spied out the land—Caleb the Overcomer, whose story is the very antithesis of the “slackness” condemned by Joshua.

The word translated “slack” is the Hebrew *raphah*. In II Sam. xxi. 16, 18, 20 and 22 it occurs as a noun and is translated “giant”, as though it were the Hebrew word *rapha*, from which *rephaim* is derived. Both the A.V. and the R.V. seem a little uneasy about translating this word “giant”, for both state in the margin that the Hebrew word is *raphah*. We believe that the word conveys a deeper meaning than appears in these translations. If *raphah* the verb means “to slack”, *raphah* as a noun could mean “The Appaller, one who makes others faint of fail”. This is the view taken by Parkhurst, and it is certainly borne out by the effect upon the ten spies, as their own words testify.

“There we saw giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight” (Num. xiii. 33).

The play upon two like-sounding words *rapha* and *raphah* is a common feature in the Hebrew O.T.

There is one fundamental of dispensational truth which we have reiterated almost to the weariness of our readers. We have often referred to the distinction between the “hope” and the “prize”, between that which is a question of sheer grace and that which, though still by grace, is in the nature of a reward, and has to do with conflict and overcoming. We have stressed the difference between the position of Ephesians with its “boldness with confidence” and that of Philippians with its “fear and trembling”. We have drawn attention in the Epistle to the Hebrews to the fact that while Abraham had the land of promise given to him as a gift by an unconditional covenant, he also had, although this is not revealed in the O.T., the promise of the heavenly city as a reward for his faithfulness (Heb. xi.-xii.). This same kind of distinction we shall find again as we consider the teaching of Josh. xiv. and xv. In these chapters we have the division of the land and the portion that fell to Judah in accordance with God’s promise, and also the special Overcomer’s portion, the added “reward of the inheritance” (Col. iii. 24), the “prize of the high calling” (Phil. iii. 14) claimed by Caleb and Othniel.

The account in the section before us—Josh. xiv. 6 - xv. 63—alternates between Judah the tribe and their inheritance, and Caleb the Overcomer and his inheritance.

### **Josh. xiv. 6 - xv. 63.**

- A1 | xiv. 6. JUDAH comes to Joshua in Gilgal.
- B1 | xiv. 6-15. CALEB, THE OVERCOMER.—  
The promise made in Kadesh-Barnea. Hebron. Rest.
- A2 | xv. 1-12. JUDAH.—Inheritance divided among families. The borders.
- B2 | xv. 13-19. CALEB, THE OVERCOMER.—  
Sons of Anak driven out.
- A3 | xv. 20-62. JUDAH.—Inheritance divided among families. The cities.
- B3 | xv. 63. NOT LIKE CALEB.—Not overcomers.  
Did not drive out the Jebusites.

It is suggestive that Joshua is found at Gilgal when the division of the inheritance is to be put in hand. Gilgal was the place where the reproach of Egypt was rolled away, and

we are again reminded that there is no inheritance either in earth or in heaven that is not associated with the Cross of Christ.

Before the tribe as a whole come forward to receive their portion, Caleb is heard and rewarded. Caleb makes his appeal to Joshua and bases everything upon “the thing that the Lord said”. He refers to an oath sworn by Moses. Most marginal notes refer back to Deut. i. 34-36, but the words quoted by Caleb in Josh. xiv. 9 are not found in this passage. This need not cause us a moment’s anxiety, for it is exactly in line with the fact that nowhere in the O.T. do we read that Abraham had any knowledge of the heavenly Jerusalem, yet Heb. xi. assures us that he had.

Caleb was forty years old when the promise was made to him in Kadesh-Barnea, and now he is eighty-five. The Lord had kept His word. Although, as Psalm xc. tells us, those who fell in the wilderness averaged about threescore years and ten (and any reaching fourscore years would only find labour and sorrow), yet Caleb found the Lord his Shield and Buckler, and was delivered from “the snare of the fowler” and the “noisome pestilence”. He had had no need to fear the “terror by night”, nor the “arrow that flieth by day”. A thousand might fall by his side and ten thousand at his right hand, but no harm could come near him. With long life the Lord had promised to satisfy him, and so at eighty-five years of age he can say:

“As yet I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me; as my strength was then, even so is my strength now, for war, both to go out and to come in” (Josh. xiv. 11).

To Caleb was given the mountain which included the city named Hebron. This city had hallowed associations. After Abraham’s separation from Lot and the command, “Arise, walk through the land”, he removed his tent to the “plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron” (Gen. xiii. 18). Here also Sarah died, as we read in Gen. xxiii. 2: “And Sarah died in Kirjath-arba; the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan”. In Hebron, also, in the cave of Machpelah were buried Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah (Gen. xlix. 29-33). We are reminded both in Gen. xxiii. and in Josh. xiv. that Hebron had borne another name, Kirjath-arba, the city of Arba, one of the Anakims, or Giants. At the time of which we are speaking, it was in the possession of three sons of Anak who were driven out by Caleb (Josh. xv. 14).

There is an important statement in Josh. xiv. 15 which we must now consider: “And the land had rest from war.” The same words are found in Josh. xi. 23, when Joshua “took the whole land”. The Companion Bible, in Appendix 50/iv. has the following note:

“The ‘Wars of the Lord’ end. Joshua then relinquishes his leadership to Eleazar the Priest (Josh. xiv.). ‘And the land had rest from war’.” (Josh. xiv. 15).  
“The First Sabbatic Year of Lev. xxv. 1-7.”

Here we have brought together two features of great importance. The first is the association of Joshua from this time onward with the Priest. The immediate necessity for the intervention of Eleazar was probably the fact that he only could divide the country

“by lot” as the Priest alone had the “Urim and Thummim”. There is, however, something more than this to be learnt. We have here a prophetic foreshadowing of the day when the Lord Jesus Christ shall fulfil the words of Zechariah:

“He shall sit and rule upon His throne: and He shall be a Priest upon His throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both” (Zech. vi. 13).

The Gospel according to Matthew sets forth the Lord first as the Son of David, the King (Matt. i. - xvi. 20), and then (Matt. xvi. 21 - xxviii.) as the Son of Abraham, the Offering (and also the Priest). In the Book of the Revelation these offices are combined, for He Who is “Prince of the kings of the earth” (Rev. i. 5) is seen also as the Great High Priest (Rev. i. 12, 13).

The second feature of prophetic importance is the fact that the statement, “The land had rest from war” (Josh. xiv. 15) is made during the first sabbatic year of Israel’s history, and is a pledge and foreshadowing of the “rest that remaineth to the people of God”, the thousand years of peace before the end (Rev. xx.).

The structure of Josh. xiv. and xv. alternates the whole tribe of Judah and the allotment of their inheritance, with Caleb the Overcomer; and at the end the whole tribe are placed in contrast with Caleb, for they fail as Overcomers in the matter of the Jebusites.

Josh. xv. 1-12 is of importance as a legal document, but we do not feel that a detailed examination of these geographical boundaries would justify the space involved. We draw attention, however, to the following points, which are of interest to all the people of God.

(1) No writer who did not possess first-hand information would expose himself to detection as the writer of Josh. xv. had done. The detailed account of the country, the names of the cities and the added comments are evidence that the Book of Joshua cannot have been a “pious forgery”.

(2) The size of the territory allotted to Judah was a piece of country about 45 miles in length by 50 miles in breadth, and it is clear from the chapter that the land literally teemed with people.

Colonel Condor writes:

“The geographical chapters (of Joshua) are most clearly explained by the aid of the long list of 119 towns conquered by Thothmes III. in Palestine before the Exodus. We thus are able to prove that many of them were standing long before the Hebrew conquest. Others are mentioned in the Canaanite letters (found at Tel-el-Amarna) as already detailed.”

*(See Volume VI, page 140 for fuller details).*

(3) Some of the names of these cities indicate their strength as fortresses, e.g., Azmon (Josh. xv. 4), while others reveal the nature of the false worship carried on, e.g., Adar (Josh. xv. 3), which means “Fire God”, Beth-Shemesh (Josh. xv. 10) meaning “House of the Sun”, and Chesil or Cesil (Josh. xv. 30), which refers to the star group Orion. The name of the city Kirjath-sepher (Josh. xv. 15) is important, as the word means “Book Town”.

This point leads us to the record of Othniel, Caleb’s brother or nephew, who went up to Kirjath-sepher, also called Debir (“Oracle”), and smote it. This is a most suggestive lesson and must be associated with Caleb’s faithful following of the Lord, when we consider him as a type of the Overcomer. All true overcoming is intimately concerned with the Word of God. The fight is the fight of faith. The contention is for the faith once delivered to the saints. The Lord Himself has left us His own glorious example, for He overcame temptation in the days of His flesh by an appeal to “It is written” (Matt. iv.). And in the days of His glory He will appear riding out of heaven as the King of kings and Lord of lords, still bearing the title: “The Word of God.” So also it is written of the Overcomers in Rev. xii.:

“And they overcame him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death” (Rev. xii. 11).

The failure of Judah to drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem may teach a deeper lesson than the inability of many of God’s children to overcome their spiritual foes. Caleb drove out the Anakim from Hebron, and Othniel took Kirjath-sepher. Fellowship (Hebron) was thus restored, and the false teaching of the enemy (Sepher = “Book”) destroyed. This, however, does not touch the seat and origin of iniquity. That is enthroned in the royal city Jerusalem. It was left for David the King, and type of Christ, to drive out the Jebusite from the royal city. Let us, however, not undervalue the lesser victory of faith, for David was crowned King in Hebron before he reigned as King over all at Jerusalem.

As he contemplates the nature of Joshua’s foes, the awful character of their idolatry (including as we find in xv. 8 the savage worship of the valley of Hinnom, the “Gehenna” of the Gospels), the essential features of the Overcomer, the Priest-King suggested by the co-operation of Joshua and Eleazar, the sabbatic year, and the failure to expel the Jebusites, the reader will not fail to appreciate how fully these records of Israel’s history foreshadow the spiritual conflict of practically every believer throughout the ages.

In conclusion, may we once more emphasize the necessity to try the things that differ and to distinguish between the inheritance which all Judah received *as a gift*, and that special portion which Caleb of the tribe of Judah received *as a reward*. The same principle underlies the Epistle to the Ephesians (the free gift) and the Epistle to the Philippians (the prize), and those who ignore this distinction are bound to suffer themselves and mislead others.

## JOSHUA.

### #14. Shadows of good things to come (xviii.-xxiv.). pp. 83 - 89

We have already given some attention to the record of Josh. xiv. and xv., where the allotment of Judah's portion of the land is described. Joseph's double portion comes next, and, according to promise, this is divided between Ephraim and Manasseh.

In Josh. xvi. we observe the sad fact that: "The Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites unto this day, and serve under tribute" (Josh. xvi. 10). This proved to be a fatal compromise for Ephraim, and in later years the prophet Hosea uses the name Ephraim as representing the two sins of covetousness and idolatry.

"Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone" (Hos. iv. 17). "He is a merchant (Heb. *Canaanite*), the balances of deceit are in his hands" (Hos. xii. 7; *see also* xii. 14, xiii. 1).

The tribute that was paid by the Canaanites really put the Ephraimites themselves under tribute, instead of their occupying their rightful place as children and heirs of God. Any complicity with our spiritual Canaanites, however apparently advantageous, must of necessity prove the undoing of our spiritual life and service. When the woman possessed by the spirit of Python cried after the apostles: "These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show unto us the way of salvation" (Acts xvi. 17), her words were true; and had the apostle been of the same mind as the Ephraimites, he might have accepted the testimony. However, as we read in Acts xvi, he would not tolerate any fellowship of this kind, however superficially true, and said: "I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her" (Acts xvi. 18). As a result the apostle received ill-treatment and imprisonment, but the fruits of his faithfulness in his first witness to Europe are ours to this day.

We noticed in a previous article, when speaking of Caleb and his claim, how he based it all upon the word of the Lord to Moses, and in the passage before us, we find the same thing with the daughters of Zelophehad (Josh. xvii. 3, 4).

In Josh. xvii. 12-18, we find Joshua administering a well-deserved rebuke to Manasseh, and the passage contains a lesson that is true for all time. At the beginning Manasseh could not drive out the Canaanite. This meant lack of faith, for God had promised that all that was needed was faith in Himself. When "the children of Israel waxed strong", instead of using their strength to fulfil the Lord's command, they fell instead into the same snare as Ephraim, and put the Canaanites under tribute. In spite of their failure we find that "the children of Joseph" came to Joshua and boasted of their greatness and blessedness, and asked why they had received but one lot and one portion.

"And Joshua answered them, If thou be a great people, then get thee up to the wood country, and cut down for thyself there in the land of the Perizzites and of the giants, if mount Ephraim be too narrow for thee" (Josh. xvii. 15).

True greatness will always find room for expansion. There will always be territory to reclaim from the enemy until the day of glory dawns. We have our inheritance, and with that as the base, we shall find countless opportunities, as did Caleb and Othniel, of realizing something of the mighty power that is towards those that believe.

We cannot, of course, consider in detail the many chapters devoted to the settlement of the tribes in the land, but if we take a bird's eye-view of the section, we shall find an alternation of the "civil" and the "sacred". The "sacred" sections are lettered "B" in the structure below and are concerned with the setting up of the tabernacle at Shiloh and the setting apart of the "cities of refuge" and the "cities of the Levites".

### **Joshua xiii.-xxii.**

- A | xiii.-xvii. Land divided among the tribes.
- B | xviii. 1. The tabernacle at Shiloh.
- A | xviii. 2 - xix. Land divided among the tribes.
- B | xx.-xxii. Cities of refuge and of the Levites.

"And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh, and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there. And the land was subdued before them" (Josh. xviii. 1).

This gathering of the people and the division of the land is an anticipation of the day spoken of by Jacob in Gen. xlix. 10: "Until *Shiloh* come: and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be." *Shiloh* means "Peace", and is practically at the centre of the land of Palestine, about 20 miles north of Jerusalem.

We learn from the narrative of Josh. xviii. that seven tribes still remained without inheritance, and that three men of each tribe were sent to make a survey and to report thereon:

"And the men went and passed through the land, and described it by cities into seven parts in a book, and came again to Joshua to the host at Shiloh. And Joshua cast lots for them in Shiloh before the Lord: and there Joshua divided the land unto the children of Israel according to their divisions" (Josh. xviii. 9, 10).

This survey made a kind of Doomsday book and mapped out the portions of each division so that no doubt should exist in future days as to the bounds of each inheritance.

The feature that is typical and of importance to us is contained in the statement: "And the land was subdued before them" (Josh. xviii. 1).

We have here an echo of the words of Gen. i. 28: "Replenish the earth and subdue it."

And we have the authority of the N.T. for associating together Gen. i., Psa. viii., and the day when all enemies shall be subjected under the feet of Christ (Heb. ii. 6-8,

I Cor. xv. 24-28)—showing how fully the occurrences in Joshua are shadows of things to come. Although the individual tribes might fail in taking full possession of their inheritance, yet at Shiloh, in the tabernacle of the congregation and before the Lord, the land was subdued.

The tabernacle remained at Shiloh until the days of Eli (I Sam. iv. 12). We hear of it at Nob in the days of Saul, and at Gibeon in the days of Solomon. Reference to the transference of the ark from Shiloh to Jerusalem is found in Psalm lxxviii., where the historic truth of Josh. xviii. is endorsed:

“They provoked Him to anger with their high places, and moved Him to jealousy with their graven images. When God heard this He was wroth and greatly abhorred Israel: so He forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh . . . . He refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim” (Psa. lxxviii. 58-60, 67).

From Josh. xviii. 11 to xix. 50 the inheritances of the remaining seven tribes, together with Joshua’s own portion are described. While we must not stay to consider the passages dealing with the seven tribes and their portions, the inheritance of Joshua himself calls for attention. Caleb receives his inheritance first (Josh. xiv.) and, although Joshua had as much right as Caleb, it is not until “an end of dividing the land” has been accomplished that Joshua enters into his own. The wording here is remarkable:

“The children of Israel gave an inheritance to Joshua the son of Nun among them” (Josh. xix. 49).

Above and beyond the evident meekness and unselfishness of Joshua personally, we certainly have here a foreshadowing of the greater Joshua. Joshua himself had nothing to leave or to give up, but the Lord Jesus laid aside His glory that He might find a dwelling-place among His people. The city for which Joshua asked was called Timnath-serah, a word which means, according to Gesenius, “A portion that was over and above”. In Heb. i. 1-3 we have revealed something of the glory of the Lord Jesus, which He laid aside when He stooped to die. And verse 4 continues:

“Being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.”

Why does this passage assure us that Christ is so much better than angels? Such a statement seems, at first sight, hardly necessary. But the point of Heb. i. 1-4 is that what was His *by right*, is His now *by merit or inheritance*—and therefore, that what could never have been shared by man before, can now be shared by all His own. The true Joshua receives an inheritance from His people, and comes and builds a dwelling-place for Himself among them.

The name of Joshua’s city in Judges ii. 9 is given as Timnath-heres, meaning “A portion of the sun”. The Rabbins have not been slow to interpret this as being due to the representation of the sun on Joshua’s grave, in memory of the miracle at Gibeon. This is highly improbable, the simpler explanation being that the letters “s” and “h” have been

transposed, an occurrence that frequently happens when copying a manuscript, and of which there are several examples in the Scriptures.

The twentieth chapter of Joshua is taken up with the appointing of the cities of refuge. The same God Who had commanded the extermination of the Canaanites, provides for the safety of the man-slayer—i.e., one not guilty of willful murder. The “avenger of blood” was not permitted to touch the man-slayer when once he had found refuge in one of these cities. He remained there until the death of the High Priest\* (\*This is referred to in Heb. ix. 27, 28. For a fuller explanation, *see* Volume XVI, pages 54, 55).

These cities of refuge were so situated as to be accessible to all the tribes. The three cities on the West of Jordan—Kedesh, Shechem and Hebron—had been closely associated with the history of the people. Kedesh was near the scene of Joshua’s great victory over the confederate kings, and so, in type, is associated with the final glorious victory of Christ (Josh. xi.). Shechem was the place where Abraham built his first altar in the land of Canaan (Gen. xii. 7). And Hebron was associated with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as well as with the overcomer Caleb.

After the appointing of the cities of refuge, the Levites came to Eleazar the Priest and to Joshua, and reminded them of the command of the Lord that they should have cities to dwell in and suburbs for their cattle (Josh. xxi. 1, 2). These were settled by lot, a total of forty-eight cities, and with this allotment, the Scripture sums up:

“There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass” (Josh. xxi. 45).

The time had now come for the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh to be permitted to cross the Jordan and enter into the inheritance which they had chosen in the land of Gilead (Josh. xxii. 9). Joshua recognizes that they have fulfilled their agreement to stand by the rest of the tribes until all have received their inheritance; and, with an exhortation to be diligent in giving heed to the commandment and the law, to love the Lord and to walk in all His ways, Joshua blesses the people and sends them on their way (Josh. xxii. 5, 6).

And now a strange thing happens:

“And when they came unto the borders of Jordan, that are in the land of Canaan, the children of Reuben and the children of Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh built there an altar by Jordan, a great altar to see to” (Josh. xxii. 10).

Immediately this news reaches Shiloh, all Israel gather themselves together for war against the two and a half tribes. And Phinehas demands an explanation of their action, reminding them of the judgment that fell at Peor, and suggesting that if the land of their choice be deemed unclean because of its separation from the Tabernacle, Israel would willingly find room for them in the land—

“But rebel not against the Lord, nor rebel against us in building you an altar beside the altar of the Lord our God” (Josh. xxii. 19).

The two and a half tribes vehemently repudiate the charge of rebellion, and deny that there had been any intention of using the altar for sacrificial purposes; it had been built in order that their children in days to come should realize that they still had part with the tribes across Jordan.

“Behold the pattern of the altar of the Lord, which our fathers made, not for burnt offerings, nor for sacrifices; but it is a witness between us and you” (Josh. xxii. 28).

This explanation satisfies Phinehas and he says:

“This day we perceive that the Lord is among us, because ye have not committed this trespass against the Lord” (Josh. xxii. 31).

How are we to regard this question of the building of the altar? The Law of Moses most certainly forbade the offering of sacrifice anywhere else but at the door of the tabernacle (Lev. xvii. 8, 9). Were the two and a half tribes justified in partly transgressing this commandment? With the fact of the history of Israel before us, and the knowledge of how easily they lapsed into idolatry, we cannot but feel that the erection of this altar was a sad mistake, and that no policy can justify departure from any commandment of the Lord. *The Companion Bible* expresses no opinion on the question. Some commentators are very much in its favour, others strongly condemn. It is difficult, perhaps, to avoid the charge of being uncharitable, but we cannot help feeling that, however good the intentions of the builders might have been, the whole action was a mistake. Anything in the nature of putting out one's hand to stay the ark of God, however, well intentioned, is wrong. The whole trouble seems to have been the natural fruit of their initial act of self-will. In Num. xxxii. 1 there are arguments that remind us strongly of Lot's fatal choice, and Moses denounces their choice as but a repetition of the false action of the ten spies (Num. xxxii. 14). It is true that an agreement was made with these tribes, and that the land of their choice was granted to them; nevertheless, we have learned both from experience and from the Scriptures that self-willed choice, even if it is permitted, generally ends in disaster. In all this history there is much that reminds us of those in Phil. iii., who minded earthly things, instead of being willing to forego all inheritance until over Jordan and in the land of promise.

The Book of Joshua concludes with an address by Joshua to all the people, in which he warns them of the results of departure from the Lord, and encourages them to adhere closely to all that had been written in the law. The passage ends with a solemn covenant on the part of the people, and the setting up of a great stone as a witness.

At the age of one hundred and ten years Joshua dies and is buried in the border of his inheritance. The bones of Joseph are buried in Shechem; and Eleazar the Priest is buried in mount Ephraim.

“And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua, and which had known all the works of the Lord, that He had done for Israel” (Josh. xxiv. 31).

There is something about this verse that makes one anticipate the sad departure that set in later, which is characteristic of the Book of Judges. The LXX has an addition to the last chapter of Joshua, and tells us that the sons of Israel worshipped Astarte and the gods of the nations round about them, and that the Lord delivered them into the hands of Eglon the King of Moab, who ruled over them eighteen years. While, therefore, the Book of Joshua is full of valuable teaching for the believer to-day, it is also a revelation of the utter failure of all men apart from the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is significant that its last words record the death of the High Priest. None but He Who ever liveth can save His people to the uttermost; all others, though types and shadows of the true, must ever fall short of perfection.

## **JUDGES.**

### **#1. The Book as a Whole (i. - xxi.).**

**“There was no king in Israel.”**

**pp. 128 - 131**

The first reading of the book of Judges leaves the reader with a feeling of perplexity. What is the purpose of the book? Upon what plan has it been written? That it reveals an awful state of affairs is most evident, and it is also obvious that this terrible condition arose directly out of the fact that “There was no King in Israel, every one did that which was right in his own eyes” (Judges xxi. 25).

While somewhat detailed accounts are given of such judges as Gideon and Samson, of others, though their names and the number of years of their judging of Israel are recorded, not a single event in their lives is chronicled. For example:

“And after Abimelech there arose to defend Israel Tola the son of Puah, the son of Dodo, a man of Isaachar, and he dwelt in Shamir in mount Ephraim. And he judged Israel twenty and three years, and died, and was buried in Shamir” (Judges x. 1, 2).

From such an entry, we gather that in this book we are dealing with actual history, but from the evident selection of incident we also conclude that the books is not only historical but also typical in its teaching. All Scripture is “profitable” for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, therefore that man of God who knows not the teaching which is associated with such names as Othniel, Barak, Gideon or Samson will not be “thoroughly furnished”.

Upon making a list of the names of those who judged or ruled Israel, we are immediately struck with the ominous fact that there are thirteen. Twelve of these were raised up by God, and one, Abimelech, a usurper, likened, in Jotham’s parable, to a Bramble, evidently foreshadowed the Antichrist.

Before giving an analysis of the book as a whole and pointing out its moral, let us set out the names of these judges, together with any features suggestive of their typical teaching.

- (1) OTHNIEL.—Enemy, Mesopotamia. Rest 40 years (iii. 9-11).
- (2) EHUD.—Left-hand. Dagger. Enemy, Moab. Rest 80 years (iii. 15-30).
- (3) SHAMGAR.—Ox-goad. Enemy, Philistines (iii. 31).
- (4) DEBORAH.—Tent peg. Enemy, Canaan. Rest 40 years (iv.-v.).
- (5) GIDEON.—Lamps and Pitchers. Enemy, Midian. Rest 40 years (vi.-viii.).  
ABIMELECH.—“Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou and reign over us” (ix. 14).
- (6) TOLA.—He judged Israel twenty-three years (x. 1, 2).
- (7) JAIR.—He judge Israel twenty-two years (x. 3-5).
- (8) JEPHTHAH.—The rash vow. Enemy, Ammon (xi. - xii. 7).
- (9) IBZAN.—He judged Israel seven years (xii. 8).
- (10) ELON.—He judged Israel ten years (xii. 11).
- (11) ABDON.—He judged Israel eight years (xii. 13, 14).
- (12) SAMSON.—Jawbone of ass. Enemy, Philistines (xiii.-xvi.).

Abimelech is not given a number, as he was self-chosen, and therefore not appointed by God.

Preparatory to a closer study, let us now take a survey of the book, noticing its broad outlines. In the opening chapter we find a recognition of the Lord.

“The children of Israel asked the Lord, saying, Who shall go up for us against the Canaanites first, to fight against them?” (Judges i. 1).

Judah is chosen and, for a time, there is progressive victory. As we proceed, however, we find marks of failure.

- (1) “He could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron” (i. 19).
- (2) “The Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem” (i. 21).
- (3) “The Canaanites would dwell in that land” (i. 27).
- (4) “They put the Canaanites to tribute and did not utterly drive them out” (i. 28).
- (5) “The Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites” (i. 32).
- (6) “The Amorites forced the children of Dan into the mountain: for they would not suffer them to come down to the valley: but the Amorites would dwell in mount Heres in Ajalon and in Shaalbim” (i. 34, 35).

Here is a solemn progression in failure. The chariots of iron, though formidable, had been spoken of by Joshua, who had said “For thou shalt drive out the Canaanites, though they have iron chariots, and though they be strong” (Josh. xvii. 18). Thus it is clear that all that Israel lacked was faith in the Word of the Lord. Instead of maintaining their separate position, Israel began to allow the Canaanites to dwell with them, and put them under tribute. But in course of time the process becomes reversed, and we find the Asherites dwelling among the Canaanites, words eloquent in typical teaching. Finally, the Amorites assume the role of conquerors. They are the ones that use force, and the

humiliation is all the more pronounced that it takes place at Ajalon, the scene of such a mighty triumph under Joshua (Josh. x. 12).

In Judges ii. 6-20 we read in solemn language the Divine synopsis of the whole book:

“The people served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua . . . . And there arose another generation after them, which knew not the Lord, nor yet the works which He had done for Israel . . . . they forsook the Lord God of their fathers . . . . and served Baal and Ashtaroth . . . . He delivered them into the hands of spoilers . . . . He raised up judges which delivered them . . . . yet they would not hearken.”

In these circumstances, instead of driving out the nations from before Israel, the Lord said He would use them to “prove” Israel, much as He had used the experiences of the forty years’ wandering in the wilderness (Deut. viii. 2).

From this point to the end of Judges xviii. we have the history of the judges, and the closing chapters depict the fearful condition, both spiritually and morally, into which Israel had fallen. As, in these closing verses, we three times hear the sad refrain, “There was no king in Israel” (xviii. 1; xix. 1 and xxi. 25), so the subject of kingship will be found running throughout the story of the judges. Gideon’s brethren “resembled the children of a king”. He himself was invited to rule over Israel but refused, and his son Abimelech, born of a concubine, in Shechem, usurped the kingdom. Again, Jephthah is invited to be head over all Gilead, and the sad confession is made in the days of Samson: “Knowest thou not that Philistines are rulers over us?” (Judges xv. 11).

Equally with the absence of the true king in all this turmoil and misrule, is felt the absence of the true priest. Even Gideon made a Ephod to the undoing of Israel (viii. 24-27). This finds an echo in the Ephod made by Micah (xvii. 5). Truly the whole sad history cries out for the one King-Priest after the order of Melchisedec, even the Lord Jesus Christ. At every turn its typical teaching illustrates the condition and character of the world and of the church, while He is absent, or while He is not recognized as Lord over all to the church.

With this review of the book in mind the reader will perhaps the better appreciate the following structure of the book as a whole, which places the items we have surveyed in their respective places, and demonstrates the design of the book and the intended lesson.

## Judges.---The Book as a whole.

- A | a | i. 1-15. "The children of Israel asked the Lord."  
b | i. 16 - iii. 9. FAILURE. | Judah and the Canaanites.  
Not destroyed utterly.  
Wives taken.
- B | iii. 10 - viii. 32. THE JUDGES. | The form of a King (viii. 18).  
Rule over us (viii. 22).  
The Ephod (viii. 24-27).  
*The need for the King-Priest felt.*
- C | ix. ABIMELECH.—THE ANTICHRIST. | The Olive, Fig, Vine.  
The Bramble.  
Reign thou over us.
- B | x. - xviii. THE JUDGES. | Be our head (xi. 8).  
Philistines rule (xv. 11).  
No King in Israel (xvii. 6).  
The Ephod (xvii. 5).  
*The need for the King-Priest felt.*
- A | b | xix. - xxi. 24. FAILURE. | Judah and Benjamin.  
Destroyed too many.  
Wives refused.
- a | xxi. 25. "No King in Israel:  
every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

## JUDGES.

### #2. The root cause of failure (i. 1 - iii. 9). pp. 166 - 171

Before we come to the exploits of the judges, we must make a closer acquaintance with the section that introduces us to their history, *viz.*, i. 1 - iii. 9. We are distinctly told that, after the death of Joshua and the elders that outlived him, Israel went astray, so that we must be prepared to find the seeds of departure even in the opening chapter.

What could be more reasonable, one might ask, than the opening request in Chapter i.:  
"Who shall go up against the Canaanites first?" (i. 1).

But we must remember that *all* Israel were commanded to fight, and that the Canaanites were one nation out of *seven* that were specified as their enemies (Josh. iii. 10). After Judah had been commanded to go up against the Canaanites and the Canaanites & the Perizzites had been delivered into their hand, we read: "And they found Adoni-bezek in Bezek" (Judges i. 5). Now we must remember that God Himself had commanded the utter destruction of the Canaanites:

“And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee: thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them” (Deut. vii. 2).

“Of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth” (Deut. xx. 16).

These commands included Adoni-bezek, but, like Saul who spared Agag, Judah spares Adoni-bezek from utter destruction. Doubtless there were some who questioned God’s command. Perhaps, with some glimmerings of His love, they argued, as some do to-day, that utter destruction of any of His creatures would be a contradiction of this wonderful attribute of love. There are some to-day who teach that there is no such thing as the destruction of body and soul in Gehenna, and offer translations to prove the salvation of Judas and the restoration of Satan. With all such reasoning we have nothing to do. What God has said should settle the matter for us all.

Adoni-bezek was caught, and his thumbs and his great toes were cut off (Judges i. 6). This was a practice in those barbaric days calculated to render captives incapable of further warfare. Adoni-bezek acknowledged that he had himself so treated seventy other kings. At the time of their consecration, the thumb and great toe of Aaron and the priests were touched with blood, so that the cutting off of these members in the case of Adoni-bezek would seem to indicate incapacity for the Lord’s service. It is interesting to notice, in passing, that in Exod. xxix. and Lev. viii. the *right ear* is mentioned first indicating that, without obedient hearing, hand and foot could not be truly consecrated.

The name “Adoni-bezek” means “The Lord of lightning”, and is a figure of Satan. Satan disabled the nations of the earth, which were reckoned as seventy in number (Deut. xxxii. 8 and Gen. x.) and he himself is to be imprisoned for a thousand years. At the end of that period he is found to be as bad as ever, and is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. Inasmuch as both Death and Hades are cast into this same fire, it is evident that the intention is destruction.

Here, in this first chapter of Judges, we have the beginning of all the future troubles of the people of God. Implicit, unquestioning obedience would have meant victory, peace and prosperity. Instead, one compromise led to another, resulting eventually in failure and defeat. It is scarcely necessary to point the moral. Each heart knows its own bitterness, and its natural tendency to spare or only partially mutilate what God has said must be destroyed.

Before we go into further detail, it will help us to see the general disposition of the subject-matter in structural form.

## Judges i. 1 - iii. 9.

- A | i. 1-20. |
  - a1 | i. 1-4. Judah and Simeon fight against the Canaanites.
  - b1 | i. 5-7. Adoni-bezek. Jerusalem.
  - a2 | i. 8-11. Judah fights against Jerusalem, Kirjath-arba and Kirjath sepher.
  - b2 | i. 12-15. Othniel. Kirjath-sepher.
  - a3 | i. 16-19. Judah and Simeon slay the Canaanites.
  - b3 | i. 20. Caleb. Hebron. Three sons of Anak.
- B | i. 21-26. Benjamin fails to drive out the Jebusites.  
The man of Luz perpetuates idolatry.
- C | i. 27. Neither did Manasseh.  
i. 29. Neither did Ephraim.  
i. 30. Neither did Zebulun.  
i. 31. Neither did Asher.  
i. 33. Neither did Nasphali.
- B | i. 34-36. Amorites force Dan into the mountains.  
Joseph exacts tribute.
- A | ii. 1 - iii. 9. |
  - a | ii. 1-5. Angel of the Lord. Nations as thorns.  
I will not drive them out.
  - b | ii. 6-10. Joshua and all that generation.
  - b | ii. 10-13. Another generation that knew not the Lord.
  - a | ii. 14 - iii. 9. Anger of the Lord.  
I will not drive them out. Left to prove Israel.

In i. 10-15 and i. 30 we have a re-statement of what has already been recorded in Josh. xv. 13-19. Caleb was an overcomer, and so also was his younger brother Othniel. The story is repeated here in order to show the root cause of Israel's failure. They did not wholly follow the Lord as did Caleb; they did not utterly destroy the seed of the wicked one but spared them, and dwelt with them, and took tribute of them. All this would be acclaimed as very human and humane, very worldly-wise and civilized, but after all disobedient and ruinous.

Just as Adoni-bezek is a type of Satan, so Kirjath-arba and Kirjath-sepher are types of Satan's activities. Kirjath-arba is associated with the Giants, the sons of Anak. These were the seed of the Wicked One, and, like the "tares" in the parable, were devoted to destruction. Kirjath-sepher means "The City of the Book". Its name was changed to Debir which means "Oracle", as Kirjath-arba was changed to Hebron, which means "Fellowship". The doctrine of demons, the false gospels and teachings that form part of Satan's propaganda, must be destroyed if true success is to be achieved. God's oracle, the inspired Scriptures (Debir) must take their place, and fellowship with the Lord (Hebron) must be our strength—and not the "strength of Baal", which is the meaning of the name Arba.

In contrast with this uncompromising attitude which characterizes all true overcomers, is the incident connected with the man who was an inhabitant of Bethel. The name

Bethel, or “The house of God”, had been given to the place by Jacob, but it had still retained its original name of Luz. Worldly wisdom would have commended the action of the tribe of Joseph. The spies see a man coming out of the city and promise him mercy if he will show them the entrance into it. The city is taken and the man and his family spared. Instead of accepting the change, however, and remaining as one of the first citizens of the renamed city of Bethel, we read:

“The man went into the land of the Hittites, and built a city, and called the name thereof Luz: which is the name thereof unto this day” (Judges i. 26).

Paul’s comment seems apposite here:

“If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor” (Gal. ii. 18).  
“How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements?” (Gal. iv. 9).

We next come to the central section of the structure: Judges i. 27-33. The repetition of the word “Neither” here is a solemn witness of failure.

“The Canaanites *would* dwell” (Judges i. 27).

The word rendered “would” is the Hiphil form of *yaal*, and is variously translated in the A.V. “begin”, “be content”, “please”, “assay”, and “would”. Perhaps in the passage under consideration the modern phrase “made overtures” gives a fairly good idea of the Canaanites’ attitude. The Canaanites expressed their willingness to pay tribute or do anything asked of them in exchange for permission to dwell in the land; and counsels of worldly wisdom and that much praised quality “humanity” prevailed.

“The Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites” (Judges i. 32).

This is ever the sequence. First the world comes into the church; then the church finds its place in the world. Give the Canaanite an inch and he will soon claim a yard, for the yard has already been conceded in principle. The word “among” is *gereb*, which is elsewhere translated “bowels”, “heart”, and “inward part”, indicating how complete was Israel’s failure. The subsequent decline and fall described in the succeeding chapters of Judges is incipient in these tragic verses of chapter i.

“The Amorites forced the children of Dan” (Judges i. 34).

Here the full tale of degradation is told, for the word translated “forced” is the word used in Exod. iii. 9:

“I have also seen the *oppression* wherewith the Egyptians *oppress* them.”

Israel, redeemed from the bondage of Egypt, and beyond both the Red Sea and the Jordan, enter again into bondage. The N.T. equivalent is found in Galatians:

“But now, after ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” (Gal. iv. 9).

Paul’s “No, not for an hour” (Gal. ii. 5) is as vital to-day as it was in his own time, and as it would have been in Judges i.

“And the Angel of the Lord came from Gilgal to Bochim” (Judges ii. 1).

Gilgal was the place where the reproach of Egypt was rolled away, where the rite that set forth “no confidence in the flesh” was performed. Bochim means “Weepers” and was so named by Israel (ii. 5).

The Lord sworn that He would never break His covenant with Israel, but many forget, when they criticize His change of attitude, that a covenant implies two parties, and when Israel had grievously broken their part of the contract, the covenant obligations of the Lord at once ceased. The terms of the covenant included the condition that Israel should make no league with the inhabitants of Canaan, and in this they failed.

“Wherefore I also said, I will not drive them out from before you; but they shall be as thorns in your sides, and their gods shall be a snare unto you . . . . that through them I may prove Israel” (Judges ii. 3-22).

The changes that is observable between Ephesians and II Timothy suggests something of a parallel, and explains the presence of so much evil in and around the church.

“For there must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you” (I Cor. xi. 19).

Even Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” takes on a fuller meaning when seen in the light of Judges ii.

We will conclude this article by giving the necessary expansion of the two members  
A | a | ii. 1-5. and A | a | ii. 14 - iii. 9. in the structure set out on page 168.

#### **A | a | Judges ii. 1-5.**

A | a | ii. 1. The angel of the Lord came . . . . and said.

b | ii. 1. BOCHIM.

B | ii. 1-3. | c | I said, I will never break My covenant.

d1 | Ye shall make no league.

Ye shall throw down their altars.

d2 | Ye have not obeyed My voice.

Why have ye done this?

c | I also said, I will not drive them out.

d3 | They shall be as thorns.

Their gods shall be a snare.

A | a | ii. 4. The Angel of the Lord spake these words.

b | ii. 5. BOCHIM.

**A | a | Judges ii. 14 - iii. 9.**

- A | a | ii. 14. The anger of the Lord was hot.
  - b | ii. 14. He delivered them to spoilers.
  - c | ii. 16-18. He raised up judges which delivered them.
- B | ii. 19. Israel followed other gods to serve them.
  - C | d | ii. 20-23. Nations left to prove. General.
  - d | iii. 1-4. Nations left to prove. Particular.
- B | iii. 6-7. Israel served their gods . . . . Baalim.
- A | a | iii. 8. The anger of the Lord was hot.
  - b | iii. 8. He sold them to the King of Mesopotamia.
  - c | iii. 9. He raised up a deliverer, Othniel.

Space will not permit a fuller investigation into these opening sections. We trust sufficient has been indicated to kindle the reader's interest, and we can confidently leave the application of much searching "correction and instruction in righteousness" to the Spirit Himself.

**JUDGES.**

**#3. "Lo-Ammi" (iii. - xiii.).**

**A prophetic principle examined.  
pp. 207 - 211**

Among the many items of dispensational importance in the Book of Judges, one question of outstanding interest is the way in which Israel and Israel's affairs influence the computation of times and dates. The question at first seems simple enough. All one has to do is to add up the periods of the judges' rule and the intervening years of rest, and the thing is done. As there is no better way of producing conviction than to try things out for oneself, let us set about this calculation and see what results are obtained.

	<b>Judges.</b>	<i>Years.</i>
FIRST SERVITUDE.—Mesopotamia.	iii. 8.	8
OTHNIEL.—REST.	iii. 11.	40
SECOND SERVITUDE.—MOAB.	iii. 14.	18
EHUD.—REST.	iii. 30.	80
THIRD SERVITUDE.—CANAAN.	iv. 3.	20
DEBORAH and BARAK.—REST.	v. 31.	40
FOURTH SERVITUDE.—MIDIAN.	vi. 1.	7
GIDEON.—REST.	viii. 28.	40
TOLA.	x. 2.	23
JAIR.	x. 3.	22
JEPHTHAH.	xii. 7.	6
IBZAN.	xii. 9.	7
ELON.	xii. 11.	10
ABDON.	xii. 14.	8
FIFTH SERVITUDE.—PHILISTINES.	xiii. 1.	40
	Total: --	369

It will be observed that we have put down all the periods concerned, whether they be periods of servitude or of rest.

Turning now to the N.T. we find that the Apostle Paul has something to say about this period, and we therefore turn to Acts xiii. 16-22, in order to check our total.

	<b>Acts.</b>	<i>Years.</i>
WILDERNESS WANDERING.	xiii. 18.	40
PERIOD OF JUDGES.	xiii. 20.	450
SAUL'S REIGN.	xiii. 21.	40
	Total: --	530

Ignoring, for the moment, the years in the wilderness and the reign of Saul, we observe that Paul's statement regarding the period of the Judges differs from our own conclusion by 81 years, a difference too great to be covered by the suggestion that the Apostle is using round numbers when he says "About the space of 450 years".

There are other checks, however, that we must take into account. Jephthah, who lived at the very period under discussion, tells us (Judges xi. 26) that the disputed territory had been held by Israel for 300 years, dating from the end of the 40 years' wandering. Solomon also speaks very definitely about the number of years that intervened between the Exodus from Egypt and the year in which he began to build the Temple of the Lord. He speaks of this year as "the 480th year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt", and the fourth year of his reign (I Kings vi. 1). If we compare Solomon's period with that given by Paul in Acts xiii., we find a difference of 93 years, which, again, in conjunction with the period covered by Solomon's account.

	<i>Years.</i>
WILDERNESS WANDERING.	40
PERIOD OF JUDGES.	450
SAUL'S REIGN.	40
DAVID'S REIGN.	40
SOLOMON'S FIRST THREE COMPLETE YEARS (I Kings vi. 1).	3
	573
DEDUCT—SOLOMON'S COMPUTATION.	- 480
TOTAL TO ACCOUNT FOR: --	93

Let us now look back over the list of items given in the chronology of the Book of Judges, on page 207. We observe that there are five periods of servitude, varying in length from 7 years to 40. Adding these periods together we have the following:

	<b>Judges.</b>	<i>Years.</i>
FIRST SERVITUDE.	iii. 8.	8
SECOND SERVITUDE.	iii. 14.	18
THIRD SERVITUDE.	iv. 3.	20
FOURTH SERVITUDE.	vi. 1.	7
FIFTH SERVITUDE.	xiii. 1.	40
	Total: --	93

This is indeed a revelation. The very number of the years of Israel's servitude is equal to the difference between the accounts of Solomon and Paul. If we look more attentively at Solomon's statement, we find that he does not say that the total number of years that intervened between the two points was 480, but that "in the 480th year" the Temple was commenced. The number is ordinal (480th), not cardinal (480), showing that while Paul was using the calendar of the Lord, and in that calendar no notice is taken of periods when Israel are in bondage. From this emerges a principle. When Israel are *Lo-ammi*, time is not counted prophetically.

Before proceeding let us endeavour to understand clearly what is meant by the *Lo-ammi* periods of Israel's history. The term is borrowed from Hosea i. 9 where we read the Hosea's son was named *Lo-ammi*, meaning, "Not My People", the name being prophetic of Israel's long night of rejection. This period of rejection is also predicted in Hosea iii. 3-5:

"For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king . . . . Afterwards shall the children of Israel return."

Before applying this principle further, one other detail demands consideration. We read in Judges x. 8 that the children of Ammon and the Philistines "vexed and oppressed the children of Israel" for 18 years. Why is this period not included in the list given above? The reason is that it was confined to "the other side of the Jordan" until the close of the 18 years (Judges x. 8, 9), and so cannot be reckoned as a *Lo-ammi* period for all Israel.

The important principle enunciated above has a profound influence upon the interpretation of Dan. ix. In this chapter we have a period of 490 years in which all the purposes and promises of God for Israel are to be fulfilled. Inasmuch as this promise was made to Daniel some 490 years before Christ, it is manifest that something is intended other than the normal reckoning of 490 years on the calendar of the world. Since Acts xxviii. Israel have been *Lo-ammi*; the prophetic clock has stopped and will not begin again until Israel's day once more dawns. Moreover, during the captivity of Israel in the time of Daniel, Israel were as much *Lo-ammi* as they were under the servitude at the time of the Judges. The 490 prophetic years of Dan. ix. cannot include the period when Jerusalem was a ruin, the Temple unbuilt, and the walls and gates destroyed. Consequently we can appreciate the reason why the angel did not give Daniel a simple period of years in Dan. ix. 25, but broke it up, the *Lo-ammi* period of seven weeks (49 years) being occupied with the restoration of the city, while the threescore and two weeks commenced when the city and people were back again into favour. This has already been discussed in Volume VI (which has recently been reprinted in Volumes XXV and XXVI) and the reader is referred to the article in Volume XXVI, page 232, together with the diagram.

This principle also has a solemn application to ourselves individually. While the believer can never be "lost" I Cor. iii. 15 makes it clear that he may "suffer loss". This applies both to the period of the Acts and to the dispensation of the mystery, and is found

in Col. iii. 24, 25, and II Tim. ii. 11, 12. When one ponders the years of so-called service that one has rendered, and then considers how much may fail to stand the test, the history of Israel and the omission of centuries of time from their calendar assumes a solemn aspect, and prompts us to pray: “So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom” (Psa. xc. 12).

Some expositors see in the various oppressors of Israel during the period of Judges, types of the great spiritual enemies of the Church.

MESOPOTAMIA.	Judges iii. 8.	THE WORLD.
MOAB.	Judges iii. 14.	THE FLESH.
CANAAN.	Judges iv. 3.	THE DEVIL.
MIDIAN.	Judges vi. 1.	EARTHLY THINGS.
PHILISTINES.	Judges xiii. 1.	CARNAL RELIGION.

Whether these suggestions can be justified only patient study will reveal. We give them, however, for what they are worth, praying that we may all be made wiser by these examples written for our learning, and experience more of the triumphs of faith and the periods of rest, and less of the dark days of servitude when prophetic time ceases and nothing but “loss” is registered.

## Great plainness of Speech.

### #1. The Dispensational Boundary. pp. 182 - 184

If the interested reader opens any Volume of *The Berean Expositor*, and consults its pages upon almost any topic, it will be observed that the subject under consideration has been presented according to a plan. The words which teach the doctrine concerned and their meanings established by usage. Usually a number of references have been given in order that the reader may be able to see for himself both meaning and usage. Then, seeing that verses of Scripture, wrenched from their contexts, may easily be used in support of false doctrine, we have sought out and presented the structure of the passage; and sometimes, to make doubly sure, we have given the structure of a whole book. Not until the words have been examined, and the structure discovered, have we sought to press the point at issue or to established the doctrine. While the majority of our readers are well able to follow these methods, and would not have us act otherwise, there are some who find it difficult to follow the main argument amidst the rather abundant detail which surrounds it. Further, those who read our pages and are hostile in their attitude give clear evidence by their criticisms that they have not understood our message.

We therefore propose, in this series, to state what we believe to be the truth on a number of important themes, avoiding detailed explanation. We shall not examine the meanings of words, we shall not set out the structures of the passages concerned, but instead, we shall refer the reader to those articles where all the proofs may be discovered. In this way we hope that some who have missed our meaning will be helped, and those who are engaged in the work of instructing others may be assisted also. It must be understood, however, that in this series we shall not present anything new. All fresh teaching will be presented as before, with proofs from the Word to substantiate all that is taught.

The first words printed in *The Berean Expositor* are these:--

**Acts xxviii. 17-31.**

**Its bearing upon the present dispensation.**

Let us attempt to use “great plainness of speech” as we set forth the importance of this passage to the understanding of dispensational truth:

*Acts xxviii. 17-31 is a dispensational boundary. As a boundary it necessarily divides contrasting dispensations. The outstanding characteristics of the Acts period is the presence and pre-eminence of Israel. The outstanding characteristic of the dispensation of the mystery is the complete absence of Israel as a nation. The hope of Israel is entertained throughout the Acts, right up to this dispensational boundary. The hope of the dispensation that ensues is the hope of*

*the calling of the mystery. The covenant with Abraham is fundamental to the calling during the Acts, but it finds no place in the epistles of the mystery. In the epistles of the mystery we are taken back to a time before the “foundation (overthrow) of the world”, and to a promise made before the age times.*

*We therefore set aside the traditional teaching that the church began at Pentecost, believing that the church of the body of Christ came into being when Israel were set aside, and Isa. vi. quoted for the last time.*

The reader who desires proofs of the above assertions is directed to the following articles:

Volumes	i. 28 ( <i>i.</i> 25); xviii. 49, 72, 73, 81; xiii. 98; xiv. 19.
The structure of the passage . . . . .	Vol. xviii. 75.
Abraham and the Acts . . . . .	Vol. i. 14, 17 ( <i>i.</i> 14, 19).
Miracles and dispensational truth . . . . .	Vol. x. 173.
The Mystery and Acts xxviii. . . . .	Vol. xviii. 72.
Paul’s twofold ministry . . . . .	Vol. i. 4; ii. 65 ( <i>ii./iii.</i> 50).

We believe that the reader who consults the above articles will not fail to understand the importance we have attached to Acts xxviii. as a dispensational boundary, and to appreciate the many proofs that justify such a belief.

[NOTE.—A double reference thus: i. 28 (*i.* 25) or ii. 65 (*ii./iii.* 50) indicates that these Volumes have been re-printed. The italic figures within brackets refer to the re-printed Volume.]

## **#2. The Covenant with Abraham and Paul’s early Ministry. pp. 223, 224**

Acts xxviii. being the dispensational boundary, marking off the revelation of the Mystery from all earlier revelations, it follows that all that was written either by Paul or by any other writer before that dispensational boundary, must necessarily conform to the particular phase of the purpose of the ages that was then in operation. That phase, which is dealt with in Paul’s early ministry, revolves round two covenants, the one made with Abraham, and the other the New Covenant made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. The statement that “Ye are all one in Christ Jesus” found in Gal. iii. 28 is not written with any reference to the constitution of the then-unrevealed dispensation of the Mystery, but to show that all such were “Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Gal. iii. 29).

The constitution of the Church during the Acts is likened to an olive tree, with some of its branches removed and replaced by grafts from the wild olive, a constitution far

removed from that of the “one new man” that was created to form the “Body” of Ephesians.\* In Romans the Jew is still first, and the apostle has to fight hard for the recognition of the fact that believing Gentiles could be heirs of the promise made to Abraham.

We now put forward the following statement, and append references so that the interested reader may find proofs and fuller details.

*Acts xxviii. is the dispensational boundary. The covenant with Abraham is fundamental to the calling during the Acts. This covenant with Abraham is incipient in the seven epistles of Paul written during the Acts, and is definitely expounded as fundamental in Galatians and Romans. Recognizing this essential difference, we believe and teach that, while the gospel of justification by faith remains unaltered to-day, the dispensational teaching which deals, not with forgiveness and life, but with sphere of blessing and destiny, has entirely changed. To go back, therefore, to the epistles of the Acts for any teaching as to the Mystery, its hope, its sphere or its constitution, can only result in confusion. In other words we must distinguish between “Doctrine”, which deals with sin and salvation, and “Dispensation”, which deals with sphere and destiny.*

The reader who desires fuller explanation and more detail should consult the following articles in *The Berean Expositor*:

Abraham and the Acts . . . . .	Vol. i. 15, 27 (i. 14, 20).
Abrahamic Covenant and To-day . . . . .	Vol. xx. 18.
Doctrine and Dispensation . . . . .	Vol. xx. 48.
Dispensation of the Mystery . . . . .	Vol. xiii. 8.
Mystery and Acts xxviii. . . . .	Vol. xviii. 72-76.

[NOTE: \* - The words “Thou standest by faith” prevent us from applying this figure of Rom. xi. to the nations.]

## **Light for the last days.**

*A series of studies in Scripture concerning the character  
of the closing days of this age.*

### **#5. God's answer to the problem of the Suez Canal. pp. 1 - 8**

In the year 1854 the Viceroy of Egypt, Said Pasha, gave the first concession to Ferdinand de Lesseps for the construction of the Suez Canal. The concession was for a lease of 99 years dating from the opening of the canal. The canal was actually opened on 17th November, 1869, so that the year in which it will revert to Egypt will be 1968, or 32 years from the date of writing.

The canal is such a vital feature both commercially and strategically, and the whole question of its future involves so many political difficulties, that one fears that war will be inevitable. While we do not intend to convey the impression that the Suez Canal is actually mentioned in Scripture, there seems to be abundant evidence to prove that it is linked up with the events of the future.

Several great changes are predicted that have to do with the configuration of the land. Among these predictions there is a definite statement that the tongue of the Egyptian sea (into which the Suez Canal enters at Suez) is to be smitten, and that another "canal" is to be opened, joining the Mediterranean Sea with the Dead Sea, and thence, via the Gulf of Abakah, with the Red Sea.

### **- - - Illustration - - - (BE-XXVII.2).**

In order to appreciate the prophecies that deal with this theme, several subsidiary studies will have to be prosecuted in order that the geography of the Scriptures may be intelligible, and the weight of evidence felt. Let us first of all acquaint ourselves with the statement made by Isaiah with reference to this subject.

"And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with His mighty wind shall He shake His hand over the river, and shall smite it into seven streams, and make men go over dryshod. And there shall be an highway for the remnant of His people, which shall be left, from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt" (Isa. xi. 15, 16).

We shall have to refer sooner or later to the map that accompanies this article, and there is one point in this connection which we will explain at once. In the year 1855,

Major I. Scott Phillips wrote a small book entitled “Approximations of Prophecy” in which he developed the idea which stimulated our own search and is to some extent the basis of this article. It will be seen that the book was published in the year following concession to de Lesseps to begin the Suez Canal. No reference, of course, to this canal is found in the book, as it was not then in existence. Major Phillips was concerned with a mightier “canal” that shall enrich Jerusalem and heal the Dead Sea. In his map he quotes the reference given above to the smiting of the river into seven streams, and places the citation across the delta of the Nile. With this, however, we are not able to agree. The word *yeor* is usually the word found in the original when the reference is to the Nile, while the word “The River” without qualifications (usually the Hebrew *Naharas* as in Isa. xi. 15) generally refers to the Euphrates. The R.V. makes two alterations:--

- (1) The word “River” is printed with a capital “R” indicating the Euphrates.
- (2) The words “Smite it into seven streams” are translated as though the river Euphrates were to be subdivided into smaller streams.

The object is that there may be a highway “from Assyria” and “like . . . . Egypt”—which would not be intelligible if the Delta of the Nile had been intended. The exodus from Egypt underlies many of the prophecies of Israel’s final restoration (cf. Isa. ix. 11; Jer. xxxi. 31, 32; Exod. xxxiv. 10). The “smiting” of the river in Isa. xi. 15 corresponds with the “smiting” of the “wicked one” in verse 4 of the same chapter.

In our article referring to the nations at the time of the end we cited “The burden of Egypt” from Isa. xix. We paid little or no attention at the time to the lengthy reference that is made to an extraordinary failure of the Nile. We must now consider this point:--

“And the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and become dry. And the rivers shall stink; the canals of Egypt shall be minished and dried up . . . . the fishers also shall lament” (Isa. xix. 5-8).

At the end of this chapter is another reference to the “highway”, not only out of Assyria as stated in chapter xi., but also out of Egypt (as implied in chapter xi. by the reference to the tongue of the Egyptian sea).

The drying up of the sea, and the making of the rivers into a wilderness is referred to once again in Isa. l. 2.

Judgment is to fall upon Egypt, and in Ezek. xxix. we read:--

“Behold, I am against thee, and against thy rivers, and I will make the land of Egypt an utter waste and desolation from MIGDOL to SYENE, and even unto the border of Ethiopia” (Ezek. xxix. 10 R.V. margin).

The word translated “tower” in the A.V. is Migdol, the name of the city mentioned in Exod. xiv. 2. If the reader will turn to the map given on page 2 he will see that Migdol is vertically above Syene, which is now called Asouan.

A series of prophecies are made against Egypt in Ezekiel, in which there is an interweaving of past history (see the reference to Nebuchadnezzar in xxx. 10) with “the Day of the Lord” (xxx. 3). Like the prophecy of Ezek. xxvii. and xxviii. concerning Tyre, they look forward for their real fulfillment to the time of the end.

We learn from these chapters that the King of Babylon will attack Egypt in the future, and the effect, unlike anything which has yet been accomplished in that country, will be that “they shall know that I am the Lord” (Ezek. xxx. 26).

Almost up to the time of the end, Palestine will have been a reproach and a wasted land, and Arabia a desert. The tables, however, are to be turned. Egypt is to be utterly wasted, the Nile is to be dried up, while Palestine shall become a delightful land, and “the desert shall blossom as the rose”.

Another prophecy associating the gathering of Israel with geographical disturbances is found in Zech. x.

“I will sow them among the peoples . . . . I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and gather them out of Assyria . . . . And shall smite the waves in the sea, and all the depths of the Nile shall dry up . . . . and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away” (Zech. x. 9-11).

The association of the house of Judah with the house of Joseph (Zech. x. 6) shows that this passage looks forward to the future day of Israel’s restoration.

The above citations are enough to satisfy the reader that, at the time of the end, considerable geographical changes are to take place in Egypt, particularly in connection with the Nile. We now turn to one or two passages that speak of geographical changes at the same time in the land of Israel itself.

In order to appreciate the first of these references in Isa. xxxiii. a knowledge of the context is essential. We give below, without elaboration, the main structure:--

**Isaiah xxxiii. 13-24.**

- A1 | 13-17. THE KING.—Seen in the land.
- B1 | 18, 19. THE ENEMY.—Not seen.
- A2 | 20, 21. THE LORD.—Jerusalem seen as quiet.
- B2 | 21. THE ENEMY.—Not seen.
- A3 | 22. THE LORD.—He will save.
- B3 | 23. THE ENEMY.—Destroyed.
- A4 | 24. THE INHABITANTS.—Forgiven.

The particular passage with which we are concerned at the moment is Isa. xxxiii. 21 and 23.

“But there the Lord will be with us in majesty, a place of broad rivers and streams; wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby . . . . Thy

tacklings are loosed; they could not strengthen the foot of the mast, they could not spread the sail” (R.V.).

At no time in history has Jerusalem been “a place of broad rivers and streams”; and it is meaningless to say that no galley with oars or gallant ship shall pass a city if it is miles from the sea, and without a navigable river. The structure relates these references to the enemy, of whom Israel need have no fear, but that only makes it more emphatic that a great geographical change involving sea and river must have come about. Let the reader ponder the following passages in the light of these predicted changes.

“When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee” (Isa. xliii. 2).

There is a reference to the crossing of the Red Sea here, for in verse 3 the Lord says: “I gave Egypt for thy ransom.” However, Israel are told not to remember “the former things”:-

“Remember ye not the former things . . . . Behold I will do a new thing: now it shall spring forth . . . . I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert . . . . I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert” (Isa. xliii. 18-20).

Turning to Isa. xi. we read:-

“They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea” (Isa. xi. 9).

How are we to understand this last phrase: “As the waters cover the sea”? The expression is a strange one, for the sea itself is a gathering together of the waters. How then can we speak of “waters” covering the “sea” as at the time of the flood, but “waters covering the sea” seems a strange figure. The difficulty disappears if we regard these words as representing a literal fact in relation to the Dead Sea. Water flowing down from Jerusalem will cover the Dead Sea, and this fact is used as a figure of the fruitful results of the knowledge of the Lord. The reader may perhaps ask how it is possible for waters from Jerusalem to cover the Dead Sea, and to this problem we must now address ourselves.

The last nine chapters of Ezekiel are devoted to the restoration of Israel’s land and temple in the last days. In chapter xlvii. we read of waters that flow from Jerusalem becoming a river that a man might “swim in”, a river that cannot be “passed over”. Ezekiel’s attention is drawn to the direction in which this river flows:-

“These waters issue out toward the east country (i.e. they flow inland, not down to the Mediterranean), and go down into the desert (*Arabah*, the plain, Deut. ii. 18—associated with the Jordan and the “sea of the plain, even the salt sea”, that is the “Dead Sea”) and go into the sea (i.e. the Dead Sea), which being brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed” (Ezek. xlvii. 8).

That the Dead Sea is meant is rendered certain by verse 10, for Engedi stands on its western shore (see map).

The prophet Zechariah describes how these living waters that heal the Dead Sea come our from Jerusalem:--

“I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle . . . . His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half toward the south . . . . for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal . . . . And it shall come to pass in that day that living waters shall come out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea (Eastern, i.e., the Dead Sea), and half of them toward the hinder sea (Western, i.e., the Mediterranean)” (Zech. xiv. 2-8).

Here we have definite statements that cannot be explained away. East and West, North and South are geographical points.

A very great valley reaches to Azal. *The Companion Bible* comments: “A new place, yet to have this name, at one extremity of the valley.” The reader will see that the A.V. spells it Azal, and the R.V. Azel. A glance at the map will show that Rollins in his “Ancient History” marks two names close together near the site of Ashkelon, namely Afcalon-Azol. Jeremiah seems to refer to this in chapter xlvii:--

“O thou sword of the Lord . . . . the Lord hath given thee a charge against *Ashkelon*, and against the sea shore” (Jer. xlvii. 6, 7).

When we remember that the Mediterranean is 1300 feet above the level of the Dead Sea, we can well imagine what would happen if a “very great valley” extended from Ashkelon or Azal on the coast, as far as the Jordan valley in the East. The rapid rise of water at the Dead Sea would cause the Jordan to find its old river bed and flow out into the Gulf of Akabah (*see map*). *R. Stephenson writes*:--

“The Wadi-el-Arabah appears in part to be an old sea beach, deeply grooved by torrents.”

And Keith says of this valley that “without doubt it was the ancient bed of that river (the Jordan) before the volcanic eruption which formed the actual basin of the dead Sea”.

The “tongue of the Egyptian sea”, the sea of Suez, will be destroyed, the land slightly raised, and where the Delta of the Nile and the Suez Canal now exist, men shall walk dryshod. Micah speaks of the Lord clearing a valley like wax and of the waters pouring down a steep place (Micah i. 3, 4). Joel tells us that “all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come out of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim” (i.e., the plains of Moab bordering the Dead Sea) (Joel iii. 18).

The words of the well known Psalm may be far more literal than many have supposed:--

“God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, And the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea;

Though the waters thereof roar and be troubled. Though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. Selah (i.e., “Look on this picture; now look on that”).

There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, The holy place of the tabernacle of the Most High” (Psa. xlv.).

The passage speaks of the contrast between the roaring torrent falling 1300 feet from Azal to the Dead Sea, the moving of the mountains and other accompaniments of this great moment, and the river of living waters that flows out from the holy place at Jerusalem.

We must bring this article to a close, particularly as the subject is not one that comes strictly within the orbit of our ministry. Enough, we trust, has been brought forward to throw some light on another feature of the last days.

There is, however, one further point which may be mentioned in conclusion. The only reserve that we might feel over accepting Major Phillips’ map is that, whereas he shows no water-way other than that of the Mediterranean, the prophecy speaks also of living waters that issue out from Jerusalem. This calls for some adjustment, which may not be possible with our present knowledge. The fact, however, remains that Major Phillips has put forward something that appears to be in general harmony with the Word, however incomplete the scheme may be. If all the details do not prove to be correct, the general teaching of prophecy concerning the land of Israel leaves us perfectly certain that in the glorious kingdom yet to come, God will not only blot out man’s canal at Suez, but will make His own at Azal, and moreover sweeten the Dead Sea, so providing a symbol of blessing for the whole earth.

## **#6. “All faiths” instead of “The faith of God’s elect”. pp. 21, 22**

We have considered in the preceding articles a few of the outstanding features that characterize the last days. We have gathered that an anti-christian system of worship will predominate, that Egypt, Babylon, Greece, Persia, the Mediterranean, and of course Palestine, will figure largely at the time of the end, and that great and even catastrophic changes must be expected in some parts of the earth, particularly in the neighbourhood of Egypt, Assyria and Palestine. Moreover, the “kings of the east” are mentioned (Rev. xvi. 12). The exact identity of these kings we do not present know. It is clear that Japan will probably play an important part in any future international dispute, but whether Japan will be one of these “kings” we do not pretend to say. Some think that the names Meshech, Tubal, and Rosh (translated “Chief prince” in Ezek. xxxviii. 2) refer to Moscow, Tobolsk and Russia. But this again we must confess we do not know. The LXX uses names here that refer to nations inhabiting the district round about the Caucasus. God and Magog in the same verse (Ezek. xxxviii. 2) refer to some nation or nations north of Palestine.

We shall endeavour to preserve and record from time to time under the heading “Light for the last days” any item of interest that touches upon the various features connected with the last days. These articles will not occupy much space, as the theme is only distantly related to the dispensation of the mystery.

We give below an extract from an article published in the “News Chronicle” of 19th May, 1936, which is an indication of the way in which “religion” is drifting.

“To unite the inspiration of all Faiths upon the solution of man’s present problems.”

I take this phrase from the prospectus of the World Congress of Faiths, which is to meet in London from July 3 to 18. It represents the ultimate purpose of a remarkable gathering, which will bring together notable spokesmen of many religions and will see them uniting in devotion, not only at their daily meetings in University College, but also at St. Paul’s and in Canterbury Cathedral.

“Mankind”, says the prospectus, “is crying out for peace. But there can be no true and lasting peace until we get down to the very roots of the present world unrest, and quicken into more active life that feeling of fellowship which, through all appearances to the contrary, is ever latent in the hearts of men.”

“To intensify this sense of fellowship is, then, the main aim of the Congress. Since only those of profound spiritual insight are capable of arousing this feeling, such men are being brought together from many countries.”

Here, at least, is recognition of the fact, so consistently ignored by the politicians, that at root the world’s disease is spiritual, demanding a spiritual remedy. And the list of those who are to speak or contribute papers is striking proof that the spiritual ferment, of which we of the Christian faith have long been aware, is something affecting all mankind.

The “present problems” of which the Congress will have to take note are tabulated thus:--

- (a) Fear.
- (b) Hate.
- (c) Nationalism, in excess or defect.
- (d) Racial animosity.
- (e) Class prejudice.
- (f) Poverty.
- (g) Ignorance.
- (h) Religious differentiation.

Opposed to them is the ideal of world fellowship, and it will be the aim of those who contribute to the discussions to show how that ideal may be attained through religious channels. Just think of the possibilities of a convention which links, for example, Dr. Parkes Cadman with the Sheik-Rector of Al Azhar, Cairo’s great Moslem University, Dame Elizabeth Cadbury with Dr. Pen-Chun Chang of Tientsin, and Sir Herbert Samuel with M. Berdiaeff, of the Greek Orthodox Church, and Professor Suzuki, of Kyoto.

Comment is hardly necessary. Some such world-wide religion is bound to come, *but it will not be of God*. The rise of the Beast and the dictatorship that will be in force at the time of the end, will mean not only commercial and political slavery, but a fierce opposition to “all that is called God or worshipped”. The Congress tabulates eight problems that are “at the root of the world’s disease” and the solemn omission is the word “Sin”. Or again, in the remedies proposed, while we have such vague terms as the

“feeling of fellowship” and “the inspiration of all faiths”, we look in vain for the Person and Work of the Son of God. It is indeed true that “mankind is crying out for peace”, but the World Congress is heading straight for that “peace and safety” that shall be followed by “sudden destruction”.

Let us continue to pray and to bear our testimony to an inspired Bible, an infallible Christ, an all-sufficient Sacrifice, and a “blessed hope”.

## **#7. Arab Opposition to the Jews in Palestine. pp. 44, 45**

The Arabs in Palestine are strongly opposed to the influx of the Jews, and are demanding that their immigration into Palestine shall be curtailed. The Scriptures indicate that the Jews will return to their land in unbelief, and that the nations of the world will become so incensed against them that they will say:--

“Come, and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance.”

“For they have consulted together with one consent: they are confederate against Thee: the tabernacles of Edom, and the Ishmaelites; of Moab, and the Hagarenes, Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek; the Philistine with the inhabitants of Tyre” (Psa. lxxxiii. 4-7).

What we see in Palestine to-day is but the spark that will eventually blaze out into a devouring flame at the time of the end.

The following extract from the *News Chronicle* (May 1936) will give some idea of the state of things at Jerusalem at that time:--

### **Jerusalem (Wednesday).**

Throughout Palestine the Arab general strike will continue indefinitely in an attempt to force the British Government to stop the flow of Jewish immigrants into the country.

This ultimatum, defying the High Commissioner’s statement that he will enter into no negotiations until law and order have been restored, was given to-day by Abdul Hadi, Secretary of the Higher Arab Committee.

### **ARAB’S LAST STAND.**

We Arabs, he said, are prepared to commit economic and racial suicide in Palestine rather than be suffocated by the increasing flow of Jewish immigration.

We are making a last stand for our rights, and we are prepared to lose everything in this struggle rather than submit to economic conquest by the Jews.

With Jews coming into this country at the rate of over 60,000 a year, Arabs will be in a minority in ten years’ time. The Jews are building a paradise for themselves and a hell for the Arabs.

Already a third of the arable land has been bought up. Unless we have justice all Arabs will become wage-slaves.

The bitterness of Arab feeling is reflected in the widespread campaign of violence throughout the country. While there is a slight lull in the shooting and rioting, following police and military action, Palestine still echoes with the crack of rifles and the crash of bombs.

### TROOPS ENGAGE SNIPERS.

Early this morning Cameron Highlanders engaged in a half-hour skirmish with snipers on the Jerusalem-Nablus road. At Gaza 18 barricades were removed by police during the night, and the townsfolk, threatened with punitive measures, removed a blockage from the railway line.

Sticks of detonating gelignite were found on the railway line near Tel Aviv, and in a disturbance at Jafta, police opened fire and threw hand grenades.

So far over 900 Arabs have been arrested and 40 agitators placed under restraint. About 300 Jews have been arrested, the majority for breaking the curfew regulations.

## **#8. Kings of the earth, and the King of Kings. pp. 61 - 63**

In tracing the growing opposition that culminates in the terrible days with which this age ends, we find ourselves constantly dealing with the lives of kings and the character of their rule. At the end of the age, we read in Rev. xi.--

“The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ: and He shall reign unto the ages of the ages” (Rev. xi. 15).

It would appear from this passage that the kings and kingdoms of this world are inimical to the Kingdom of the Lord, and that the Lord will not reign until all other kings and kingdoms are set aside. In speaking of kings, we do not intend to differentiate between a Monarchy and a Republic, between Dictatorship and Democracy. All forms of government are included in the conception of sovereignty; and all rule, authority, and power must be placed beneath the feet of the Lord, before the end comes.

Having seen this fact concerning the end of the age, let us now leave the Book of the Revelation and trace the general record of kingship through the Scriptures. We shall notice, however, that, although we shall be leaving the Book of Revelation for the Book of Genesis, we shall still be dealing with the same characteristics, and even with the same geographical centre.

After the flood, Noah's three sons re-people the earth; and Ham's descendants soon assume the dominance.

“And Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord. Wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before

the Lord. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel . . . . Nineveh . . . . the same is a great city” (Gen. x. 8-12).

The name “Nimrod” is from the Hebrew *marad*, to rebel, so that the first kingdom to be established on earth is associated with “rebellion” and “confusion” (Babel). Moreover, this Kingdom was a usurpation, for it was the Divine plan that the king of God’s approval should come from the line of Shem. Further on in the same book we read: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah . . . . until Shiloh come” (Gen. xlix. 10). And Balaam, in Numb. xxiv., prophesied concerning the coming king: “A sceptre shall arise out of Israel” (Num. xxiv. 17). Kings were promised among the descendants of Abraham and Sarah (Gen. xvii. 6, 16) and of Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 11).

After the prophecies of Genesis we next meet with “another king”—the oppressing King of Egypt. It is surely significant that the title “King of Egypt” occurs in Exodus just thirteen times, this number being closely associated with rebellion and Satan.

The next kings of whom we read, in the Book of Numbers, are the kings of the Canaanites, Arad, Sihon and Og, and Balak, King of Moab (Num. xxi., xxii.). There is no need to enlarge upon the fact that each of these kings carries on the thought of Satanic rebellion.

In the Book of Deuteronomy, which completes the record of Moses, no new kings are introduced, but in chapter xvii. Moses foretells that Israel would say:--

“I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me” (Deut. xvii. 14).

Laws are given to regulate the King’s conduct, but these instructions and the prediction that such a time would come, do not alter the fact that Israel by so choosing were turning away from the Lord, and departing from His true purpose. It would appear that not only Saul, but all the kings that followed (even David and Solomon) were concessions to Israel’s evil choice rather than the direct will of the Lord. The laws that follow Deut. xvii. 14, were applied not only to Saul but to all the succeeding kings. Every king and every throne is in some measure an indication that the Lord is not yet accepted. Before He can reign, the kingdoms of the earth must pass away. The only kings that will be tolerated when the Lord sits upon His throne will be those who will form a kingdom of priests unto the Lord, and those kings of the earth who will bring their glory and honour to the light and rule of the Lamb in the New Jerusalem.

Before passing on to the Book of Joshua we give below three passages in the Law of Moses that look forward to the time of the end:--

“Melchisedec, *King* of Salem . . . . Priest of the Most High God” (Gen. xiv. 18).

“The shout of a *king* is among them” (Num. xxiii. 21).

“He was a *king* in Jeshurun” (Deut. xxxiii. 5).

In Josh. xii. 9-24 thirty-one kings are named as smitten by the victorious Israelites upon entering into their inheritance. The Book of Judges ends on the note: “There was

no king in Israel.” In the next book, Ruth, we have the name of Naomi’s husband Elimelech, which means “My God is King”. In I Sam. ii. Hannah’s song ends with the words “king” and “anointed” (I Sam. ii. 10). Later in the same book Saul is chosen king by the people, and David is chosen by God.

Turning to the Book of the Psalms, we read:--

“Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers of the people take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His anointed” (Psa. ii. 1, 2).

God’s answer to this spirit of rebellion is found in verse 6: “Yet have I set My King upon My holy hill of Zion.”

The opening pages of the N.T. record the birth of the King. The story of the Gospels, however, is one of rejection, and as “Kings of the Jews” the Lord of glory dies. Israel had already lost her kingship in the earth, and Nebuchadnezzar and his successors were occupying the throne. Now their rightful King is despised and rejected, and the times of the Gentiles run on their way until the crisis is reached in the clash of arms and other terrible events connected with the Beast and the brief reign of the ten kings, of which we read in the Apocalypse.

“The prayers of David, the son of Jesse” shall at length be answered (Psa. lxxii.) and many other glorious prophecies fulfilled, but not until heaven’s King is recognized as King of kings and Lord of lords can these prophecies of blessing be fulfilled and peace come to the earth.

It is hardly necessary, we trust, after having considered these things, to stress the importance of the movements of kings and rulers in interpreting the signs of the times. In our next article we hope to deal with Nebuchadnezzar’s dream which covers the whole course of Gentile dominion up to the time of the Coming of the Lord.

## #9. The Kings of the East pp. 81 - 83

In our previous study of the geographical changes that will take place at the time of the end, we referred to the passage in Isa. xi. which speaks of the “tongue of the Egyptian sea”:

“And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with His mighty wind shall He shake His hand over the river (which we saw was the river Euphrates) and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry-shod” (Isa. xi. 15).

There appears to be a further reference to this in Rev. xvi. 12, where we read:

“And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river, the Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the Kings of the East might be prepared.”

This seems to be a fuller explanation of Isa. xi. 15, revealing that among the “men” who will go over dry-shod, there will be eastern kings and their armies. That war is in view, the verses that follow make plain. Supernaturally evil influences gather the kings of the whole world to battle, and the battle-ground is Armageddon. This valley had already played an important part in Hebrew history, for here Deborah and Barak had destroyed Sisera (Judges iv. 19), and in Zech. xii. we find slaughter and lamentation associated with Megiddo (Zech. xii. 9-11).

Who are these “Kings of the East” that meets in arms in the land of Palestine before the end comes? We cannot say with any certainty, but if we listen to those who view these things from the standpoint of national defence and diplomacy, it seems evident that Japan must be included. If, moreover, it be true, as the writer we quote below claims, that Japan is moved by a great religious motive, we can the more readily understand the reference to demoniacal influence.

In *John Bull, June 13th, 1936*, there appeared an article by W. N. Ewer, an authority on Foreign Affairs, which contained the following statements:

At the other end of the world, a whole nation is convinced that it has divine mission to conquer and rule all the Far East. And not only the Far East, but all the world. That is why there is danger of war in Eastern Asia and in the Pacific, in which, should it come, Great Britain can hardly help being involved. Not so much because of Japan's economic need for expansion as because of Japan's religion. Economic wants can be met by compromise and concession. There is no compromising with a religion. And, as never before perhaps in history, imperial expansion is with the Japanese an article of religious faith, as binding as the obligation on a pious Christian to preach the gospel to the heathen. The Emperor is Akitsu-Kami, the Living God. The way of the Emperor is the Great Law of the Universe. The Divine Virtue of the Emperor must be extended to all parts of the world, equally and indiscriminately. That, quite seriously and earnestly, is the inspiration of Japanese policy.

When the new Japan was in the making, the Lord Hotta, one of its founders, laid down the line to be followed:--

Our object must always be to lay the foundation for securing hegemony over all nations. We must, when we are strong, punish the nations which are contrary to the principle. We must declare our protection over harmless nations. The nations of the world will come to look up to our Emperor as the Great Ruler of all the nations. They will follow our policy and submit to our judgment.

That was in 1858.

“In the middle of the twentieth century Japan will meet Europe on the plains of Asia and wrest from her the mastery of the world”, said Prime Minister Count Okuma.

That was in 1915.

“Our great missions from heaven are to promote our national expansion and to liberate the peoples of the Orient, who are groaning under the oppression of the white race”, wrote General Tada, Commander of the Japanese Army in China.

That was in 1936.

And the Japanese who dies for this mission, whether criminal or good man, general or private or common citizen, at the moment of shouting ‘Banzai’ to the Emperor, becomes united in the Great Life of the Universe and lives for ever as a guardian deity of the nation.

\* \* \* \* \*

For forty years Japan has been patiently, steadily, unremittingly, preparing the conquest of China. She has attacked from without, she has undermined from within: she has advanced, paused, even retreated: she has use money and arms, threats and cajolements. The means have been skillfully varied: the end has never changed.

Already she has carved out of China a continental empire far larger than her own territory. She took Formosa and the Pescadores in 1895, the Liaotung peninsula in 1905; she annexed Korea in 1910.

Those were the prelude. In 1931 came the big advance. In less than five years Japan had conquered and brought under her own dominion the three provinces of Manchuria, Jehol, and Chahar. She controls Hopei and Seiyuan, and can take them when she chooses. An area as big as half Europe, with a population as big as that of Germany, containing one of the biggest cities in Asia, with incalculable resources.

Mussolini’s conquest of Abyssinia is petty larceny by comparison with this great steal.

\* \* \* \* \*

Checked for the moment in Mongolia, the drive has turned again southward towards the heart of China. But it may turn, it may be forced to turn, westward again, to deal with the Chinese Communist armies (no negligible force) which are now in Shenshi and Kansu.

Suppose (it is more than likely) that Tokyo orders an “anti-Red” campaign: that the Red Armies (which are Chinese peasant armies) retreat westward to the Mongolian border: that they ask aid in their extremity from the Russians? Supposing a dozen other alternatives? Every time you come back to the stark facts. Japan, under the double influence of economic need and religious fervour, is moving forward steadily, unceasingly to the conquest of China, of all the East, of all Asia.

Accompany this article was a map with Japan depicted as the body of an octopus, with tentacles outstretched to Manchukuo, China, India, Sumatra, Borneo, the Philippine Islands, New Guinea, and North Australia.

Once again we would make it plain that *The Berean Expositor* has no politics. We neither approve nor disapprove, we merely record; and we do so only because these things, when viewed from the standpoint of prophecy, may throw some light on the events of the last days.

## #10. The trouble in Palestine. pp. 101 - 104

“Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about . . . . And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people: all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it” (Zech. xii. 2, 3).

It is evident from Scripture that Palestine and the people of Israel are to be the centre of world-wide controversy before the day of the Lord finally comes and settles the matter for ever. Already the elements of unrest, that will work like leaven through the nations, are becoming manifest. At the present time the ferment has been brought about by the resentment of the Arabs against the Jewish immigration into Palestine. We give below extracts from an article that appeared in the *Sunday Dispatch* for 14th June, 1936, by Emile A. Ghory, secretary of the Palestine Arab Party.

“He knows politics: began at school when he presented Lord Northcliffe with an address on injustices to Arabs in Palestine in 1922. Studied for four years in America, graduated Master of Arts in political science. Owned three newspapers in Palestine. They were all suppressed. Now he comes to tell Britain what the 100 million Arabs and Moslems under the Union Jack think of British handling of the situation; and what the other 250 million Mohammedans think of it.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“Britain is called upon to save her prestige in the East, to prove that she plays fair. Arabs in Palestine will die in maintaining the general strike rather than accept the annihilation which is inevitable if the present system continues.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“I am a Christian . . . . Twelve per cent (105,000) of the Arab population of Palestine are Christian. They are as active as the Moslems in opposing the influx of the Jews.

Every Arab there is convinced that Jewish immigration should cease and that Jews should be debarred from purchasing more land. We are really afraid of Jewish domination.

In 1918 there were 53,000 Jews in Palestine; in 1931 175,000.  
Now there are 400,000.

Immigration has gone far beyond the absorptive capacity of the country. Yet it still increases. Those figures are official. But they would be much greater if the Jews who have entered the country illicitly were included.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“Britain has 100 million Arabs and Moslems. They are being alienated by Zionism. Throughout the world there are 350 million Mohammedans. Palestine to them is a sacred land. It is important that British policy does not antagonize them.

Since Italy is establish in Abyssinia the route through the Suez is no longer permanently safe for British shipping.

Britain must have an alternative route from the Mediterranean to India and her other Eastern possessions, and that route lies through Arab lands. Their friendship is essential for the solidarity of British imperialism. But at present there is an increasing hostility to Britain because of the administration in Palestine.

Syria and Transjordanian joined the general strike, collected funds for it, organized protests. In Iraq the Arabs have formed committees to collect funds and to co-operate with the Arabs in Palestine. These Arabs threaten to march to the assistance of the Arabs in Palestine. The tribes are armed and war-like.

In Iraq the Officers of the army (which is Arab) state that they cannot hold their men much longer unless Jewish immigration to Palestine is stopped.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“We demand a constitutional government in which the populations will be represented proportionally to their numbers.

Under the mandate it was obligatory on Britain to establish self-governing institutions. Owing to Jewish pressure that has never been done.

We have, indeed, less freedom of Government under Britain than we had under the Turks.

We have appealed to Britain for 18 years.”

In the conflict between Jew and Arab, “Lawrence of Arabia” is being freely spoken of. King Feisal added a footnote in Arabic to the agreement signed in London on January 3, 1919, and it is being circulated that Lawrence “mellowed it down” considerably in his translation.

We give first Lawrence’s translation, and then a translation made direct from King Feisal’s own handwriting.

Being unable to read English, Feisal added a protective footnote to the treaty in Arabic. This, translated by Lawrence on to Dr. Weizmann’s copy and signed later by Feisal, reads as follows:--

“If the Arabs are established, as I have asked in my manifesto of January 4th addressed to the British Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs, I will carry out what is written in this agreement. If changes are made I cannot be answerable for failing to carry out this agreement.”

A photographic copy of Feisal’s own Arabic reveals stronger sentiments. It reads:--

“Should the Arabs obtain their independence, as asked in our report submitted to the British Foreign Office on January 4, 1919, I agree to what was included in the Articles herein, and should the slightest change or alteration take place I shall neither be responsible nor obliged for any word and this treaty will be considered null and void and of no consequence. Nothing whatsoever could be asked of me.”

These documents may prove to be of great historic interest later on as things develop, and the close association of an actual “King of Babylon” with the affairs and fate of the land of Israel must necessarily be of interest to all readers of the Scriptures.

In our next article we hope to give extracts from the reply made in the *Sunday Dispatch* by the Rev. M. L. Perlzweig, Director of Political Information of the Zionist Organization.

We make no comment. We have no political opinions to offer, either for or against. We give these extracts for what they are worth, as indicating a movement that we believe will grow, until it breaks out finally into the vast upheaval indicated by prophecy.

### **#11. Palestine, Arab and Jew. pp. 124, 125**

In the previous article of this series, we quoted some of the statements made by the Secretary of the Arab party in *The Sunday Dispatch*. The same newspaper also provided an opportunity for a Jewish leader, the Rev. M. L. Perlzweig, Director of Political Information of the Zionist Organization, to reply. The following is the short biographical note given by *The Sunday Dispatch*:--

“For nearly 20 years a leader of British Zionism. Was elected an international leader at the World Zionist Congress held at Lucerne last summer. Is chief of the Political Information Department. Graduated in History at London University and Oriental Languages at Cambridge. Was an active member of the Cambridge Union and was made a life-member of the committee. While an undergraduate he refused a request to stand as parliamentary representative for Cambridgeshire. He founded the Young Zionist Movement. Is chairman of the World Union of Jewish Students and is a rabbi at the largest synagogue in the British Empire.”

The following are some extracts from the article concerned:--

“One of the worst mistakes is to regard this strife as an armed conflict between Jews and Arabs. It is nothing of the sort. The Jews have all to lose and nothing to gain; above all, they want peace to develop and expand their property and trade in Palestine. So much Jewish capital is sunk in the country that it would be madness to want otherwise.”

“The Arabs point to the immigration figures and say that the Jews are swamping them. This charge cannot be substantiated by the facts. Since the war the Jewish population has increased by 350,000, while the Arab population has increased by 393,000. Before the coming of the British Mandate and the establishment of the Jewish National Home the conditions were so bad that there was a continual Arab emigration and the population

remained stationary. It is only since the arrival of the Jews that the process has been reversed. The immigration of Arabs into the country from purely Arab territories bordering Palestine is now continual and in many instances illegal.”

“The real object of the attack on the Jews is Britain. The chief centres of disturbance are places like Nablus, Jenin, Tulkarem and Gaza, where there are no Jews. The insurgents are a minority. They have no backing from the Muslims. The strike costs £3,000 a day, yet Arab contributions amount only to £1,000. The total expenditure on strike pay is estimated at £100,000. Where does the money come from? It is a point that asks for consideration and enquiry. Communist agitation has played its part in arousing on the Jews. The British troops have been subjected to subversive propaganda.”

“To the Arab world has been assigned Syria, Iraq, Egypt, Transjordan and Arabia. Why should anyone begrudge us a foothold in the country of our ancestors?”

Arab leaders are charging *Dr. Chaim Weizmann* with a breach of faith for publishing at this stage of the dispute his copy of the Arab-Jewish Treaty of Friendship.

“Dr. Weizmann had not the courage to produce the document in Feisal’s lifetime because he knew it would instantly be discredited. The most Dr. Weizmann could do in the past was to hint at its existence. Now Feisal is dead and cannot reply. If it is genuine why did not the Jews produce the document to the Shaw Commission in 1929?”

Mr. Arthur Lourie, Political Secretary of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, writes in reply to this charge:--

“May I point out that the full text of this treaty was published in the year 1924, many years before King Feisal’s death? It is to be found on pages 188-189 in Volume iii. of ‘Documents of the Peace Conference of Paris’ edited by David Hunter Miller (Legal Adviser to the American Delegation to the Peace Conference).”

The question of the rightful ownership of “the Land” is destined to be a factor of central importance in the controversy of the last days, and we can see even now the gathering forces that are preparing for the final outburst.

## **#12. The ships of Chittim (Dan. xi. 30). pp. 141 - 144**

The Mediterranean Sea is destined to be the highway for the great conflict of nations at the time of the end, with Palestine as the final battle-ground. Already there are important developments in this region that are causing the rulers of the earth to think seriously.

If we take a map of the world and draw a line from London to Sydney in Australia, the line will pass through North Italy, Palestine, Colombo and—very nearly—Singapore. Since 1869 this line has ruled the strategy of the British Navy. A great change, however, has come about in recent years. Italy has acquired possessions in Tripoli and, now that the aeroplane is an important factor, this places Malta in a precarious position. At the

other end of the Red Sea, Italy has now acquired possession of Abyssinia, and consequently, as things are at present, in time of war the Suez Canal would become a death-trap. In these circumstances it is not to be wondered at that the eyes of those who have the control of these things have turned to Cyprus, lying as it does so near to Palestine and within easy reach of the Suez Canal. The following is quoted from an article by Philip Jordan in the *News Chronicle* for 12th June, 1936:--

“What had been British strength is now British weakness. A menaced Red Sea means, perhaps, an untenable Mediterranean; for you cannot blow up one part of a by-pass without making the whole of it unfit for traffic.”

“Outside home waters British naval strategy was based on the Mediterranean as a highway for sea traffic; but it may well prove that Italian tactics have turned it into a lake from which, in time of trouble, British ships will find it difficult to leave in safety, for between Gibraltar and the Canal is a narrow channel separating Sicily from Tunis. It is guarded in the middle by Italy’s fortified island of Pantellaria.”

“The times are out of joint for pre- and post-war naval strategy. The Mediterranean, once a flowing tide of ships, may become the focal point in another war. In such a war the British fleet would suffer damage that might be irreparable. Its danger lies in its comparative immobility: its safety in the impregnable air base which lies at the eastern end of that land-locked sea. For Palestine is the hope of its salvation. Behind that narrow country lie the immeasurable deserts of biblical antiquity: before it, the sea.”

“Operating from a base out of range of any hostile navy or air force, the wings of Britain could spread themselves, rise and destroy and then return comparatively undamaged. Under the aegis of those wings now falls the safety of the Suez and of the wealth of Egypt; and under their aegis, in future, the Mediterranean must operate.”

The reader will see that it is inevitable that Palestine must figure largely in the future plans of the great conflicting nations of the earth.

There are several references in the Scriptures to a place called “Chittim”. This is the ancient name of the island of Cyprus, and is probably used in Scripture much as we use the term “The Levant”, including not only Cyprus itself but some of the coast-land of the adjacent countries. For the moment, however, we will leave the wider sphere and concentrate upon the island of Cyprus itself.

The references to Chittim are six in number: Num. xxiv. 24, Isa. xxiii. 1, 12, Jer. ii. 10, Ezek. xxvii. 6, and Dan. xi. 30. Of these references, the last is of most importance to us at the moment. The context speaks of the day when the “vile person”, who comes in peaceably and obtains the kingdom by flatteries, shall return from battle against the King of the South. And in verse 30 we read:--

“The ships of Chittim shall be against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return and have indignation against the holy covenant” (Dan. xi. 30).

The next verse, which speaks of the “abomination that maketh desolate”, fixes the time as being that of the end. It would appear that some sea power, associated with Cyprus, is to be an antagonist of this “vile person”, who is opposed to the holy covenant.

The history of Cyprus is briefly as follows. According to the earliest records we have, it was first colonized by the Phoenicians. From them it passed to the Greeks; and Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, Romans and Byzantines have since occupied it in turn. In 1878 a convention was concluded with the Sultan of Turkey, by virtue of which Cyprus was ceded to Great Britain, an annual tribute of £92,800 being paid to the Sultan. When Turkey entered the Great War in November 1914 the island was annexed by Great Britain.

The following map is taken from *The Observer* for 14th June, 1936.

### **- - - Illustration - - - (BE-XXVII.143).**

“ ‘Cyprus is the Key of Western Asia’, wrote Lord Beaconsfield to Queen Victoria in 1878. Sir Roland Stokes, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in Cyprus 1926-32 wrote: ‘Cyprus is an indispensable and might easily become an invaluable link in the chain of our Imperial defences.’ This saving possibility a grateful Empire owes to that practical visionary of genius, Beaconsfield. In Bismarck’s phrase: ‘*Der alte Jude, das ist der Mann*’.”

The following extracts are from an article by Captain Norman Macmillan, A.F.C., D.F.C., which appeared in the *Daily Mail* for 9th June, 1936.

“Italy has now turned from war conditions in Abyssinia to a process of colonization.”

“The construction of aerodromes in Abyssinia in recent months, and the creation of more that is now taking place, will enable the Italians to control that country as surely and certainly as the British Air Command controlled Iraq.”

“Cyprus is British. There we can do what we will. There is no need to negotiate treaties to determine what armed stations we create, what garrisons we employ.”

“Money expended there will be expended upon a part of Empire territory that is held in fee simple. There is no fief to local government, no qualified occupation under mandate from the treaties of the great war.”

“On the seaboard, concrete shelters could be provided for submarines, together with underground accommodation for oil, spares, victuals, and repair shops. Thus munitioned as a great submarine and air fortress, Cyprus could dominate the Eastern Mediterranean, and give us security for our trade route and possessions in and about that ocean.”

“By utilizing Cyprus as a base, we have it in our power to make provision for the safety of our people both at home and overseas. Let us get on with it before it is too late.”

“It can be made invincible if the Navy and the Air Force combine to make the principal Mediterranean base for British aircraft and submarines—Cyprus.”

To prevent the slightest misunderstanding we must state again that *The Berean Expositor* has no politics. We give the quotations above as signs of the times, but express no opinion either way thereon, for this lies entirely outside our province.

### **#13. Does Scripture say anything concerning war in the air. pp. 174 - 177**

A superficial reading of II Thess. ii. would lead one to believe that at the time of the end complete atheism will prevail, for in verse 4 we read:--

“Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God” (II Thess. ii. 4).

The phrase: “All that is called God, or that is worshipped” would include even false gods, and false worship. To such an extent will the ruler of the last days be opposed to any thought of God that he will tolerate no act of worship. And yet one god remains in spite of all, for this Man of Sin places himself in the temple, “showing himself that he is God”. So, when we turn to the passage in the Book of the Revelation which corresponds to II Thess. ii., we find, in a day when God will be denied, and the Beast shall open his mouth and blaspheme God and His name (Rev. xiii. 6), that all the world will wonder after the Beast, and will “worship the Dragon which gave power unto the Beast; and will worship the Beast, saying, Who is like unto the Beast? Who is able to make war with him?” (Rev. xiii. 4).

The word here translated “power” is *exousia*, and means “authority”:--

“All this authority (said the Devil) will I give Thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me: and to whomsoever I will give it. If Thou therefore wilt WORSHIP ME, all shall be Thine” (Luke iv. 6, 7).

Here is the direct contrast to Rev. xiii. 4. What Christ refused, the Man of Sin accepts.

Satan is called, in Eph. ii. 2, “The prince of the authority of the air”, and his agents are described as the “world-holders of this darkness” (Eph. vi. 12). There are only seven occurrences of *aer* (“air”) in the N.T. and there can be no doubt that the “air” in the commonly accepted sense of the word is intended. “They cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air” (Acts xxii. 23). Had the passage read “threw dust in their eyes” we might have felt that a figure of speech was intended out, but, as the passage stands, the meaning must be literal.

So I Cor. ix. 26: “beateth the air”, I Cor. xiv. 9: “speak into the air”, I Thess. iv. 17: “meet the Lord in the air”, are all to be taken literally. When we read in Rev. ix. 2 that the sun and the air were darkened, the reason given—the smoke coming out from the pit—is a sufficient explanation, and no figure need be introduced.

In Rev. xvi. we find the kings of the earth gathered together by demoniacal powers to battle. The place where they assemble is called *Armageddon*; and immediately this is stated, we read that the last of the seven vials is poured out into the “air” (Rev. xvi. 13-17).

Satan has the “authority of the air”. When he gives this authority to the Beast, the whole world realizes immediately that he is invincible, and their thoughts turn at once to war. The last of earth’s battles is to be fought at Armageddon, and it will be brought to an end when the angel pours out his vial into the “air”.

Leaving this passage for the moment, let us go back to the Apocalypse of the Old Testament, the Book of Daniel. The eleventh chapter reveals the character of the time of the end:--

“And the king shall do according to his will, and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods . . . . neither shall he regard the God of his fathers . . . . but in his estate shall he honour the god of forces . . . . Thus shall he do in the most strong-holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory” (Dan. xi. 36-39).

The Hebrew word *maoz*, “force”, occurs seven times in Dan. xi.:--

“Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to *strengthen* him” (xi. 1).

“Out of the branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the *fortress* of the King of the North” (xi. 7).

“His sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces (*chayil*, “army” as in Dan. xi. 7, 13, 25, 26): and one shall certainly come and overflow and pass through: then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his *fortress*” (xi. 10).

“Then he shall turn his face toward the *fort* of his own land” (xi. 19).

“And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of *strength*, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate” (xi. 31).

“He shall honour the god of *forces*” (xi. 38).

“In the *most strong* holds” (xi. 39).

The first reference in this chapter is to the angelic power that strengthened Darius the Mede when he became king over the realm of the Chaldees (Dan. ix. 1). The closing references are to the supernatural powers that will be involved by the Man of Sin.

One of the continual ascriptions of praise offered to God in the O.T. is that He is the Strength of His people, the same word *maoz* being used:--

“He is the saving *strength* of His anointed” (Psa. xxviii. 8).

“He is their *strength* in the time of trouble” (Psa. xxxvii. 39).

The Man of Sin is opposed to God and all His ways, and naturally turns elsewhere for strength. Psa. lii., while speaking in the first place of Doeg the Edomite, is prophetic also of the Man of Sin:--

“Is this the man that made not God his strength (*maoz*) . . . . and strengthened (*azaz*) himself in his wickedness?” (Psa. lii. 7).

Psa. lxxviii. is also prophetic of the time of the end. It speaks prophetically of Christ’s ascension: “Thou hast ascended on high” (verse 18), and also of His second coming: “His *strength* is in the clouds” (verse 34).

In the blessing pronounced by Moses, when he looks down the ages to the time of the end, he says:--

“There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, Who *rideth* upon the heaven *in thy help*, and in His excellency on the *sky*” (Deut. xxxiii. 26).

This is the prophetic answer to the world’s cry at the empowering of the Beast: “Who is like unto the Beast? Who is able to make war with him?” If the power of the Beast is the power of the “air”, it is equally true that the Deliverer of Israel “rides upon the heaven . . . . and on the sky”. In Psa. lxxviii., also, we read: “Who rideth upon the heavens” (Psa. lxxviii. 4, 33).

Isaiah speaks of the day to come when Israel will be tempted to trust in chariots and horses, instead of looking to the Holy One of Israel (Isa. xxxi. 1). This will be following the policy of the Man of Sin, “the man who made not God his strength”. After rebuking Israel for their trust in the arm of flesh, the passage goes on to speak of the deliverance that will be accomplished by the Lord:--

“So shall the Lord of hosts *come down* to fight for Mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. As birds *flying*, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem; defending also He will deliver it; and *hovering over* He will preserve it” (Isa. xxxi. 4, 5).

We are anxious not to fall into the mistake of misusing the prophets by attempting to prophesy ourselves. We simply draw attention to a series of facts, which have an obvious bearing on the subject before us, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. It is clear that the great world power at the time of the end will be considered invincible. Its leader will receive power from Satan, and will worship one god only, a “god of munitions” (Dan. xi. 38 Margin). As we also know that he will worship Satan it seems clear that this god of munitions must be Satan himself. The Scriptures refer to Satan as the Prince of the authority of “the air”, and it is the general conviction among all nations that supremacy in the air and world-wide dominion will, in the future, go together. It is clear also that the allusions to the deliverance of Israel by the Lord, Whose “strength is in the clouds”, Whose excellency is “on the sky”, and Who will at length defend Jerusalem “as birds flying”, cannot be explained away. The Second Coming of Christ is often associated with “clouds”, so much so that the Rabbins gave the Messiah the title: “The Cloud Comer.” Taking all these things into consideration the conclusion seems irresistible that we are living in days when the last weapon is being perfected, the weapon which will be used by Satan and his agents in their final bid for world power.

While we cannot help feeling saddened at the way in which all nations are preparing for Armageddon, we are thankful to know that there is another Power that is to be as

supreme in the air as in heaven and earth, and that at the critical moment it shall be said: “Behold, He cometh with clouds.” In that day the Wicked One shall be destroyed, the authority of the air shall be broken, and “the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ”.

# Light upon the purposes of prayer.

## #1. Revelation and realization.

pp. 95 - 99

From time to time we receive enquiries relative to the place of prayer, especially in the light of the revelation of the mystery. We therefore endeavour in these articles to suggest a word of help to all who may be seeking light upon this most important subject. It is not given to us however to write pages of matter “without the Book”. Our method is and must continue to be both expository and Berean in character, and we believe our readers would not have it otherwise.

If we make our search in the Scriptures regardless of dispensational divisions, we shall discover many precious lessons that belong to the matter of prayer, and which are true for all time. In so doing, however, we shall, unless we keep a watchful eye on the things that differ, be in danger of incorporating some items belonging to the prayers of one dispensation with those of another. For example, such an indiscriminate use of scripture would lead to the inclusion, as legitimate for the present time, of the practice of the anointing with oil and the prayer of faith for the saving of the sick, found in James v. 14, 15.

Again, thousands still use the prayer that includes the words: “Forgive us our debts, AS we forgive our debtors” (Matt. vi. 12), without ever realizing the weighty explanation added by the Lord in Matt. vi. 14, 15, and expanded into a parable in Matt. xviii. 21-35.

“So likewise shall My heavenly Father *do also unto you*, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses” (Matt. xviii. 35).

It seems fitting therefore to take our enquirers to their own dispensational scriptures, and we propose to illustrate the place and office of prayer in this dispensation by passages taken from the prison epistles.

To most of our readers the general outline of the epistle to the Ephesians will be familiar, and we shall not be under the necessity of occupying space by the setting out of the subject-matter before us. We suggest that any reader who is unfamiliar with the structure and general outline of the epistle would find much to help in this direction by consulting our latest book: “The Testimony of the Lord’s Prisoner”, or by using the Index to the bound volumes of *The Berean Expositor*.

The first prayer we have to consider is found in Eph. i. 15-19, which we will here quote so that all readers may have the actual passage before them.

“Wherefore, I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers, That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him; the eyes of your understanding being

enlightened: That ye may know what is the hope of His calling, and what is the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints: And what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe” (Eph. i. 15-19).

The first word of this passage is one of great importance, inasmuch as it shows us the relationship that is intended between the previous revelation of Eph. i. 3-14 and the subsequent prayer—“Wherefore (*dia touto*) because of this.” We perceive that the prayer is of a threefold nature:

- (1) What is the hope of His calling.
- (2) What is the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints.
- (3) What is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe.

Let us also be clear on this point, that the prayer is not that we may know what is the *calling*, or what is the *inheritance*, or what is *faith*—these are already known—but has to do with the expansion of these basic features with a view to the enrichment of the understanding. Now in Eph. i. 3-14 we have a threefold revelation.

- (1) The will of the Father (3-6).—This is His calling.
- (2) The work of the Son (7-12).—Here we find our inheritance.
- (3) The witness of the Spirit (13-14).—Here we first read of believing.

Here we have “wisdom and revelation”, but the prayer that follows is that we may have “the *spirit* of wisdom and revelation”. When this is given we shall not only know that we were chosen before the overthrow of the world, but we shall have the spirit of this choice. Not only shall we know that our blessings are all spiritual, and all in heavenly places, but we shall receive the *hope* of this high calling of God in Christ Jesus. So with the second part of the revelation, and the second clause of the prayer. The revelation shows that the inheritance forfeited by sin becomes ours by the redemption of Christ, and by His exaltation to headship over heaven and earth, “in Whom we have obtained an inheritance”. While the fact of the inheritance is there, and the security is revealed, the spirit of it is a subject which awaits the added prayer. Revelation makes the inheritance known: prayer reveals “What is the *riches* of the *glory* of His inheritance in the *saints*”. Surely we perceive the difference here.

So with the third part of the revelation and the third item of the prayer. Revelation has indicated the “word of truth, the gospel of your salvation” as the object of belief. This is accompanied by the “seal and the earnest”, but it is the office of prayer to reveal the spirit of this revelation, namely, “What is the exceeding greatness of His *power* to usward who believe”, and thereby the faith of the believer is associated with the risen and ascended Lord, a source of strength, indeed!

What do we learn then by this relation of prayer to revealed truth? Let us endeavour to illustrate it by a simple analogy. Without fear of contradiction or overstepping the bounds of fact, the revelation of truth contained in the scriptures may be represented by the figure of food. It is indeed a common scriptural figure.

Let us therefore suppose that ten persons sit down at the same table, and partake of the same dishes. It is evident that each guest's plate may contain the same element of food, but in no two cases will the results be exactly alike. In some cases full nourishment may be obtained from the food. In others mastication will be faulty, and again in others, digestive troubles will prevent the eater from getting the benefit from certain parts of the diet. In effect this is saying that the possession of *food* does not necessarily ensure that the possessor is *fed*. So also with the Word of God. If its mere possession meant illumination and salvation, all booksellers, printers and publishers who handled the sacred volume would be saved persons. The words of the Prayer Book are full of sound sense and doctrine which exhort to "read, mark, learn and *inwardly digest*". The lesson we learn from the connection of revealed truth with prayer in Eph. i. is just this one of the relation of food to digestion. The Scriptures supply the "wisdom and revelation", and prayer supplies "the *spirit* of wisdom and revelation", and just as "the body without the spirit is dead, being alone", so the printed page of the Word remains but "the letter" unless it be prayerfully partaken of and its truth spiritually digested.

One further feature before we conclude this article. This spirit of wisdom and revelation is in the "knowledge of Him". In article #35 of the Epistle to the Romans, we have discussed the various words translated "know". We will not repeat the whole process here, but merely quote one section which will suffice for our purpose.

"*Oida* is less personal than *ginosko*. It is allied to the verb "to see" whereas *ginosko* is allied to *nous*, "the mind". The word 'perceive' can well be substituted for the five occurrences given (in the article) under *oida*. Place the two passages together for comparison:

'I had not acknowledged (*ginosko*) sin, but by the law' (Rom. vii. 7).

'I had not perceived (*oida*) lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet' (Rom.vii. 7)."

The word translated "knowledge" is *epignosis*, the added *epi* (on) giving the sense not only of acknowledgement but of realization. The words: "That ye may know" in Eph. i. 18, are a translation of *oida*, "to perceive". Hence the "eyes of understanding being enlightened" precedes this prayer.

What we have discovered therefore comes to this. First, God must graciously give us the truth itself: apart from that we are unsaved and hopeless. Then, He must give "the spirit" of this wisdom and revelation, so that we may both "acknowledge" and "realize" Him, His calling, inheritance and our faith. Finally: the eyes of the understanding being enlightened, He can lead us on to "perceive" what is the *hope*, the *riches*, the *glory*, the *power*, apart from which the revelation of Scripture remains like undigested food, containing all the elements of life and growth and well being, but of no avail unless partaken of, digested, and converted to the use of the eater.

It should of course be realized that there has been no attempt in this article to deal with "What is the hope of His calling"—that has been considered in other articles. In this series we have kept to the subject before us, "Light upon the purposes of prayer", and have found that the teaching of Eph. i. 15-19 sheds some light upon the subject.

Our first finding, then, is that prayer is to the Word what digestion is to food. This calls for one further remark, obvious enough in daily life, but sometimes sadly missed in spiritual things. If, before it yields up its life-giving goodness, the Word necessitates prayer, prayer correspondingly needs the Word, for whoever heard of anyone growing strong and tall merely because he had a good digestion? A good digestion is valueless unless there be good food to digest: so prayer without the Word is a process without material. Prayer that is not ever and always acting upon the revealed truth of the Word will but lead to spiritual starvation. When both are together—the spiritual food and the spiritual digestion—then the Word will live and become the very food for spiritual growth.

If, to some, reference to the processes of digestion seems rather unseemly, such may be able better to appreciate the relation of the Word of God and prayer if expressed thus: *Revelation and realization*.

## **#2. Revelation and Anticipation.**

**pp. 137 - 139**

We have seen in Eph. i. the intimate connection that exists between the revelation of truth, and its realization. We now turn to the next great prayer of Ephesians, seeking further light upon the purpose of prayer. This prayer occupies a central place in the complete epistle, uniting by its position the seven sections of doctrine (Eph. i. - iii. 13) with the seven sections of practice (Eph. iv.-vi.). The place occupied by the prayer largely indicates its purpose. But, first, let us acquaint ourselves with the letter of the Word so that we may appreciate its spirit.

“For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of Whom the whole family of heaven and earth is named, That He would grant you according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith: that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God” (Eph. iii. 14-19).

We observed that the first prayer opened with *dia touto*, “because of this”, and we observe that this second prayer opens with *Toutou charin*. *Charin* is translated “for the sake of” in Titus i. 11, and this we adopt here to mark the distinction. We should next ask “For the sake of what” does the apostle bow his knees and pray? We look at the preceding context, with its revelation of the dispensation of the mystery, and upon reaching verse one of this chapter we once more meet with the words “For the sake of this”.

Upon examination, we shall discover that Eph. iii. 2-13 is a parenthesis, explaining and justifying the apostle’s claim to be the prisoner of the Lord for the Gentiles. The

connection therefore of the prayer of chapter iii. is really with the close of chapter ii., the closing section of which reveals the church as a temple fitly framed together, "buildd together for an habitation of God in spirit". "For the sake of this" is the prayer of the apostle. This habitation being "in spirit" he first prays for the strengthening of spirit in the inner man, with this object "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith". "Dwell" is *katoikeo*, "habitation" is *katoiketerion*.

Here we may see one of the purposes of prayer. Collectively and dispensationally we are a temple, a dwelling place for God in Spirit. This is revelation; prayer leads to realization. The Scripture reveals the glorious calling of the whole church; prayer makes it an individual appropriation. Prayer desires that what is true of me as one of a great company, shall in some measure be experienced by me as an individual believer. We are however warned against a selfish isolation in this quest for experimental realization, for the prayer indicates that the mightiest realization of all can only be as we "comprehend with all saints". So also the earlier preparation of the prayer. "The whole family in heaven and earth" is placed prominently before us. This prayer really ranges the whole revelation already given in the first three chapters of Ephesians, turning revelation into realization.

The comprehension of breadth, length, depth and height, takes account of the four great distinguishing features of the revelation of the mystery. Breadth is mentioned first, in iii. 6, where the threefold equality of the new calling is indicated. Such breadth had never before been known. Such being our blessed privilege, the prayer is that we may enter into its fullness. The length is found in ii. 7 and i. 4, where in the working out of this great purpose the ages to come are linked with the period before the overthrow of the world. Depth and height are both indicated by the revelation of ii. 6, "raised us up" and "made us sit together in heavenly places", Eph. ii. 11, 12, revealing the abject character of those thus raised up, aliens, strangers, Christless, hopeless, godless. While "exceeding power" is the climax of the first prayer, "knowledge-exceeding love" is the heart and centre of the second. We have not yet reached the goal of this second prayer, however, for spiritual strength, experimental realization of the "temple" character of our calling, the mighty comprehension of breadth, length, depth and height, and the even mightier attempt "to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge", are but steps to that goal.

"In order that you may be filled unto all the fullness of God" (Eph. iii. 19).

"The fullness" is the goal of the ages. In its first occurrence in Matt. ix. 16 the word so translated is used to indicate the opposite of a "rent" or "schism". This "rent" was in mind when "The whole family in heaven and earth" was named. It was in mind when the heading up of all things in heaven and earth was revealed, in Eph. i. 10. The purpose of this prayer is nothing less than the believer should be led so to acknowledge Christ as His Head, so to take his place in the mighty scheme, so to anticipate that day when every knee shall bow, so to anticipate that day when God shall be all in all, that, as expressed in the language of the poet, he may be able to say: "I feel now the future on the instant."

Prayer links us to the revealed purpose. Prayer enables us most earnestly to desire the accomplishment of that purpose, and prayer creates the desire in the heart that what shall

yet be true of the whole, in the future, shall be true of me, in my degree and capacity, now, in the present. We may by its power become “living epistles” indeed. We may each become an embodiment of anticipation of the ages to come.

If therefore we were able to sum up our first examination and say that the relationship of the Word and prayer could be expressed as revelation and realization, we can now take a step further and say that prayer leads to realization, comprehension, and, above all, personal anticipation of the truth of divine revelation. It is much like that “faith which is the substance of things hoped for”. We sometimes hear our children singing: “Make the Book live to me, dear Lord.” This is the office of prayer, and the goal of this prayer is particular and personal anticipation of the divine purpose.

### **#3. Revelation and Participation.** **pp. 177 - 179**

There is one more prayer used in the epistle to the Ephesians that will throw light upon the “purposes of prayer” in this dispensation of the mystery. The first prayer had relation to the three items of revelation given in Eph. i. 3-14, and led into the spirit of this revelation, acknowledging Him, and perceiving what are the hope, riches and power belonging to this calling. The second prayer led to the desire that what God planned to do when the ages should reach their goal, He might do in us, in spirit, now, as a small yet real anticipation of that day. The third prayer has not the vastness of scope of the second, but is more intimate and personal. Let us have the passage before us.

“Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds; that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak” (Eph. vi. 18-20).

The great basis of the two prayers just considered was the revelation of truth contained in the Scriptures. This revelation should ever have this basic place in our hearts and minds. Alas, the reverse is often the case. We do not always “seek first the kingdom of God”, but are much more concerned with what we shall eat, and what we shall drink, or wherewithal we shall be clothed. These things are known unto God, and prayer is not to be used merely as a means of satisfying our temporal needs, but for satisfying the more pressing needs of the spirit.

When we examine this prayer of Eph. vi., we find a blending of scriptural facts with personal affairs. We have only to continue a perusal of the chapter to find that this prayer was the expression of a desire to turn all the apostle’s circumstances to good account; consequently, after asking for the prayers of the Ephesian church the apostle adds,

“But that ye also may know my affairs” (*ta kata eme*, balancing in the first prayer *ten kath humos pistin*), “and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things, whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts” (Eph. vi. 21-22).

In this passage we meet once more the two words for “know”, *oida* and *ginosko*:

“In order that you may *perceive* the things according to me (my affairs), and what I am doing.”

“In order that you may *know* the things concerning me” (*peri*, around me, my circumstances).”

What were Paul’s affairs, doings, circumstances? We can only surmise in the light of his epistles and the close of the Acts, from which we get some idea of the facts of his imprisonment. The more we know of the conditions of prison life at that time, the more urgent does Paul’s need appear. Yet let us observe that before sending Tychicus to tell them all his affairs, Paul had already limited the prayers of the Lord’s people on his behalf. He does not ask them to pray for his deliverance. Why? He was the prisoner of the Lord, and such a prayer would therefore express dissatisfaction with his position and consequent disloyalty to his Lord. Why does he not ask for assistance that his lot might be made more tolerable? It was because of what he had already told the Philippians when he said that he had learned a quieting and steadying lesson that made such prayers superfluous.

“I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, to be independent. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound; everywhere and in all things I am instructed to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me” (Phil. iv. 11-13).

But if Paul asks prayer neither for deliverance, nor amelioration of his prison lot, for what will he ask? The answer is that his great concern was his own faithfulness to the ministry which God had given him.

He asked for “utterance”, *logos*; he asked that he might open his mouth “boldly”, his great desire being “to make known the mystery of the gospel”. He was a prisoner. Yes, but that fact impinged upon his very ministry and their prayers. The only place that Paul would allow his imprisonment to have in the prayers of the saints on his behalf was that he might be enabled to live in full accord with its meaning and import.

“The mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds.”

His language here is a glorious testimony to the power of faith. Where we might have said “prisoner” he says “ambassador”, and who would ask the prayers of the saints that the Lord’s ambassador be dismissed?

Here, then, is a third purpose of prayer. Prayer was not to be used to accomplish deliverance from prison or soften its austerities, but rather to enable the servant of Christ to triumph over them, and make them subserve the Lord’s will and purpose.

Circumstances may enchain us; “our affairs”, if described in the language of men, may seem mean, poor, colourless, miserable. Prayer lays hold of these circumstances, and the prison wall cannot prevent the truth from sounding out to the whole Gentile world. The prisoner becomes the honoured ambassador of the Most High, and his desires are so far above the, by comparison, mere pressure of outward circumstances that, as a matter of consideration, they cease to exist. He knows a holy independence of them all, and his one concern is for personal faithfulness.

The three prayers of this Epistle may therefore be summed up as follows:

- (1) Revelation turned into Realization (Eph. i. 15-19).
- (2) Revelation turned into Anticipation (Eph. iii. 14-19).
- (3) Revelation turned into Participation (Eph. vi. 18-22).

#### **#4. Root and Fruit. pp. 213 - 215**

The prayers recorded in any one book of the Bible will necessarily take their colouring from the special aspect of truth characterizing that book. This we have seen exemplified in the three prayers of Ephesians. The basic truth of the dispensation of the mystery is never absent from these three prayers.

In the pursuit of our enquiry we next turn to Philippians. In Chapter i. 9-11 of this Epistle we have the apostle’s prayer for those who had had such fellowship with him in the gospel as eclipsed the efforts of all other assemblies.

“And this I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment. That ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ; being filled with the fruits of righteousness which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.”

When considering the three prayers found in Ephesians we did not attempt an analysis of the Epistle, nor can we here give an analysis of the Epistle to the Philippians. Suffice it to say that the key words of Ephesians, namely “Head”, “Body”, “Mystery” and “Fullness” are absent, and, instead, we have “No reputation”, “Prize”, “Striving as athletes”, “Fellowship of His sufferings”, etc. Philippians, instead of dealing with the “ground and the root”, is more concerned with the “fruit”. Instead of stressing a salvation which is not or works, it urges believers to “work out their own salvation”. Instead of “access with boldness” we have fear and trembling” and “if by any means”. In this prayer for the Philippians it is the love of the believer that is in view, “that your love may abound”, whereas in the Ephesian prayer it is “the love of Christ” that is central. We do not usually think of abounding love and keen discernment together, yet it is for this that the apostle prays. The word “judgment” is *aisthesis*. Etymologically this word means “perception by the external senses” such as seeing or hearing something, etc.

*Aistheterion* means the organ of sensation, and in the definitions of Galen, the *aistheterion* is defined as “the organ to which any sense is entrusted—either the eye, or the nose, or the tongue”. For this word we turn to Heb. v. 14.

“But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age (perfect) even those who by reason of use have their senses (sense organs) exercised to discern both good and evil.”

It has been our earnest contention for years, that the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to the Philippians, though they ministered to two distinct companies, were nevertheless parallel. The above occurrences of *aisthesis* and *aistheterion* are all that are to be found in the N.T., and the passage in Hebrews helps us to understand the prayer of Philippians. Heb. v. deals with the sufferings of Christ and with His being made perfect. Phil. iii. deals with fellowship with His sufferings and the believer being made perfect.

The idea of perfection is expressed in the terms of growth, from babyhood to manhood, from the period when senses, though possessed, are unexercised, to that in which they are put to full use; from mere knowledge to discrimination. While the component parts of *aisthesis* speak of the physical senses, the usage of the N.T. is against the interpretation that the etymology suggests, namely, “sensibility”, and it must not be forgotten that the usage of a word is of even more importance than its composition. In this case the usage would indicate something akin to “perception”, “discernment”, “discrimination”, with the underlying thought of the spiritual equivalent of the five senses. The prayer of Phil. i. is for growth: that abounding love may quicken every spiritual sense: that the eyes of the understanding, opened in Eph. i., may now be quickened to discern and approve differences and excellencies. That the spiritual ear may be enabled ever to distinguish between the Word of truth and its counterfeit, and that the other spiritual senses may, by reason of use, be enabled to discriminate in their various functions. This immediately follows in the prayer itself, “That ye may approve things that are excellent” or, as the margin puts it, “That ye may approve things that differ”.

*Dokimazo*, the word translated “prove” and “try” must never be dissociated, in the mind, from the testing or trying of metals. Peter uses it in full recognition of this sense, when he says:

“That the trying (*dokimion*) of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried (*dokimazo*) with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ” (I Pet. i. 7).

Philippians has in view the day of Christ, and the glory and praise of God.

The idea of growth is still employed in the expression of the desire for the more advanced “fruits of righteousness”.

Here therefore the goal before the Apostle in the prayer is the growth, the adulthood, and the perfecting of the believer. That the root should bear fruit; that the senses should be exercised; that life should manifest itself in living. In view of this conception of root,

growth and fruit, the twofold ministry of the Word and prayer can be easily expressed in the language of the apostle.

“I have planted (the root, the Word), Apollos watered (the growth, the prayer), but God gave the increase” (in both),

for revelation is *from* Him and prayer is ever *to* Him.

## Notes and jottings from an old Bible.

### #10. Exodus vi. 4-8.

p. 39

"I HAVE" ..	Exod. vi. 4. . .	Irrevocable Covenant . . . . .	Established.
"I HAVE" ..	Exod. vi. 5. . .	Omniscient Sympathy . . . . .	Heard.
"I HAVE" ..	Exod. vi. 5. . .	Immutable Faithfulness . . . . .	Remembered.
"I AM" ..	Exod. vi. 6. . .	The Unchanging One . . . . .	The Lord.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 6. . .	Bands of Love . . . . .	Jer. xxxi. 3.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 6. . .	Deliverance . . . . .	Isa. lxiii. 1.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 6. . .	Redemption . . . . .	Exod. xv. 13.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 7. . .	Possession . . . . .	Isa. xliii. 21.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 8. . .	New Earth Anticipated . . . . .	Rev. xxi. 3.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 8. . .	Covenant fulfilled . . . . .	Gen. xv. 18.
"I WILL" ..	Exod. vi. 8. . .	Heritage Given . . . . .	Psa. xlvii. 4.
"I AM" ..	Exod. vi. 8. . .	The Great Guarantee . . . . .	The Lord.

### #11. The Word a Whetstone.

p. 99

It gives EDGE to our testimony . . . . .	Acts ii. 37.
KEENNESS to our vision . . . . .	Acts xvii. 11, 12.
COURAGE in our ministry . . . . .	II Tim. ii. 15.
INTENSITY to our love . . . . .	Acts xvi. 14, 15.
ALERTNESS to our faith . . . . .	Acts xvi. 33, 34.
TONE to our spiritual life . . . . .	Psa. i. 2, 3.
EQUIPMENT for service . . . . .	II Tim. iii. 16, 17.

It is possible that the above outline was taken from the writings of the late *C. H. Spurgeon*, to which we believe were added notes as to the Word being a KEY-STONE in preaching, doctrine, etc.; a GRAVE-STONE for self and pride; a FOUNDATION-STONE upon which to build; and a LODGE-STONE to draw out our love and faith.

**#12. Separation.**  
**p. 125**

BY COMMAND . . . . .	“Be ye separate” (II Cor. vi. 17).
BY GIFT . . . . .	“Which Thou gavest Me out of the world” (John xvii. 6).
BY CALLING . . . . .	“Called you out of darkness” (I Pet. ii. 9).
BY REDEMPTION . . . . .	“That He might deliver us from this present evil world” (Gal. i. 4).
BY POWER . . . . .	“Keep them from the evil” (John xvii. 15).
BY NEW LIFE . . . . .	“Awake . . . . . arise from the dead’ (Eph. v. 14).
FROM LOVE OF GOD . .	“Nothing can separate” (Rom. viii. 38, 39).

**#13. “I am my beloved’s, and my beloved is mine”**  
**(Song of Solomon vi. 3).**  
**p. 219**

I AM HIS BY CHOICE . . . . .	Eph. i. 4; John xv. 16.
I AM HIS BY GIFT . . . . .	John vi. 37; xvii. 2, 6, 24.
I AM HIS BY CREATION . . . . .	John i. 3; Eph. ii. 10.
I AM HIS BY PURCHASE . . . . .	I Cor. vi. 19, 20.
I AM HIS BY CONQUEST . . . . .	II Cor. ii. 14 (R.V.); Rom. i. 1.
I AM HIS BY CESSION . . . . .	Rom. vi. 13; xii. 1.
I AM HIS BY UNION . . . . .	John xv. 4; Gal. ii. 20.

## **The powers that be.**

*(Being a series of studies of Roman history,  
and Roman laws and customs,  
in so far as they throw light upon the N.T. narrative).*

### **#1. The Edicts of Julius Caesar in favour of the Jews. pp. 163 - 166**

“The faith of God’s elect and the truth which is after godliness” (Titus i. 1) may at first sight seem rather far removed from such mundane things as Roman laws. And yet, when we remember that the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians was a prisoner in Rome, and that he was not only a Hebrew, but also a Tarsian, a freeman and a Roman citizen, we begin to realize that there is some connection. The apostle Paul was protected by several Roman governors, and was the instrument for the conversion of at least one (Sergius Paulus: Acts xiii. 12). He reasoned with another on the subject of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come (Acts xxiv. 25), while yet another, King Agrippa, had said upon hearing his defence: “Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian” (Acts xxvi. 28).

Not only does Paul come into direct touch with Rome and its law, but in connection with the Saviour Himself—at His birth, at the commencement of His public ministry, at His trial and at His crucifixion under Pontius Pilate—there is a series of points of contact with the Roman power. We remember also that both Paul and his Lord have something to say about paying tribute and recognizing authority. Taking all these things into account, therefore it would seem that a knowledge of Roman history and Roman laws would provide valuable sidelights upon the New Testament. We are nevertheless aware that it is not every reader who will find the subject of great interest, and we do not intend to give prominence to a study which is, after all, a side-issue. The articles of this series will be kept within modest bounds so that more important Scriptural exposition shall not be crowded out, but we hope that no reader will find the subject so uninteresting that he cannot find at least one item each time that will prove of use in the study of the Word of God.

The Roman Emperors who figure in the New Testament are: Augustus, Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero. Before we speak of these rulers, however, we will go back a little before the birth of Christ to Julius Cæsar, whose influence, both among the Jews and in the Roman world, was very strong, both in the days of our Lord and of His apostles.

Julius Cæsar was the first of the Roman Emperors, and died by assassination in B.C.43. The important point with which we are concerned at the moment is his attitude towards the religion of the Jews. When we remember the jealous way in which Rome looked upon any political movement within the Empire, prohibiting public meetings and allowing no tax-gathering to be undertaken apart from its own agents, it is at first a matter

of some surprise that the Jews should have been permitted to maintain their Sabbaths, to exact tribute, and to gather together from all parts of the Roman Empire to keep the feast at Jerusalem, not only with the approval of Rome, but under its protection. These privileges were largely due to the decrees of Julius Cæsar, which, in substance, were as follows.

The first decree was issued in B.C.47 as a recognition of the assistance that Hyrcanus, the High Priest, had rendered during the Alexandrian war.

“Caius Julius Cæsar, imperator and high priest, and dictator the second time, to the magistrates, senate, and people of Sidon, sendeth greeting. If you be in health, it is well. I also and the army are well. I have sent you a copy of that decree, registered on the tables, which concerns Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander, the high priest and ethnarch of the Jews, that it may be laid up among the public records; and I will that it be openly proposed in a table of brass, both in Greek and in Latin. It is as follows:--

I, Julius Cæsar, imperator the second time, and high priest, have made this decree, with the approbation of the senate: Whereas Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander the Jew, hath demonstrated his fidelity and diligence about our affairs, and this both now and in former times, both in peace and in war, as many of our generals have borne witness, and came to our assistance in the Alexandrian war with fifteen hundred soldiers; and when he was sent up by me to Mithredates, showed himself superior in valour to all the rest of that army: for this reason I will that Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander, and his children be ethnarchs of the Jews, and have the high-priesthood of the Jews for ever, according to the customs of their forefathers, and that he and his son be our confederates; and that beside this, every one of them be reckoned among our particular friends. I also ordain, that he and his children retain whatsoever privileges belong to the office of the high priest, or whatsoever favours have been hitherto granted to them; and if at any time hereafter arise any questions about the Jewish customs, I will that he determine the same; and I think it not proper that they should be obliged to find us winter quarters, or that any money should be required of them” (*Josephus Ant. xiv. x. 2*).

The next decree ordained:

“That he, as himself the high priest and ethnarch of the Jews, defend those that are injured.”

“This (comments Lewin) was a concession of no little practical consequence. The most beneficial laws would be utterly worthless, if their provisions could be broken with impunity. Now, however, that the relation of patron and clients was established between the High Priest, and the Jews of all countries, if any one suffered wrong the High Priest had authority to make a formal complaint; either to the Proconsul or to the Emperor, and the High Priest’s ambassadors were to have a free passage for the purpose.”

Another edict permitted the Jews to possess Jerusalem and encompass the city with walls, while yet another exempted them from paying tribute on what “they call the Sabbatical Year because thereon they neither receive the fruits of their trees nor do they sow the land”.

Finally, Julius Cæsar wrote:

“The Jews of Delos, and some other Jews that sojourn there, in the presence of your ambassadors, signified to us, that, by a decree of yours (the inhabitants of Parium, a city

of Mysia), you forbid them to make use of the customs of their forefathers, and their way of sacred worship. Now it does not please me that such decrees should be made against our friends and confederates, whereby they are forbidden to live according to their own customs, or to bring in contributions for common suppers and holy festivals, while they are not forbidden so to do even at Rome itself.”

In the earlier part of his book Josephus promises that he will reproduce all the public decrees of the Romans in favour of the Jews. He actually writes out a number of them, which, if cited in these pages, would occupy more than one issue of this magazine, but finding so many more, he apologizes for not transcribing them all. We trust that by the perusal of the few extracts we have given, the reader will have realized something of the value of being acquainted with Roman history as it bears upon the story of the N.T.

We append a list of all references in the N.T. to the Emperors of Rome, and make our quotations from the R.V.

AUGUSTUS.—“There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled” (Luke ii. 1).

TIBERIUS.—“In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar” (Luke iii. 1).

“Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? . . . . They say unto Him, Cæsar’s. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s” (Matt. xxiii. 17-21; Mark xii. 14-17; Luke xx. 22-25).

“If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar’s friend; every one that maketh himself king speaketh against Cæsar” (John xix. 12).

“Forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that He Himself is Christ a King” (Luke xxiii. 2).

CLAUDIUS.—“A great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar” (Acts xi. 28).

“These all act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar” (Acts xvii. 7).

“Claudius has commanded all Jews to depart from Rome” (Acts xviii. 2).

NERO.—“Nor yet against Cæsar, have I sinned at all . . . . I am standing before Cæsar’s judgment-seat . . . . I appeal unto Cæsar . . . . Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? unto Cæsar shalt thou go” (Acts xxv. 8, 10, 11, 12).

“Fear not Paul; thou must stand before Cæsar” (Acts xxvii. 24).

“I was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar” (Acts xxviii. 19).

It will be seen from this list that Cæsar’s rule, at the time of the birth, ministry and death of Christ, through the history of the Acts and latent in the very title of Paul “the prisoner”, is a factor which we cannot ignore without loss.

## #2. Augustus, and the Taxing under Cyrenius (Luke ii. 1, 2). pp. 204 - 207

“And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed, and this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria” (Luke ii. 1, 2).

With these words Luke introduces the circumstances of the Saviour’s birth.

Cæsar Augustus, whose original name was Gaius Octavius, was the son of a niece of Julius Cæsar, and was adopted by him as his son and heir. We shall have to speak more particularly on the subject of Roman adoption in a future article, and we therefore refrain from giving more detailed comment here. According to custom, Octavius changed his name upon being adopted, and called himself Gaius Julius Cæsar Octavianus. The murder of Julius Cæsar threw the Roman world into a state of chaos, from which the figures of Mark Antony and young Octavian soon emerged as protagonists. At the age of thirty-three Octavian became the master of the world. Julius Cæsar had been assassinated by those who were anxious to safeguard the state as a Republic. Octavian endeavoured to further his predecessor’s general aims but without perpetuating his fatal error.

“The system of the Imperial government, as it was instituted by Augustus, and maintained by those princes who understood their own interest and that of the people, may be defined as an absolute monarchy disguised in the form of a commonwealth. The masters of the Roman world surrounded their throne with darkness, concealed their irresistible strength, and humbly professed themselves the accountable ministers of the senate, whose supreme decrees they dictated and obeyed” (*Gibbon*).

The Senate conferred upon Octavian the following titles: *Augustus*, a name that is translated *Sebastos* in the Greek, and is almost a claim of Divine honours; *Pater Patriæ*, “Father of his country”; and *Princeps*, “First citizen”. The Senate also invested him with the power of *Tribune* and *Imperium*, the latter giving him absolute control over the army.

*Augustus* reigned from B.C.27 to A.D.14. He established the *Pax Romana* (the “Roman Peace”), and of him it was said that he “found Rome of brick and left it of marble”. The literary and intellectual life of Rome reached its highest point under his rule, and, speaking relatively, it is true to say:

“His course was wise and beneficent; literature and the arts flourished under his auspices; good laws were enacted; and he was in many respects deserving of the lavish praise heaped upon him by the writers of that time” (*Maunder*).

Augustus repeated and enforced the edicts of Julius Cæsar in favour of the Jews. The edict of Augustus contains the following statement with reference to Hyrcanus:

“Whereas the nation of the Jews, and the High Priest Hyrcanus, have proved themselves loyal to the Roman People, not only at the present juncture, but also in the time of my father Cæsar the Emperor, be it enacted by me and my council, with the

sanction of the Roman People, that the Jews do use their own customs according to the law of their fathers, as they used them in the time of Hyrcanus, the High Priest of the Most High God” (*Josephus Ant. xvi., v. 2*).

It is interesting to observe that the Greek words here are *Theou hupsistou*, “Most High God”, the same words as are used in the Septuagint version of Nebuchadnezzar’s ascription in Dan. iv.

The decree set in motion by Augustus, that sent every Jewish family back to the city of their tribe, unwittingly brought about the fulfillment of the prophecy that the Messiah should be born in Bethlehem, for Joseph would most certainly not have allowed his wife to undertake the fatigue of such a journey, when she was within a few weeks of giving birth to a child, unless there had been some such edict that could not be disobeyed.

The statement that this taxing took place when Cyrenius was governor of Syria (Luke ii. 1) has caused a great deal of thought and criticism, and there have been many who have set aside Luke’s record as both unhistorical and impossible. Until recently the critics have rejected Luke ii. 1 on four counts:

- (1) Augustus did not issue a decree for a census.
- (2) Under the Empire there was never any regular system of census.
- (3) Where there was a casual census, only the husband’s presence was necessary.
- (4) And his presence was not required at his original home.

Luke implies by the word “first” that this census was the beginning of a series that followed. Pliny, in his *Natural History, vii. 48 (159)*, tells us that, during the census taken under Claudius in A.D.48, a man living at Bologna entered his age as 150. This excited the curiosity of Claudius, who investigated the records of previous enrolments and corroborated the entry. This proves beyond question that there had been a series of enrolments, and that they were accessible for investigation in A.D.48.

Tacitus also mentions a census in A.D.61 and we know that Vespasian and Titus were Censors in A.D.73-74.

Clement of Alexandria says that Christ was born “in the 28th year, when first they ordered enrolments to be made”. Tertullian says that the Saviour was born when a census was being made in Syria by Sentius Saturninus, and Josephus places the governorship of Sentius as 8-6B.C.

Recent discoveries in Egypt have thrown more light upon Luke’s statement, and evidence is now available of a census system in operation in Egypt from A.D.90 to A.D.258. In this system we find that every man had to return to his own home or birthplace.

For example, an order issued in A.D.104 reads:

“That all who for any reason whatever are away from their own homes should return to their homes to enroll themselves.”

In A.D.154 we find a text showing the operation of the law:

“If any person . . . . is found straying on alien land, he shall be arrested and brought before me as no longer merely suspect but actually a confessed malefactor.”

We find the same law in force in Egypt, in Thrace, and in Palestine.

In 1912 Professor Ramsay discovered an inscription at Antioch *which reads*:

“To Gaius Caristianus (Son of Gaius, of Sergia tribe) Fronto Caesianus Juletus, Chief of engineers, pontifex priest, prefect of P. Sulpicius, Quirinius, prefect of M. Servillius. To him first of all men at state expense by decree of the decuriones, a statue was erected.”

“Quirinius” is the “Cyrenius” of Luke ii. 2 and this inscription shows that he was elected chief magistrate of the colony of Antioch and that he had nominated Caristianus to act as his prefect.

It is beyond our purpose to go into all the proofs that Sir William Ramsay has brought forward to establish the date of Luke ii. 2. It is sufficient to state that the discoveries he has made in Asia Minor “confirm the correctness of all the facts that Luke mentions regarding the census and its manner and its date”.

In conclusion we would remind the reader that all arguments found in commentaries written before 1910 were written without the evidence now available and should therefore be read with discernment.

## The Epistle to the Romans.

### #62. The Goal: Conformity to the Image of His Son.

#### (1) An examination of difficult words (viii. 29, 30).

pp. 32 - 37

We now commence the study of another member of the structure of Rom. viii., namely, verses 29 and 30. This member corresponds to verses 5-15, as follows:--

B | 5-15. Led by Spirit of Christ. SONS now (*huios*).  
B | 29, 30. Conformed to the image of His SON then (*huios*).

“For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the Firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified” (Rom. viii. 29, 30).

The analysis of the passage is simple, and is as follows:--

A | PREDESTINATION.—Conformity. Steps leading to.  
B | PURPOSE.—Christ. Firstborn among many brethren.  
A | PREDESTINATION.—Glory. Steps leading to.

But before we can appreciate its magnificence we shall have to arrive, with some certainty, at the meaning of several of the words used.

*Foreknowledge*.—How are we to understand this word? The word *proginosko*, to foreknow, occurs five times in the N.T., and the noun, *prognosis*, twice, making seven references in all. The passages are as follows:--

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

“My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; which *knew* me from the beginning” (Acts xxvi. 4, 5).

“For whom He did *foreknow*, He also did predestinate” (Rom. viii. 29).

“God hath not cast away His people which He *foreknew*” (Rom. xi. 2).

“Elect according to the *foreknowledge* of God the Father” (I Pet. i. 2).

“Who verily was *foreordained* before the foundation of the world” (I Pet. i. 20).

“Ye, therefore, beloved, seeing ye *know* these things *before*” (II Pet. iii. 17).

It will be observed that the usage subdivides this list into three groups. (i.) *God*.—It is used of God in connection with Christ and His sacrifice for sin. (ii.) *God*.—It is used of God in connection with His people who are called the elect, or the chosen. (iii.) *Man*.—It is used of man in the sense of knowing beforehand, or of having previous information. The grouping of these occurrences may be made more evident if set out as follows:--

- A | Reference to Christ and His sacrifice (Acts ii. 23).
- B | Reference to man and his previous knowledge of facts (Acts xxvi. 4, 5).
- C | Reference to the elect people of God (Rom. viii. 29; xi. 2; I Pet. i. 2).
- A | Reference to Christ and His sacrifice (I Pet. i. 20).
- B | Reference to man and his foreknowledge as a result of scriptural testimony (II Pet. iii. 17).

Commentators are divided in their treatment of the meaning of the “foreknowledge” of God. The Calvinist sees in the word a synonym for predestination. Others an indication of love and favour. Apart from theological necessity, the word means to know beforehand, without responsibility as to the event. Dr. Liddon says of the earlier suggestions, “The New Testament use of the word does not sanction this (not even Rom. xi. 2; I Pet. i. 20), or any other meaning than *to know beforehand*”. To us, creatures of time and space, such knowledge borders upon the impossible. Indeed, some, like Jonathan Edwards, have boldly said: “It is impossible for a thing to be certainly known, to any intellect, without evidence”, and have come to the conclusion that the foreknowledge of God compels Him, the Most High, to decree, foreordain, and unalterably fix every act and word that He has foreknown. It is extraordinary that any should thus presume to say what is or is not possible to the Lord; nor can such avoid the logical conclusion of their argument, that God must be, if they are right, the author of sin, a conclusion diametrically opposed by the Word of God, and odious to the conscience of His children.

Time is the measure of motion, and in our limited state, the idea of a timeless state expressed by the title I AM, is beyond our comprehension. A very crude illustration, however, may be of service in arriving at some understanding of the matter. Suppose the reader to be standing at a small table upon which there rest books, paper, ink and pens. As he stands, he comprehends the whole table and contents as one; there is neither a first nor a last. The articles could be well be enumerated from the left hand as from the right. Now, further, suppose that an ant has crawled up one of the table legs, and that he visits each article in turn. To the ant there will be definite sequence because the element of time is introduced and, resultingly, there will be a first and a last. So, also, if a spider crawl up the opposite leg, its enumeration would be reversed. So God, as it were, sees all at a glance: He knows the end from the beginning, but the future is hid from our eyes.

We shall be wise, therefore, to leave the word foreknowledge to mean just what it says and no more. The infinite knowledge of God makes it impossible that He shall not know who will preach and who will teach; where they will go, and when they will go; who shall hear, who reject, who accept, and who be left without a word of the gospel. The one great demand upon all who hear the gospel is that they believe the testimony of God concerning His Son. Whoever so believes passes into all the blessings purchased by the blood of Christ. Whoever does not believe makes God a liar (I John v. 10). If there were any idea of preordination in this, refusal to believe would be as much a part of God’s predeterminate decree as is election to glory, and it would not be possible to make God a liar by so refusing His testimony. Further, in the passage before us, foreknowledge is differentiated from predestination, for we read: “Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate.” If we alter the word “foreknow” to any word bearing the sense of

predetermining or predestining, the sentence ceases to have meaning, as, for example, if we read: “whom He did foreordain He also did predestinate.”

We therefore understand the passage before us to declare that God, Who is not under the limitations of time and space as we are, and needs no external evidence in order to attain to His knowledge, knows all things, past, present and future: knows them perfectly and completely, and can, therefore, act with complete certainty where, to us, all would appear in a contingent light.

*Predestination.*—Those who were foreknown of God were also predestinated to conformity to the image of His Son. Here is another term that demands care in application. What is meant by predestination? It is somewhat unfortunate that the English translation contains the word “destiny”, which interjects the conception of fate, although, speaking exactly, the word “destiny” contains no more than the idea of “end” or “destination”.

The word predestinate is a translation of the Greek *proorizo*. The word *horos*, from which *horizo* is formed, does not occur in the N.T., but it has the well-established meaning of boundary or limit. This word, in its turn, is from *horao*, to see, boundaries generally being marked to make them visible and conspicuous. Those whom God foreknew He also marked out beforehand for a glorious end—conformity to the image of His Son.

Three words have now been considered, each commencing with the prefix *pro*:

- (1) Purpose, *Prothesis*. Something set or placed before the mind, a proposition.
- (2) Foreknowledge, *Proginosko*. To know beforehand, and.
- (3) Predestinate, *Proorizo*. To mark off beforehand.

The whole testimony of the Scriptures is to the effect that God has a purpose before Him, according to which He works and, in accord with that purpose of peopling heaven and earth with the redeemed, He foreknew every one who would respond to the call of grace, and accordingly marked them off beforehand for the various spheres of glory that His purpose demanded.

If we believe that God fixed unchangeably, from all eternity, whosoever should, in time, believe, then however much we may hedge and cover the fact, there is but one logical conclusion, a conclusion that, in days gone by, has driven many to the edge of despair. That conclusion is, that He Who absolutely and unalterably fixed the number of those who should believe, just as surely fixed unalterably the number of those who should not believe, a conclusion so monstrous that it has only to be expressed to be rejected.

“How then shall they call on Him in Whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of Whom they have not heard?” (Rom. x. 14).

In the original the word “conformed” in Rom. viii. 29 is *summorphos*, which is made up of *sun*, “together with”, and *morphe*, “form”. The English word “form” is from the Latin *forma*, which is but a transposition of the letters of the Greek *morpha* or *morphe*. While the word *morphe* indicates visible shape, its usage, both in its simple form and as a compound, compels us to see in it a resemblance that is much deeper than mere outward conformity. We have, for example in Rom. ii. 20, “a form of knowledge”, and in II Tim. iii. 5 “a form of godliness” which was merely external and “formal”. In Mark xvi. 12 and Phil. ii. 6, 7, we have the word used in the account of the appearance of the Lord to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, and in the exhortation based on that most wonderful condescension, when He laid aside the “form” of God by taking upon Him the “form” of a servant. In combination with the preposition *meta*, we have the familiar word *metamorphosis*, a word used in the study of insect development to indicate the change from pupa to perfect butterfly, a wonderful illustration comparable with the argument based on the sowing of seed used by the apostle in I Cor. xv. Again we find the word in Matt. xvii. 2 and Mark ix. 2, where it is translated “transfigured”. In Phil. iii. 21, future resurrection glory is in view, the word “change” being *metaschematizo*, and the words “fashioned like” being *summorphon*.

The primary meaning of “form” is uppermost of these references. We note the change from that which is external to that which is within in Gal. iv. 19, when the apostle says: “My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be *formed* in you”, and again in Rom. xii. 2, where we have the two words *suschematizo* and *metamorphoo* translated “conformed” and “transformed” respectively. The difference between the two words may be better appreciated if we remember that *morphe* deals more with organic form, and *schema* with external appearance.

“And be not conformed to this age, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind” (Rom. xii. 2).

Here it is most evident that the transformation is internal and not merely outward and visible. Again, in II Cor. iii. 18, the words “changed into the same image” must not be construed to refer only to a future resurrection likeness, but to a present spiritual anticipation. Lastly, the words occurring in Phil. iii. 10: “being made conformable unto His death”, refer to present spiritual transfiguration that anticipates “conformity to the body of His glory” in that day (Phil. iii. 21).

With this thought we return to Rom. viii. 29. Conformity to the image of His Son is to be both a present experience and a future hope: the one, associated with the “renewing of our mind”, *now* (Rom. xii. 2), the other associated with the “redemption of our body”, *then* (Rom. viii. 23). In Rom. viii. sonship is, here and now, essentially associated with resurrection, the “spirit” of sonship being expressed in Christlikeness, while literal sonship itself (adoption, viii. 23), will be expressed in complete likeness to the glorified Lord, in body as well as in spirit. God’s goal for His children should also be consciously their goal. To be like Christ, the Son, is to satisfy all that Scripture demands in holiness, righteousness, wisdom, and acceptance. All growth in grace and all advance in knowledge must be submitted to this one standard—conformity to the image of His Son. We have borne the image of the earthy: we look forward to bearing the image of the

heavenly in resurrection glory (I Cor. xv. 49), the teaching in this pass being associated with the two Adams. While in Rom. viii. 29 the subject of the two Adams is in the foreground (*see* Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 as a whole), a closer, family, figure is used of the Lord, namely: “that He might be the firstborn among many brethren.” The following passage in Heb. ii. vividly comments on this truth:--

“It became him, for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren . . . . Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same” (Heb. ii. 10-14).

The reader will remember that the structure of Rom. viii. as a whole (given on page 74 of Volume XXV) throws into prominence the words “Son” and “Sonship”. Whether it be deliverance, life, peace, growth or victory, the spirit of sonship must never be forgotten. To attempt entry into the position of Rom. viii. in any other spirit is to court disaster. The Lord foreknew us, and He predestinated us to the glorious goal of conformity to “the image of His Son”. May He see of the travail of His soul, and be satisfied *now*, even as He shall be when we shall stand in all the glory of His resurrection before God our Father!

**#63. The Goal: Conformity to the Image of His Son.**  
**(2) Four links in the chain of Purpose (viii. 29, 30).**  
**pp. 76 - 79**

Having attempted an explanation of the two great words “foreknowledge” and “predestination”, and having seen that their goal is “conformity to the image of His Son”, we must now move forward to the expansion of this theme which is dealt with in Rom. viii. 30.

“Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified” (Rom. viii. 30).

It will be observed that the calling, the justification, and the glorification of the believer are all spoken of in the Aorist tense, which is usually translated by the past. While due regard must be paid to Greek grammar, we must never forget that behind the Greek of the N.T. is the Hebrew of the O.T., and that through the LXX version the Hebrew has influenced the usage of the Greek in a thousand ways. It may be of service to give a few examples of the way in which the past tense of the verb is used in the Hebrew O.T. to denote the certainty that something will take place in the future:

“Unto thy seed *have I given* this land” (Gen. xv. 18).  
“*Thou hast become* a father of a multitude of nations” (Gen. xvii. 4).

“Lo, I have sent unto thee, Naaman, my servant, and *thou hast recovered* him of his leprosy” (II Kings v. 6).

In the last example given the king was mistaken, but his meaning is clear.

The four words used in Rom. viii. 30 may be likened to links in a chain, the first and the last belonging to the remote past and the eternal future, while the second and third, “calling” and “justification”, are apparent in time.

PREDESTINATION (Before age times).	CALLING AND JUSTIFICATION (During the age times).	FUTURE GLORY (After age times).
---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

Those whom God predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, He predestinated to be glorified; the two expressions represent the same thing seen from two different points of view. It is not given to man to look into the Book of Life to see the names written there, neither is it granted to him to see into the future so as to forecast the names and number of the redeemed. He can, nevertheless, be assured both of the past predestination and of the future glory by reason of the two links that are forged in time—“calling” and “justification”. We must, of course, remember that there is a calling that is not co-extensive with election—“Many are called, but few chosen”—but we are not concerned with this here, for the immediate context has already spoken of those who are “the called according to His purpose”.

While the call of the believer takes place in time, we must, nevertheless, keep well in mind the words of Rom. iv. 17, that God “quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were”. And again, while our calling is not to be divorced from faith and obedience, we must not forget the words of Rom. ix. 11 concerning the choice of Jacob instead of Esau:

“For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth.”

Another passage that forcibly reminds us of the nature of this calling is found in II Tim. i.:

“Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before age times” (II Tim. i. 9).

In the Epistle to the Romans we find the believers in Rome given the gracious title of “the called of Jesus Christ” (Rom. i. 6).

While the calling, therefore, of the believer has a connection with times past, or rather with a period before time began, there is also an important aspect of it that is associated with present time and with those gracious means that, equally with the decrees of eternity, are ordained by the God Who sees the end from the beginning, and worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. So, in II Thess. ii. we read of being called by the “gospel” (II Thess. ii. 14). And, in I Thess. i. 4-6:

“Knowing, brethren beloved, your *election* of God. For our *gospel* came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance . . . . ye became followers . . . . having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost” (I Thess. i. 4-6).

To the ordinary Jew or Greek, the preaching of Jesus Christ and Him crucified is a stumbling-block and foolishness, but “unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God” (I Cor. i. 23, 24).

A few verses further on, we find “calling” and “choice” placed together in the same passage: “For ye see your *calling* . . . . God hath *chosen* the foolish” (I Cor. i. 26, 27).

Returning to Rom. viii. we read: “Whom He called, them He also justified” (Rom. viii. 30). It is certain, therefore, that those whom the Lord thus calls will respond, for their justification is also assured.

Justification is “by faith” (Rom. i. 17; iii. 28), and “by grace” (Titus iii. 7). Those justified were before “ungodly” (Rom. v. 6), and had “come short of the glory of God” (Rom. iii. 23, 24).

This gift of righteousness to those who did not previously possess it, is the great underlying plan of the message of Romans, and its exposition has occupied us in some form or other throughout this series. No one can enter into glory who is not righteous. He must either be righteous in himself and by his own works, or failing that, he must have a righteousness provided freely by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Predestination to glory does not ignore the sinfulness of man or the holiness of God. It includes all that is necessary to ensure the presentation, as holy and without blemish, of all those who are chosen in Christ, in whatever sphere of glory may be theirs.

The Epistle to the Romans frankly recognizes that “all have sinned and come short of the glory of God”, and unless this shortcoming can be righteously cancelled, it is clear that predestination to glory would be as impossible to God as it is impossible for Him to lie. Consequently, the chapter that states emphatically that all have failed to glory, states just as surely that both the sinner and God Himself are justified in the process of salvation. The deliverance of the sinner is “through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus”. Christ has been “publicly set forth as a propitiation”, so that a righteous ground has been provided, which can never be challenged by angel or man—a righteous ground upon which the love of God can embrace the sinner, the holiness of God meet his sin and the righteousness of God be declared in the very act. In other words, salvation has been so arranged that “He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus” (Rom. iii. 26).

It is a joy, therefore, to note that the next references to the glory of God speak either of Abraham, the believer’s pattern of justification by faith (Rom. iv. 20), or of the believer

himself: “Therefore being justified by faith . . . . rejoice in hope of the glory of God” (Rom. v. 1, 2).

The word “predestination” in I Cor. ii. 7 is veiled in the A.V. translation, which renders it “ordained”. The passage speaks of predestination in relation to the “glory” of the believer: “Which God *ordained* before the world *unto our glory*.”

We must bring our study to a close. The apostle has now reached the magnificent conclusion towards which the whole teaching of Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 has been directed—a triumphant challenge to heaven and earth to lay anything to the charge of God’s elect, or to separate the redeemed from the love of God. This must be our next study. May all the wonderful steps leading up to it, that we have already seen, draw forth our praise and thanksgiving as we once again realize the central truth of God’s revelation, expressed in those mighty words: “In Christ”, “through Christ”, and “with Christ”. Truly, as the apostle declares in the opening verses of his letter, the gospel of God is concerning “HIS SON” (Rom. i. 1-4).

**#64. No condemnation; no separation.  
More than conquerors, now and ever (viii. 31-39).  
pp. 114 - 119**

The whole of this glorious chapter of Romans may be likened to a flight of seven steps leading ever upwards, from the doctrinal statement that “there is no condemnation” to the answering challenge “Who is he that condemneth?” It is now a considerable time since we considered the structure of this chapter as a whole, and we will therefore set it out again in this closing article, so that none of our readers may miss the essential relationship between the close of the chapter and its opening.

**Romans viii. 1-39.**

- A | 1-4. No condemnation. God sent His own SON (*huios*).
- B | 5-15. Led by Spirit of God. SONS now (*huios*).
- C | 15-17. Spirit Itself bears witness. SONSHIP (*huiiothesia*).
- D | 17-21. Suffering and Glory. Manifestation of SONS (*huios*).
- C | 22-28. Spirit Itself intercedes. SONSHIP (*huiiothesia*).
- B | 29, 30. Conformed to the image of His SON then (*huios*).
- A | 31-39. Who condemns? He spared not His own SON (*huios*).

It will be observed, we trust, with joy, that God’s answer throughout the varied experiences of this chapter is to be found in “His Son” and “sonship” in Him.

The opening member (viii. 1-4) deals with the subject of “No condemnation” stated doctrinally, in its Godward aspect. The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus sets us free from the law of sin and death; and the utter failure of the flesh in respect to obedience

and righteousness is met by the gift of God's Son, Who "by a sacrifice for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Margin, viii. 3). The closing member likewise deals with the subject of "No condemnation", but approaches it from the experimental standpoint, viewing it not so much from the angle of the law as in relation to suffering and trial. And just as "His Son" proved an all-sufficient answer to the failure of the flesh, so again He provides an all-sufficient answer to the conscious weakness of the flesh. In the opening section we are "free from the law of sin and death"; in the closing section we are "more than conquerors" in the midst of tribulation.

The theme of this last section—Rom. viii. 31-39—is developed by a series of questions and answers, which can be seen best in the form of a structure:

### Romans viii. 31-39.

- A1 | 31. QUESTION.—What shall we then say *to these things*?
- B1 | 31. ANSWER.—If God be for us, who can be against us?
- C1 | 32. Argument: "How?" He spared not His own Son.
- A2 | 33. QUESTION.—Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?
- B2 | 33. ANSWER.—It is God that justifieth.
- A3 | 34. QUESTION.—Who is he that condemneth?
- B3 | 34. ANSWER.—It is Christ that died.
- C2 | 34. Argument: "Yea, rather." Risen. Right Hand. Intercedes.
- A4 | 35. QUESTION.—Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?
- B4 | 37. ANSWER.—We are more than conquerors *in all these things*.
- C3 | 35-39. Argument: "I am persuaded."
  - a | Seven phases of earthly trials.
  - b | O.T. anticipation.
  - a | Nine phases of unseen trials.
  - b | "Any other creature."

Let us rejoice in the triumph of the believer in this passage as he goes from strength to strength. He begins with the great fundamental fact that "God is for us", and asks "Who can be against us?" The question is unanswerable. It goes echoing down the vaults of time to lose itself in infinity, without finding any one able to take up the challenge.

And then—"God has justified us." Here the believer presses forward into the light of holiness. Though a sinner, he can dare all in the consciousness of his acceptance in the Beloved. Who can lay anything to his charge? "We are more than conquerors through Him that loved us." His death, His resurrection, His present place at the right hand of God (the place of the Accuser—see Zech. iii. 1), His intercession, are all "for us". With such a Saviour, what can tribulation, or distress, or persecution, accomplish? They cannot separate us from the love of Christ. In the teeth of all opposition, and in the very midst of the trials themselves, we are more than conquerors.

And what of foes that are unseen and unknown? The Apostle scales the heights and plumbs the depths, not only of present human experience, as in verse 35, but of all possible experience, present and future, visible and invisible, known and unknown,

belonging to this creation, or to any other creation, and with magnificent confidence utters the triumphant “I am persuaded” with which the chapter closes.

It must now be our delightful task to descend from this mountain top, in order that we may the more clearly understand the language of the Apostle, and so more truly enter into these riches of grace. Let us first look at the opening challenge:

“If God be FOR us, who can be AGAINST us?”

The word “for” here is *huper*, and “against” *kata*. The two prepositions are used in a similar way in II Cor. xiii 8: “For we can do nothing *against* the truth, but *for* the truth.”

So also in Luke ix. 50: “He that is not *against* us is *for* us.”

If anyone should ask “In what way has it been demonstrated that God is for us?” the Apostle refers back, in the words “these things”, to the whole chapter, and particularly to verses 29 and 30. In His foreknowledge, He is most certainly “for us”. To clinch the matter, however, Paul adds one all-powerful argument:

“He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?” (Rom. viii. 32).

The word translated “to spare” (*pheidomai*) is used in the LXX in connection with Abraham: “Thou hast not *withheld* thy son, thine only son” (Gen. xxii. 16). The Hebrew word *chasak* here translated “withhold” is rendered “spare” in eight passages in the A.V. One of these references is solemnly suggestive of what it meant for God not to “spare” His own Son:

“He made a way to His anger: He *spared* not their soul from death, but gave their life over to the pestilence” (Psa. lxxviii. 50).

When we remember that these words were spoken of the Egyptians at the time of Exodus, the sufferings of Christ on our behalf stand out in even greater fullness. If Christ was spared nothing, if He bore all our sins, with all their consequences, can there be any argument better able to give the believer assurance before God?

“*His own Son.*”—With these words the initial argument of viii. 1-4 is resumed. In the first section, the utter inability of the flesh is answered completely and for ever by “God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh”, no condemnation to us being the inevitable result. So in the closing section, the fact that “God spared not His own Son”, is the Apostle’s answer to all doubts, fears and accusations. “With Him”, therefore, we may confidently believe that God will freely and graciously (*charizomai*, cf. *charisma*, the “free gift” in Rom. v. 16) give us all things.

We have already drawn attention in an earlier article to the difference between “all things” (*panta*) which the Lord makes to work together for our good, and “the all things” (*ta panta*) which He freely gives us with the gift of His beloved Son. The Apostle now

proceeds to unfold some of “the all things” that are ours, and concentrates upon two chief points:

- (1) NO CONDEMNATION—in relation to the possible laying of a charge against us.
- (2) NO SEPARATION—in relation to overwhelming trials.

The first problem is solved by a reference to Christ’s finished work, and the second by a reference to the everlasting association of the believer with Christ. Let us consider this more in detail.

The Apostle’s answer to the question: “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?” is simple, direct and conclusive: “It is God that justifieth.” The word *engkaleo*, “lay to the charge”, occurs seven times in the N.T., six references occurring in the Acts in connection with Paul, and the seventh in the passage under consideration in Romans. The references in the Acts are as follows: xix. 38, 40; xxiii. 28, 29; xxvi. 2, 7. The word has reference to a court of law and is rendered “accuse”, “call in question”, and “implead”.

The Apostle next approaches the subject of the believer’s security from another angle: “Who is he that condemns?” (Rom. viii. 34). Again, his answer is complete and conclusive. Our attention is turned from “God that justifies” to the ground of that justification which He Himself has laid. “Christ that died”—it is this that puts away our sins; we are justified by His blood, and reconciled by His death (Rom. v. 9, 10). “Yea, rather”, the Apostle continues (or “Still more”, an echo of the “Much more” of Rom. v. 9, 15 and 17) “That is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of God, Who also maketh intercession for us.” Here it will be observed that the Apostle brings forward the “finished work” of Christ. Not His death only, but also His resurrection; not His resurrection only, but also His ascension to the right hand of God; not His ascension only, but also His present intercession. To understand the importance of this last fact, we must remember the words of Rom. v. 10: “Saved by His life.”

And Heb. vii. 25 reads:

“Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.”

What “strong consolation” is ministered by these gracious words.

The Apostle now leaves the court of law, having settled once and for all the perfect standing of the believer before the Lord, and turns to the present circumstances of life. With these circumstances in view he asks: “Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?” (Rom. viii. 35). It is evident from Scripture and also from the experience of the Apostles themselves, and the universal experience of all the children of God in all dispensations, that perfect acceptance with God does not bring with it immunity from suffering in this life. Indeed, Rom. v. 1-5 has already assured us that the justified may boast in tribulations because of their perfecting work. In Rom. viii. 35 the Apostle enumerates seven items: “Tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or

nakedness, or peril, or sword.” And to enforce his argument, he appeals to the recorded experience of the O.T. saints:

“As it is written, For Thy sakes we are killed all the day long: we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter” (Psa. xliv. 22).

Could any quotation from the O.T. appear less likely to afford comfort and strength? Yet the Apostle does not hesitate to use it. It is not an act of faith to shut one’s eyes to trouble and suffering. The Apostle has written lists of perils and sufferings, but he was never in danger of being separated from the love of Christ. *That* is the issue, not exemption from trial.

“Nay, IN ALL THESE THINGS (not exempt from them) we are super-conquerors (*hupernikomen*) through Him that loved us” (Rom. viii. 37).

In justification of the thought that we are not only “conquerors” but “super-conquerors”, the Apostle takes a further step—into the unknown and unseen. He first refers to the two extremes of human consciousness, “death and life”, and then turns his attention to the invisible powers of the spirit world, “angels, principalities and powers”. He then refers to all time, “present” and “to come”, and “height” and “depth”; and in all creation, high or low, visible or invisible, he fails to find anything that can by any possible means separate us from the love of Christ. He now takes one more step and includes “any other creature”, any other possible creation; for, however different and unexpected it might be, it would still come from the same Creator, Who has already manifested Himself to be so absolutely on our behalf.

“The love of Christ” of verse 35 is seen to be “the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord”. What a “persuasion”. What a call to stand fast, to manifest that we belong to such a Saviour, that we are loved by such a God, that we are saved with such a salvation. No condemnation; no separation. Safe here, and safe for ever hereafter.

“Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s” (I Cor. iii. 21-23).

**#65. The dispensational Section opens (ix.-xi.).**  
**pp. 154 - 159**

With the closing words of Rom. viii. the inner section of this epistle ends. This inner section deals, not with the covenant relationship of Israel with Abraham, but with man in general, whether Jew or Gentile, in relation to Adam. Just as it is necessary to distinguish between the unconditional covenant made with Abraham and the law that was given 430 years afterwards (Gal. iii. 17), so it is important to distinguish between the covenant made with Abraham and the relationship between all men and Adam. When this question has been dealt with and the glorious outcome stated (Rom. viii. 1, 38, 39), the apostle addresses himself to yet another aspect of truth. This aspect, in which the apostle was deeply interested, is concerned with the position of his own countrymen: their attitude to the gospel, their place in the scheme of things, the question of God's elective purposes, and many other related subjects. When facing the problems of Rom. vii. we felt like exclaiming that here surely is the most difficult passage in Romans. But when we come now to consider Rom. ix.-xi., we feel inclined to reverse our judgment.

As we proceed with our examination of these three chapters, we shall discover that the great theme of Romans, with its emphasis on "justification" and "the gospel", is not forgotten, but runs through their teaching just as surely as in Rom. i. - v. 11, and Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39.

There are twelve references to "righteousness" in Rom. ix.-xi., which occur at the end of Rom. ix. and in the first half of Rom. x. The occurrences in Rom. ix. are as follows:

*Dikaiousune* ("Righteousness") in Romans ix.

GENTILES.

- A | 30. Followed not after *righteousness*.
- B | 30. They have attained unto *righteousness*.
- C | 30. Even the *righteousness* which is of *faith*.

ISRAEL.

- A | 31. Followed after the law of *righteousness*.
- B | 31. They have not attained to the law of *righteousness*.
- C | 32. Sought it (i.e. *righteousness*) not by *faith*.

These contrasting passages are followed in Rom. x. by a further contrast, this time between the "righteousness of God" and "their own righteousness", and the "righteousness of the law" and the "righteousness of faith"—and centrally placed, the statement that Christ is the "end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. x. 3, 4, 5, 6, 10).

The "gospel" (*euaggelion*) is mentioned twice (Rom. x.16; xi. 28), and "preaching" twice (*euaggelizo*) (Rom. x. 15). "Salvation" (*soteria*) comes three times (Rom. x. 1, 10;

xi. 11) and the verb “to save” (*sozo*) five times (Rom. ix. 27; x. 9, 13; xi. 14, 26). While the presence of these evangelical terms is sufficient to show that the main theme of the epistle is still in sight, an examination of the passage makes it evident that the point of view has changed. We are now looking at things *from the dispensational standpoint*. The writer is concerned with the nation itself, and not merely with the individuals in the nation. The effect of the one nation upon the many nations is noted, the salvation of “all Israel” is thankfully recorded, and the reconciling of the world is seen to be contingent upon the casting away of Israel.\* (\* - This “reconciliation” must be carefully distinguished from the “reconciliation” of Rom. v. 1-11).

This theme, which, as Rom. ix. 1-3 and x. 1 show, was very near to the apostle’s heart, has already been touched upon in the opening chapters, but there it is glanced at momentarily to be put aside until in these chapters it can be given the consideration it deserves. We refer to the opening verses of chapter iii. where the apostle realizes that the leveling doctrine of justification by faith appears to do away with the dispensational advantages of the Jew, and may even lead some to think that Israel’s unbelief makes the faithfulness of God of none effect. In chapter iii. the apostle is content to express his repudiation of such a charge, basing his argument mainly on the fact that God would cease to be the Judge of the world if His righteousness could possibly be impugned. As soon, however, as he has carried his doctrine to its glorious goal, he returns to this tremendous theme. He now establishes fully the “advantage” and “profit” of being one of the circumcision (Rom. ix. 4-5), and emphasizes the fact that the true Israel of promise were called “in Isaac” and in accord with “the purpose of God according to election” (ix. 6-13). The question of Rom. iii. 5: “Is God unrighteous Who taketh vengeance?” is repeated in Rom. ix. in connection with God’s sovereign choice of Israel and rejection of Esau: “Is there unrighteousness with God?” (Rom. ix. 14). The sovereignty of God is further discussed and emphasized by bringing forward two very different examples: the Lord’s words to Moses: “I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy”, and the raising up of Pharaoh (ix. 14-18). In Rom. ix. 27 a remnant only is “saved”, but in Rom. xi. 26 it is “all Israel”. The section opens with sorrow (Rom. ix. 1-3) but it closes with song (Rom. xi. 33-36).

Before we can do much more, it will be necessary to obtain a view of the scope of Rom. ix.-xi. as a whole. We have already seen that the section opens with “sorrow” and closes with “song”, and that while only a remnant is “saved” at the beginning, it is “all Israel” at the close. These features give us the first great divisions of the section, which we must note. We observe, moreover, that immediately following the list of Israel’s advantages (Rom. ix. 4, 5) the apostle breaks into a doxology. In this doxology, where it is a question of the Lord being “over” all, *panton* is used, but in the concluding doxology of Rom. xi., where it is a question of origin and goal, *ta panta* is used. In the central section we find the expression “Lord of all”. Here the context indicates that a wide range is intended, for “there is no difference”, says the apostle, “He is rich unto all that call upon Him” (Rom. x. 12). The “all”, clearly, is co-extensive with “those that call”. This great section of Romans, therefore, is bounded at either end by the tremendous thought that “God is over all”, and at the centre the same note is struck. We will not attempt, at

the moment, a full structural analysis of these chapters. Let us be content at the beginning with the barest outline. We can fill in the detail as we learn more.

**Romans ix.-xi.**  
**A tentative outline.**

A | ix. 1-5. Sorrow.

Doxology. "Over all (*panton*), God blessed unto the ages" (ix. 5).

B | ix. 6-29. The Remnant saved. Mercy on some.

*Corrective as to "all Israel" (ix. 6).*

C | ix. 30 - xi. 10. The Stumbling stone. | The Lord of all that believe.

Christ the end of the law. | No difference.

B | ix. 11-32. All Israel saved. Mercy on them all.

*Corrective as to the Remnant (xi. 1-5).*

A | xi. 33-35. Sorrow.

Doxology: "Of Him, through Him, and to Him are all things (*ta panta*).

To Him be glory unto the ages" (xi. 36).

We must now turn our attention to the opening words of chapter ix.:

"I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom. ix. 1-3).

The apostle realized only too keenly that in fulfilling his mission as an apostle to the Gentiles, he laid himself open to the false charge of indifference to the fate of his own people, Israel. When, therefore, he begins this section dealing with their failure and removal, he feels impelled to use the strongest language to demonstrate his deep concern for his brethren according to the flesh. Hence the oath-like form of his opening words:

"I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost."

*The Companion Bible* draws attention to the fact that the words "I could wish" in the profound sentence "I could wish myself accursed from Christ" are a translation of the Imperfect, and should therefore read: "I used to wish." The Companion Bible further remarks that the statement is in the form of the figure *Anamnesis* or "Recollection", the apostle recalling his attitude in the past. This, of course, is very different from the teaching on the surface of the A.V. rendering, namely, that Paul actually wished at the time that he write that he could be accursed from Christ. Further, the apostle had just penned the conviction that nothing in heaven or hell could separate him from the love of God (Rom. viii. 39). It is only fair, however, to the reader to say that a number of great expositors hold that the apostle, in the depth of his feeling, uttered words that would be a true index of his heart, even though his head would have to deny them. This is termed the "potential rendering". The apostle does not say that he "desired" this, but that he "could desire" it if it were permissible, such was his love for his people.

“The desire rose up in the apostle’s heart, and to a certain extent he allowed and sanctioned it. Yet only to a certain extent, for a higher desire struck in and controlled it—the desire to be in perfect accord with God’s desire and will. Hence his desire to be anathema for his countrymen never was completed and complete. It hung suspended. It remained imperfect. It was conditional, and the condition that would have brought it to maturity was never forthcoming. Thus the embryo-desire was in reality but a potency, so that the translation *I could desire* is indicated” (Dr. John Lightfoot on Rom. ix.).

The question is difficult to decide with certainty. According to one interpretation the apostle is manifesting a sympathetic understanding with the attitude of his countrymen by saying in effect, “I know, for I did the same myself”. According to the alternative view, he is emulating Moses, who cried:

“Yet now, if Thou forgive their sin ---- ; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written” (Exod. xxxii. 32).

Perhaps it is impossible for us in the present life to arrive at a conclusion. The question does not demand a decision. No point of doctrine or practice is affected by either view, and, therefore, while we still believe the apostle said that he “used to wish” in the past, thereby assuring Israel that there would be no self-righteous condemnation so far as he was concerned, we freely grant the liberty of others to believe that such was the apostle’s love for Israel, that, if the sacrifice would have proved effective, he was willing even for that, if only his nation might be saved. In either case, it is clear that any charge against Paul of indifference to the fate of his countrymen now that he is the apostle to the Gentiles is effectively answered.

## **#66. Israel’s Privileges (ix. 4, 5). pp. 191 - 198**

The apostle’s sorrow for his kinsmen is expressed, first of all, not in terms of their fall, but in relation to the heights of privilege from which that fall had taken place, and it is the enumeration of Israel’s dispensational privileges that for the present must occupy our attention.

“I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart (for I myself used to wish that I were anathema from Christ) for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed unto the age. Amen” (Rom. ix. 2-5).

It will be helpful, before we examine these items in detail, to observe their disposition. By noting the correspondence between them we shall obtain a clearer view of their true meaning than by the individual study of each in turn.

**Israel's Dispensational Privileges.  
Romans ix. 3-5.**

- A | According to the flesh. KINSMEN.
- B | Who are Israelites.
- C | To whom pertaineth the adoption.
- D | And the glory.
- E | And the covenants.
- E | And the giving of the law.
- D | And the service.
- C | And the promises.
- B | Whose are the fathers.
- A | According to the flesh. CHRIST.

We note at once that this list of privileges is bounded at each end by the words "According to the flesh". The term "flesh" has a variety of meanings and must always be interpreted in the light of the context. Perhaps it would not be far wrong to say that in this one epistle, we can find almost every variety of its usage. Let us notice a few examples.

(1) The "flesh" considered as equivalent to human nature without any reference necessarily to sin:

"Which was made of the seed of David according to the *flesh*" (Rom. i. 3).

(2) The "flesh" considered as the equivalent of the human body in contrast with the heart and "the spirit":

"Circumcision which is outward in the *flesh*" (Rom. ii. 28).

(3) The "flesh" considered as the seat of sin, the characteristic of the natural man who is not "spiritual" but "carnal":

"Ye are not in the *flesh*, but in the spirit" (Rom. viii. 9).

(4) The "flesh" considered as the medium of human expression, in contrast with the "promise of God" which works in another plane:

"They which are the children of the *flesh*, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed" (Rom. ix. 8).

It is evident that the apostle, in Rom. ix. 3 and 5, uses the words "according to the flesh" in the first of the four senses enumerated above. The Israelites were his brethren, his kinsmen "according to the flesh". It had been the boast of the apostle that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. If the other apostles could say that they were Israelites, so also could he (II Cor. xi. 22). In Rom. xi. 1, even though the apostle is a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, he sees in his own salvation a pledge that not one Israelite who had been foreknown of God could be cast away: "For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the stock of Benjamin."

Returning to our passage in Rom. ix., it should be noted that the pronoun in the phrase “Who are Israelites” is of a rather special character:

“It is a peculiar compound pronoun (*hoitines*) that has no parallel in English. The force of the apostle’s expression might be represented thus: *Who belong to the category of Israelites, who, whatever else they may or may not be, are Israelites*” (Morison).

At the conclusion of this list of privileges, the apostle places the coming of Christ Himself. One of the chief glories of the people of Israel was that, of all nations on earth, God had chosen this nation to be the one through whom in the fullness of time Christ should be born. And yet—and the tragedy of this struck Paul like a blow—when at last He had indeed come as the prophets had long predicted, born of the line of David, and in the City of David, Israel had not known the day of their visitation.

If the people of Israel were Paul’s “kinsmen” according to the flesh, Christ was their glorious “Kinsman-Redeemer”.

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy . . . and deliver . . .” (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

Intimately connected with this glorious privilege of being so closely associated with the Messiah “according to the flesh”, are all the other advantages enumerated in Rom. ix. 3-5. We must now consider these advantages in more detail.

In correspondence with the title “Israelites” we find “the fathers”. In this context the word must be limited to the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as in Acts iii.:

“The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our *fathers*” (13).  
“Ye are the children of the . . . . covenant which God made with our *fathers*, saying unto Abraham” (25).

The word is sometimes used in a wider sense, as for example in Acts vii.:

“Our *fathers* found no sustenance” (11).  
“He sent out our *fathers* first” (12).  
“Our *fathers* had the tabernacle” (44).

In these references, however, the additional word *hemon* (“our”) is used, whereas in Rom. ix. 5 the word is used in the absolute sense, and must therefore be limited.

In the next corresponding pair we have “the adoption” and “the promises”. “The adoption” is rightly related to “the promises” and not to “the fathers”, for it is closely linked up with the thought of inheritance.

“And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is My son, even My firstborn” (Exod. iv. 22).

It is unnecessary to labour the point that there were many nations in existence before Israel. There were the Egyptians who oppressed them, and the ancestors of Abraham himself, as well as the seventy nations mentioned by name in Gen. x. Israel was the firstborn by adoption, chosen by God for special favours and privileges “above all nations upon the earth” (Deut. xiv. 2). To such pertain “the promises”.

These promises were largely those made by God to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Out of the nine occurrences, in addition to Rom. ix. 4, of “promise” and “to promise” in Romans, seven refer to the promises made to Abraham, one to the “fathers”, and one to the “gospel” (Rom. i. 2). The reader will discover that there are few references to “promises” in the N.T. that do not refer to Abraham and his seed. In the O.T. the promises include “the land” and “the throne”, and Rom. xv. 8 declares that the ministry of the Lord Jesus was at the first “to confirm the promises made unto the fathers”. In the Prison Epistles there are no “promises”. Instead we have “*the* promise”, entirely unconnected with “the fathers”, and going back to a time “before the overthrow of the world”.

The next pair of privileges mentioned by the apostle are connected with “the glory” and “the service”. In the second of these cases the A.V. translators have felt constrained to add the words “of God”; and, in the first case also, we might well read: “the glory *of the Lord*.” The “glory of the Lord” was spoken of by the Rabbinical writers as “The Shekinah”, the word being derived from *shaken*, “to dwell”, and referring to the visible glory of the Lord that dwelt between the Cherubim above the Mercy Seat. While this was the peculiar privilege of Israel—no other nation had the visible presence of the Lord in their midst—they like the rest “came short of the glory of God”, and their failure was all the more marked by reason of the greatness of their privileges.

“The service” that corresponds to “the glory” is referred to in Hebrews:

“Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine *service*” (Heb. ix. 1).

“The priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the *service* of God” (Heb. ix. 6).

The central pair in the structure consists of “the covenants” and “the giving of the law”. That Israel alone, of all the peoples of the earth, received “the law” is so abundantly attested by Scripture that there is no need to give actual quotations. That the “covenants” also, with one exception, are exclusively the prerogative of Israel is not so generally accepted. The exception, of course, is the covenant made with Noah and with all flesh, in the days of the flood, and is God’s pledge that never again will He destroy the earth by water. With this exception, all the covenants of Scripture belong to Abraham and his seed. This includes the “new covenant”, as a reference to Jer. xxxi. and Heb. viii. will show.

There is only one reference to a covenant in the Epistles of the Mystery, and that is in Eph. ii. 12: “Strangers from the covenants of promise.” In the flesh, no Gentile could hope to stand on the same level as Israel. If he became a proselyte, he was admitted into the favoured circle, but never attained equality. In the days to come, when Israel enter

into their adoption and promises, when “the glory” and “the service” are indeed theirs, the nations round about them will travel up three times a year to Jerusalem to keep the feasts and obtain knowledge of the Lord, recognizing in this favoured nation “the priests of the Lord” and the “ministers of our God” (Isa. lxi. 6; Zech xiv. 16-21).

Before passing on to consider the latter part of Rom. ix. 5, let us set out the dispensational disabilities of the Gentiles, and compare them with the dispensational advantages of Israel as set above.

### **Dispensational disabilities of the Gentiles (Eph. ii. 11, 12).**

- A | Gentiles. IN THE FLESH.
- B | Without Christ.
- C | Aliens from the commonwealth of Israel.
- C | Strangers from the covenants of promise.
- B | Having no hope.
- A | Godless. IN THE WORLD.

What a desperate condition to be in. In the flesh and in the world, a foe within and a foe without; and then Christless, Godless, and hopeless, having neither citizenship nor covenant. How thankful we should be for the change that grace has made. And how necessary to make it clear that our present calling is entirely separate from Israel’s commonwealth and Israel’s covenants. Even though our abstaining from certain observances should involve us in misunderstanding, we can surely do no less than remain loyal to the true characteristics of our high calling, leaving the citizenship, the hope and the covenants of Israel in their own sphere. However, we are not primarily concerned at the moment with the doctrine and practice of the Mystery, but rather with the contrast between the Jew and the Gentile “in the flesh”, as set out in Rom. ix. and Eph. ii.

There is one further item in Rom. ix. that we have not yet dealt with, that finds its negation in Eph. ii. Of the Gentile we read: “Ye were without Christ.” Of Israel it is written: “Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever.”

Left undisturbed by the opinions of men, the reader would naturally understand these wonderful words as an ascription of the highest praise to the Lord Jesus Christ. The very statement “as concerning the flesh” seems to demand the sequel “Who is over all, God blessed for ever”. There would be no point in the phrase “as concerning the flesh” if the subject of the sentence were merely a man.

We cannot leave the matter here, however, for there are many who would force into this plain ascription of Deity contrary views of their own.

With reference to this passage Wardlaw writes, in his book *The Socinian Controversy*:

“This seems abundantly plain, so plain, and so decisive, that if there were not another text in the Bible directly affirming this great truth, I know not how I should satisfy myself in rejecting its explicit testimony. It has accordingly been put upon the rack, to make it

speaking by dint of torture a different language. It might, perhaps, be enough to say, respecting this passage, that, according to the order of the original words, the received translation is the most *direct* and *natural* rendering. This, so far as I know, no one has ventured to deny. All that has been affirmed is that it is *capable of bearing* a different sense. And this has accordingly been attempted in no fewer than five different ways:

‘Of whom, by natural descent, the Christ came. God, Who is over all, be blessed for ever.’

‘Whose are the fathers, and of whom the Christ came, Who is above them all (viz., the fathers). God is blessed for ever!’

‘Of whom the Christ came, Who is over all things. God be blessed for ever.’

‘Of whom the Christ came, Who is *as* God, over all, blessed for ever.’

‘Of whom the Christ came (and) whose, or of whom, is the supreme God, blessed for ever.’”

Sadly enough, the R.V. has brought these untenable views to the notice of all its readers. The note in the R.V. reads as follows:

“Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh* and translate, *He Who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever: or He Who is over all is God, blessed for ever.* Others punctuate, *flesh, who is over all, God be blessed for ever.*”

No wonder Dean Burgon wrote of this marginal note:

“Now this is a matter—let it be clearly observed—which (as Dr. Hort is aware) belongs to *interpretation*, and not to *textual criticism*. What business then has it in these pages at all? Is it then the function of Divines appointed *to revise the Authorized Version*, to give information to the 90 millions of English-speaking Christians scattered throughout the world as to the unfaithfulness of ‘some modern interpreters’? We refer to Manuscripts, Versions, Fathers; and what do we find?

- (1) It is demonstrable that the *oldest Codices, besides the whole body of the Cursives*, know nothing about the method of ‘some modern interpreters’.
- (2) There is absolutely not a shadow, *not a tittle of evidence in any of the ancient Versions*, to warrant what they do.
- (3) How then about the old Fathers? We find that the expression ‘Who is over all (things), God blessed for ever’ is expressly acknowledged to refer to our SAVIOUR by the following 60 illustrious names.”

The Dean then gives the sixty names, with chapter and verse, which the interested reader can find fully set out in his “Revision Revised” (pp. 212, 213).

Long ago it was noted by Bengel that in all classes of doxology *Barak* in Hebrew and *Eulogetos* in Greek *precede* the name of God. There are thirty places where the LXX, following the Hebrew order, adheres to this rule, and if Paul had intended a separate doxology, he would certainly have followed the same practice.

In the earlier part of this same Epistle to the Romans we find a passage which is in some respects parallel with Rom. ix. 5:

“Who worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. i. 25).

It is the consistent testimony of the N.T. that all things were created “by Him and for Him—i.e. Christ” (Col. i. 16), and the ascriptions of praise in Rom. ix. 5, and in Rom. xi. 36 are both offered to the same God. In Rom. ix. 5 He is over “all things” (*panton*) without reservation, evil as well as good. In Rom. xi. 36 out of Him, and through Him, and unto Him are “*the* all things” (*ta panta*), certain specific “all things”, which do not include that which is evil. This important distinction we must discuss when we reach Rom. xi. 36 in the course of our exposition.

Our space is already filled, but the theme is so wonderful and so vital that we trust none of our readers will consider the time spent too long. We joyfully acknowledge that which Israel in their blindness failed to see, that the Messiah Who came from themselves, so far as the flesh was concerned, and Who, according to the Spirit, was declared to be the Son of God with power (Rom. i. 3, 4) was at the same time: “Over all, God blessed for ever.” To this the apostle adds his solemn “Amen”. May all who read and believe echo that “Amen”, and rejoice to know that one day Israel shall look on Him Whom they pierced, the One Who, even in the days of Isaiah, was named “The mighty God”, and shall at last say of Him:

“Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us” (Isa. xxv. 9).

### **#67. The Purpose according to Election (ix. 6-13). pp. 233 - 239**

If the contemplation of the high glory of Israel’s privileges has led the apostle for the moment away from himself and the failure of his kinsmen, his next word is an indication that he has returned once more to the theme of Israel’s failure in order to meet the objections raised by their defection and fall. The word “but” does not appear in the A.V. of verse 6, but is there in the original. After referring to his intense grief, the apostle is careful to correct any false impression by saying: “But it is not such as that the word of God has failed.” Commentators draw attention to this opening phrase as an instance of what is called a “Solecism”, because it appears to be a mixture of two different modes of expression neither of which is fully stated. The word comes from *soloikos*, “to speaks like an inhabitant of Soloi in Cilicia”, where Attic Greek had been corrupted by the Greek Colonists.

The word of God would have failed if it had declared that any specific number of Israelites would believe in the Lord Jesus at His first coming. No such statement, however, had been made; rather the reverse, for from prophecy it was quite plain that at the first Israel would reject their Messiah, and be in turn rejected—only a remnant, and that according to the election of grace, preserving the seed and the line unbroken. In order to enforce this fact concerning the remnant according to the election of grace, the apostle commences a somewhat complicated argument, establishing from the history of Israel the principle of God’s sovereign choice in connection with the true seed.

First of all he puts forward this thesis:

“Not all who are out of Israel, are Israel.”

The second mention of Israel here does not refer to the man Jacob, but to the nation, the thought being that fleshly descent does not constitute the seed or the election, for both are by promise and by grace.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These words are immediately followed by the question:

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

In Gal. iv. Ishmael is likened to the unbelieving Jews “born after the flesh”, while the true believing Jews are likened to Isaac; and his mother, the freewoman, to Jerusalem that is above and free. These constitute the “Israel of God” (Gal. iv. 21-31, vi. 16).

As we study the argument put forward by the apostle in Rom. ix. an important principle emerges that extends beyond the limits of the people of Israel.

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

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

The following extract from Nedarim f.31.I is suggestive:

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

This brief quotation is sufficient to show that the apostle’s method of argument was familiar to the Jews and would be easily followed.

When dealing with Rom. iv. we showed that the words “counted for” or “imputed for” indicated that one thing, namely “faith”, was reckoned for another, namely “righteousness”, and that on account of the finished work of Christ. In that chapter the fact is stressed that Isaac was not begotten merely by the flesh, but that his birth was a foreshadowing of the resurrection of Christ. The fact that Isaac is again brought into prominence in Rom. ix., and that mere physical descent is set aside, only the children of the promise being “counted for the seed”, provides conclusive proof that the fluffiest of the purposes of God does not necessitate that every individual Jew and every physical descendant of Abraham must be saved. Known unto God from the beginning are those who constitute the seed of promise.

The fact that the bulk of the nation was in a state of unbelief at the time that Paul wrote, did not in any way throw doubt upon the accuracy of prophecy and the promises. Rather the reverse, for there are a number of references in the O.T. to Israel’s apostasy and the preservation of a remnant. Isaiah, in a day of departure, speaks of this remnant in i. 9; x. 21, 22, etc., and is quoted in Rom. ix. 27:

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

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

The same principle holds good with respect to “all in Adam” and “all in Christ”. These terms do not extend to every individual descendant of Adam, for some, like the Canaanites, ought never to have been born. At the creation of Adam, God had already in view a chosen seed, whose names are written in the Book of Life. Although this purpose has been attacked by Satan, and imperilled in many ways—by Cain and others, by the offspring of the sons of God and the daughters of men at the time of the flood, and by the “tares” of our Lord’s own day (John viii. 39-44)—the children of promise are preserved, and will finally reach their true goal.

The history of the birth of Esau and Jacob, and the prophetic utterance that preceded their birth, call for a word of explanation. We can all see that Israel’s superior position did not depend upon birth or personal goodness. By blood and birth Esau and Jacob stood on the same level; or indeed, if there was any advantage it was with Esau, the elder. And the question of goodness is also ruled out. Many readers, however, will feel that a problem that needs solution is founding Rom. ix. 3:

“Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I heard.”

The next verse contains our own unspoken thought:

“What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?”

How could God be righteous if He hated an unborn infant that, according to His own word, had not done “either any good or evil”? The answer is that upon examination we shall find that no such statement is intended.

If we refer back to the passages from which the apostle quotes, we shall find that under the names Esau and Jacob two *nations*, and two *peoples* are in view.

“Rebekah his wife conceived. And the children struggled together within her; and she said, If it be so, why am I thus? And she went to enquire of the Lord. And the Lord said unto her, *Two nations* are in thy womb, and *two manner of people* shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger” (Gen. xxv. 21-23).

“I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast Thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob’s brother? saith the Lord; yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for dragons in the wilderness. Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of Hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever” (Mal. i. 2-4).

In connection with these passages it should be borne in mind that, both in the Hebrew of Genesis, and in the Greek of the LXX and Rom. ix., the words “elder” and “younger” are literally “greater” and “lesser”. The adjective “greater” is used in Scripture where we should use “elder”, as for example in Gen. xxvii. 1 where the literal translation would read: “Esau his *great* son” (Heb. *gadol*). This allows the statement of Gen. xxv. 23 to

be true of the two children as such (the “elder” and the “younger”) and also prophetically true of the two nations descended from them (the “greater” and the “lesser”).

It should be noticed that the words “greater” and “lesser” are not used in connection with the two children, but occur in the concluding statement about the two “nations” and “peoples”, one of which is “stronger” than the other. The Hebrew word *rab*, translated “elder” in Gen. xxv. 23, occurs some hundreds of times in the O.T. Scriptures, but is not translated “elder” in any other passage. While we now know that the “greater” coincided with the “elder” of the twins, the prophecy did not make this clear. The whole account of the blessing of Jacob would be difficult to understand if Isaac knew that Esau had been definitely set aside. Which of the two sons was to be the father of the “greater” people was beyond the power of Rebekah and Isaac to discover, and we are only able to know now because prophecy has become history.

It is a matter of history that the Edomites grew rapidly to greatness. While Israel were journeying through the wilderness, a band of pilgrims just liberated from Egypt’s bondage, the Edomites were a settled kingdom.

“And Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the king of Edom. Thus saith thy brother Israel, Thou knowest all the travail that hath befallen us . . . . Let us pass, I pray thee, through thy country” (Num. xx. 14-17).

That Edom was the “greater” people at that time is evident, for we read: “Edom came out against him with *much people*, and with a *strong hand*” (Num. xx. 20). Subsequently Edom was conquered, and of David we read: “He put garrisons in Edom; throughout all Edom he put garrisons, and all they of Edom became David’s servants’ (II Sam. viii. 14). We learn from Josephus that under John Hyrcanus the national independence of Edom was finally destroyed, and they merged into the nation which had at first been “the lesser”.

Just as the name Israel stands both for Jacob himself and also for the nation descended from him, so the name Esau is used in the Scriptures both for the twin brother of Jacob, and for his descendants, the Edomites.

Thus we read:

“I have given Mount Seir unto Esau” (Deut. ii. 5).  
“I have made Esau bare” (Jer. xlix. 10).

Had the apostle, when writing Rom. ix., intended to discuss the doctrines of free-will, and eternal election and reprobation, he would have been obliged to have introduced many different arguments. His purpose in this chapter is much simpler. He is pointing out that the whole history of the people of Israel is the outworking of an elective purpose, and that if this elective purpose is satisfied for the moment by the salvation of a remnant, then there can be no truth in the suggestion that the Word of God has failed. When seen in their true context, the words “hate” and “love” in verse 13 create no insuperable difficulty, but if the apostle’s object in Rom. ix. is misunderstood, then we

must expect confusion, and the inevitable evils that flow from a false representation of the sovereignty of God. Just as the advocates of eternal punishment can only find a basis for their dreadful creed by ignoring the qualifying statements of Scripture, and applying what is peculiar and limited to what is universal, so in Rom. ix. we can only build up the Calvinistic doctrine of eternal reprobation, with the allied error which regards sin as parts of the Divine decree, if we fail to see that Paul is here dealing with the dispensational question of Israel's rejection and failure.

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

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

A1 | 6-8. The Word of God.

B1 | 6-8. In Isaac, a seed reckoned. |

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

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

c | In Isaac the seed shall be called.

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

b | The children of promise.

c | Counted for a seed.

A2 | 9. The Word of Promise.

B2 | 9. To Sarah, a child promised. |

a | At this time.

b | Will I return.

c | Sarah shall have a son.

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

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

a | Rebekah . . . . Isaac. Common parentage.

b | Purpose according to election.

c | Greater, lesser; loved, hated.

## Things above.

### #1. “Where Christ sitteth” (Col. iii. 1). pp. 121 - 124

It is not only our duty but also our privilege to obey the exhortation of Col. iii. 1, 2 to set out minds on things above. In the course of our ministry, we often pass this exhortation on to others and have it passed on by others to us. While the Word preached, just as it is written, is full of power, yet there is in it such fullness that always there is room for exposition and application. This enables faith to be exercised with intelligence and the truth of the particular passage to be perceived with a measure of comprehension.

In this series it is therefore our endeavour to direct attention to what the Scriptures mean when they speak of “things above”.

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

Following the lead of the passage itself, our attention is first drawn to the fact that “things above” are expanded by the apostle himself as “where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God”. To obtain some idea of “things above”, therefore, we must learn from the Word what are the answers to the questions:

- (1) Where is Christ now sitting?
- (2) What is implied by the fact that He is seated?
- (3) What is involved in this position on the right hand of God?

The Scriptures contain ample evidence that the Lord Jesus Christ is now “far above all heavens” (Eph. iv. 10). The original reads *huperano panton ton ouranon*, about the translation of which there is no controversy. *Huperano* occurs only three times in the N.T., as follows: Eph. i. 21; iv. 10; and Heb. ix. 5. Concerning the heavens themselves we can have no opinion that is of weight, but we have no difficulty in understanding the reference to the ark and the cherubims:

“The ark . . . . and over it (*huperano*) the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy seat” (Heb. ix. 4, 5).

The instruction to Moses were:

“Thou shalt put the mercyseat above upon the ark” (Exod. xxv. 21).

The cherubims were made “of the matter of the mercyseat” (Exod. xxv. 19 *margin*), and as the mercyseat is said to be above the ark, so the cherubims are said to be over the mercyseat. We find upon further examination that whereas the church of the One Body is blessed *in* heavenly places, *en tois epouraniois*, “in the over heavens”, Christ, their exalted Head, is said to have ascended *above* all heavens, or, as we read in Heb. iv. 14,

He “passed through” the heavens, the translation “passed into” in the A.V. not being sufficiently expressive. *Dierchomai* is translated “pass through” ten times in the A.V. Six of the occurrences refer to the travels of the apostles, and one refers to the “passing through” the Red Sea of the children of Israel (I Cor. x. 1). Not only do we read that the Lord “passed through” the heavens, and is now “above all heavens”, but we read that He has become “higher than the heavens” (Heb. vii. 26). Here the word so translated is *hupseloteros*, which is the comparative of *hupselos*, “high”.\*

This glorious exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ is associated in Hebrews with His high priesthood, but in Ephesians with His headship. The sphere of blessing that pertains to the Epistle to the Hebrews is the “heavenly calling” of the promise made to Abraham (Heb. iii. 1), and the word here translated “heavenly” is *epouranios*. This calling finds its goal in the “heavenly” country, and the “heavenly” Jerusalem (Heb. ix. 16; xii. 22). We are told in Heb. ix. that the tabernacle consisted of two parts, the first called the Sanctuary, and, beyond the second veil, that part which was called “The Holiest of all”. Into this second part the High Priest went, alone, once every year (Heb. ix. 7), and this finds its antitype in the entry of Christ into heaven itself in the presence of God (Heb. ix. 24).

There is a marked difference between the Hebrew believer’s sphere of blessing and that highest place of all which is occupied by their exalted High Priest. They are divided from one another as the Holiest of all was from the Holy Place. The worshippers may draw near with boldness, but sit down there in that Presence, never; the very thought would savour of blasphemy in an Hebrew’s ears. But when we come into the dispensation of the mystery, there is no question of boldness of access, as found in Heb. x. 19, for the believer who is a member of His body is definitely declared to be “seated together” in the heavenly places, where Christ sits at the right hand of God, far above all principality and power (Eph. i. 19-22; ii. 6), a statement that is gloriously unique.

Closely associated with the two references to *huperano* which are found in Ephesians is the word “fullness”, *pleroma*, or “fill”, *pleroo*, words specially characterizing the mystery, and which do not therefore occur in Hebrews.

“He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places far above all principality . . . . and gave Him to be Head over all things (*huperano*) to the church which is His body, the fullness (*pleroma*) of Him that filleth (*pleroo*) all in all” (Eph. i. 20-23).

“He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above (*huperano*) all heavens that He might fill (*pleroo*) all things” (Eph. iv. 10).

[NOTE: \* - Should any reader, actuated by the Berean spirit, check these references by Young’s Analytical Concordance, he will find that under the heading “High, *hupselos*” is placed: Heb. vii. 26, “Such an high priest became us, (Who is)”. This is an error in that great work, the word “high priest” there being *archiereus*, which is correctly listed on the next page of the Concordance.]

We learn not only by positive statement, but by comparison. For example: if David had said “Wash me and I shall be white”, that would have been a true statement. But how much more forceful are his actual words, “Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow”. Thus, from Ephesians we learn the high calling of the church, but such positive teaching is enhanced by comparing it with that which relates to the heavenly calling of Hebrews. In both epistles Christ is the exalted and seated One. To the Hebrews, as High Priest, He is within heaven’s holiest of all, a sphere which is above them. But to the Ephesians, as Head over all things to the church, He is not seated there alone, for the church is seated there, too. The nature of this revelation of love and grace is such that it is no matter for surprise to find it questioned and combated. But, while nothing but revelation could justify such a statement, the poverty of our appreciation of superabounding grace is no warrant for lowering heaven’s greatest of all blessings.

When Abraham “looked for a city which hath foundations”, or when he and his children “desired a heavenly country” (Heb. xi. 10, 16), they certainly “sought” and “set their mind” on things above and in so doing exemplified the principle of the “seek . . . . set” exhortation of Col. iii. 1, 2; but neither Abraham nor any of his seed could ever look away, above all heavens, to the seated Christ, and know that *where* He sat in that supernal glory, *there* was the sphere of all their blessing and hope. Such a prospect was never put before them. It was hidden with the mystery from the ages and generations that preceded the testimony of the Lord’s prisoner. Here then is one great fact that we must keep to the fore when, by faith, we endeavour to follow out the injunction of the apostle to “seek those things that are above”. We will remember that it is “*where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*”.

## **#2. “Where Christ sitteth” (Col. iii. 1). pp. 161, 162**

Having seen *where* Christ sits, there follows the next consideration: *Why* is He seated? The apostle does not say: “seek those things which are above where Christ *is*”, or “where Christ *standeth*”, or “where Christ *intercedeth*”, but “where Christ *sitteth*”.

In the figures of the O.T. a seated posture is associated, among other things, with a king, a judge, and a refiner. While every reference will afford contributory light, the most illuminating passage is found in Zech. vi. 13:

“He shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne.”

This speaks of Christ as the “King-Priest”, the Priest after the Order of Melchisedec, and points once again to the Epistle to the Hebrews. It was the fact that Christ is *seated* that appeared to the apostle to be the most important fact in the presentation of the truths brought out in Hebrews, for, the moment he states the glorious fact that the Saviour “purged our sins”, he passes straight on to the climax, namely, that

“He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb. i. 3).

Now we know from the testimony of this same apostle that the burial, the resurrection, and the ascension, must all have their place if we are ever to speak of a “finished” work of Christ. Yet such is the special aspect of this epistle, that these facts are overleaped in order that there shall be the closest possible association of thought between the purging of sins and the seating of Him Who thus accomplished our sanctification.

While the actual seating of Christ is not mentioned in Heb. iii. 1 the believer is called upon to consider Him both as “the Apostle”—that is the One sent from God, thus embracing the first advent of the Lord, and as “the High Priest”—that is the One Who returned back to God, His work having been accomplished. The insistence elsewhere in this epistle on the fact that the Priest is seated enables us to realize that it is implied here. The exhortation in Heb. iv. 16 to come boldly to the throne of grace likewise implies a seated Christ. In Heb. v. 6 Christ is first revealed as the High Priest after the Order of Melchisedec and Psalm cx. 4 is quoted. The reader will remember that the Psalm opens with the words:

“The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand” (Psa. cx. 1).

The very fact therefore that Christ is a priest after the Order of Melchisedec indicates that He is now seated at the right hand of God.

The whole of Heb. vii. is occupied with the Melchisedec priesthood and its teaching, and this the apostle summarizes as follows:

“Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: We have such an high priest Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens. A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man” (Heb. viii. 1, 2).

Chapter ix. is devoted to the typical teaching of the tabernacle, and explains the meaning of the words, “the true tabernacle”, which the apostle associated with the “seated priest”. Chapter x. first shows that it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sin. It then gathers up all that has been taught in the earlier chapters concerning the glorious fullness of the person of Christ: His unchanging priesthood, His once-offered sacrifice, and His heavenly sanctuary, unpitched by man.

“And every priest standeth daily 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. 11, 12).

A		11.	The standing priests.	\	Work NEVER done.
B		11.	The repeated sacrifices.	/	
B		12.	The One Sacrifice.	\	
A		12.	The seated Priest.	/	Work FOR EVER done.

Here then is the answer to our question. We seek those things which are above where Christ sitteth, because there, and there only, can the believer find peace and satisfaction, completeness and acceptance, by reason of a work that is finished: "Seek those things which are above", said the apostle. "Where Christ sitteth" indicates the super-heavens. "Where Christ *sitteth*" implies that His work is finished.

Our exposition has been meagre; our comprehension of so vast a theme poor; but at least we shall have some understanding when we put into practice the exhortation of the apostle in Col. iii. 1, 2.

### #3. "Where Christ sitteth" (Col. iii. 1). pp. 201 - 203

There is one more statement in this opening passage that demands attention. It is the specific declaration that Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. It will enable us to realize the importance of the fact if we notice the way in which the apostles insist upon stating it. In the passages quote below any explanation or enlargement of the statement that is given by the apostles is printed in italic type.

"For David speaketh concerning Him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for He is on my right hand *that I should not be moved*" (Acts ii. 25).

"This Jesus hath God raised up . . . . therefore being by the right hand of God *exalted*" (Acts ii. 33).

"For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, *until I make Thy foes Thy footstool* . . . . God hath made that same Jesus . . . . both Lord and Christ" (Acts ii. 34-36).

"Him hath God exalted with His right hand, *to be a Prince and a Saviour*, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" (Acts v. 31).

"Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of God *Who also maketh intercession for us*" (Rom. viii. 34).

"The mighty power which He wrought in Christ, when he raised Him from the dead and set Him at His Own right hand in the heavenly places, *far above all* principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, *not only in this age, but also in that which is to come*, And hath put *all things under His feet*, and gave Him to be the *Head over all things* to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of *Him that filleth all in all*" (Eph. i. 19-23).

"Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, *being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they*" (Heb. i. 3, 4).

"But to which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on My right hand, *until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool*" (Heb. i. 13).

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: we have such an high priest, Who is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, *a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle* which the Lord pitched and not man" (Heb. viii. 1, 2).

“But this man after He had offered One sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God . . . . *for by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*” (Heb. x. 12-14).

“Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of faith, *Who for the joy that was set before Him* endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (Heb. xii. 1, 2).

Let us look at the seven occurrences quoted from the epistles. The first is from Rom. viii. 34:

**The right hand is the place of the accuser.**

“Satan standing at his right hand to resist him” (Zech. iii. 1).

“Let Satan stand at his right hand, when he shall be judged, let him be condemned” (Psa. cix. 6, 7).

The focal point of the doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans is chapter viii. 1:

“There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.”

To this end the gospel had been preached: to this end love had made a way whereby God might be just as well as the justifier of the believer. It is therefore to the point that the apostle stresses the fact that none can lay anything to the charge of God’s elect, *for Christ now occupies the accuser’s place*, and He died for us! He lives for us! He intercedes for us!!! No wonder Rom. viii. concludes in the high strain of victory and glorious persuasion there found.

When therefore we seek those things which are above, they are where Christ sitteth; our perfect pledge of full salvation.

**The right hand is the place of Him Who is Head over all.**

Had we read on in Rom. viii. we should have come to that pæan of the super-conqueror who sees death and life, angels, principalities and powers, alike, beneath the feet of the risen Christ, shorn of all power to harm or injure His redeemed.

This exalted position being the especial glory of the church of the mystery, we find it categorically stated in our next reference, namely, Eph. i. 19, 23. The position of the Lord at the right hand of the Father of Glory places Him far above principality and power; puts all things under His feet and gives Him to be Head over all things to His church. When therefore members of this church seek those things which are above, they enter a sphere beyond the dreams of man; beyond the highest aspirations of hope; beyond the limits of present human experience. They anticipate the goal of the ages when God shall be all in all, and, by faith, enter into their high destiny “in heavenly places”.

**The right hand is the place of Him Whom has inherited the excellent name.**

As we read the opening of Heb. i. 3 we are amazed at the majesty and glory of Him Who for our sakes stooped to the death of the cross. He Who was the brightness of the glory of God, He Who could uphold all things by the word of His power, must be infinitely “better than angels” and in His Own right has a more excellent name than they. That is most blessedly true. But we must not forget that He Who was in the form of God became man, and took upon Him the form of a slave, and was in due time highly exalted, and will one day, as “Jesus”, receive the title “Lord”, which nevertheless was His before the earth was made (Heb. i. 10). The Lord when He laid aside His glory did so for our sakes. When He became man, he became “a little lower than the angels” (Heb. ii. 7, 9). By so doing He became one with every son that He will lead to glory (Heb. ii. 10-17), and what He had voluntarily laid aside He received back, in His new capacity, as reward. In this inheritance all His redeemed may share. When therefore the believer seeks those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God, he seeks those glories that once were His alone, but which now, by reason of His condescension unto death, and His triumphant resurrection, may be shared by His people.

We have already considered, in the second paper of this series, the references to Heb. viii. 1, 2 and x. 12-14, when dealing with the testimony of Hebrews to the “seated priest”. These, together with the references now considered, provide “strong consolation” to all who draw near to that place where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

## “What manner of persons ought ye to be.”

### #22. Symbols of Service. Teachers and Teaching. pp. 29 - 31

Among the gifts given by the ascended Lord to His church in Eph. iv., we find “pastors and teachers” mentioned (Eph. iv. 11), and the apostle Paul on two occasions couples the office of “teacher” with that of “preacher” and “apostle” (I Tim. ii. 7; II Tim. i. 11). Even in O.T. times the teacher had his place. We are apt to think that the Levitical priesthood was wholly taken up with offerings and ceremonials. These certainly occupied a great amount of time, but the value of these offerings and ceremonials lay in their typical teaching, for the blood of bulls and goats could never in itself take away sin. Consequently we find that the Levite was a teacher as well as a priest or server of the tabernacle.

“He said unto the Levites that *taught* all Israel . . . . Put the holy ark in the house” (II Chron. xxxv. 3).

“And of Levi he said, Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one . . . . They shall *teach* Jacob Thy judgments, and Israel Thy law: they shall put incense before Thee, and whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine altar” (Deut. xxxiii. 8-10).

The close association of ceremonial and teaching is evident; the holy ark, the incense, the burnt sacrifice, and teaching are all spoken of in the same context. The words of II Chron. xv. 3 are significant in this connection:

“Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without the law.”

It is possible to have a life full of ceremonial, offerings, incense, washings and fasts, and yet to be without “the true God”. Only as these ceremonials and offerings are explained and their meaning appreciated will God be really known.

#### **Apt to teach.**

The passage in Eph. iv. 11 does not indicate that a teacher to-day is endowed with any supernatural gift, such, for instance, as the gift of prophecy or the gift of tongues. Nevertheless the teacher himself was a gift to the church and as such must have possessed some fitness for his work. When the apostle instructs Timothy in the difficult task before him, he writes:

“The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be *able to teach* others also” (II Tim. ii. 2).

“The servant of the Lord must not strive: but be gentle unto all men, *apt to teach*” (II Tim. ii. 24).

“A bishop then must be blameless . . . . *apt to teach*” (I Tim. iii. 2).

It is only reasonable to believe that anyone sent by the Lord to teach will have an “aptitude” for teaching. If he has to speak, he will be able to speak plainly, and will be able to make himself heard and understood. However good the message may be, it is valueless if it is inaudible or unintelligible.

### **Moral fitness.**

These qualifications, however, are by no means all. There are also moral qualifications that are essential. This we may gather from the passage already quoted from I Tim. iii.

“A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil” (I Tim. iii. 2-7).

The domestic qualifications mentioned here belong not so much to the teacher as to the bishop, for in these early days the Church was in the house. The rest of the passage, however, may be taken as indicating the qualities that should accompany aptness to teach, if the teacher is to be approved of God.

It should be remembered that the words translated “teacher” (*didaskalos*) and “teach” (*didasko*) give us *didaskalia*, which is translated in most passages by the word “doctrine”.

### **Teaching and Practice.**

Throughout the Scriptures we find a salutary insistence upon the necessity for the life to correspond with the teaching given and received. The balance of doctrine and practice is very noticeable in the epistles, and also in the lives of the apostles. Paul himself draws the attention of Timothy to his consistency in this matter, saying:

“Thou hast fully known my *doctrine, manner of life*” (II Tim. iii. 10).  
“I have *shewed* you, and have *taught* you” (Acts xx. 20).

The relation between “shewing” and “teaching” was a very practical one in the apostle’s case, as verses 34 and 35 reveal:

“Yea, ye yourselves know, that *these hands* have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have *shewed* you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive” (Acts xx. 34, 35).

The subject of the teacher and his teaching is so great that we at first thought of taking some lesser theme, and of reserving the subject of teaching for a more thorough treatment. However, we have presented very briefly one or two aspects of it here, and

trust that the service of each of us may be the better for the brief consideration we have given.

**#23. Symbols of Service.  
Unmoveable.  
pp. 73 - 76**

At the close of the Sermon on the Mount the Lord likens His hearers to two builders, the one who built his house upon a rock, and the other who built his house upon the sand. The figures vary in different parts of Scripture, but the underlying truth remains that the believer, while in one sense he may be said to grow and run and wrestle, is nevertheless in another sense “unmoved”.

“Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee; He shall never suffer the righteous to be moved” (Psa. lv. 22).

There are two reasons for being moved that are brought to our notice here. One is unrighteousness. There is no peace for the wicked. Figures such as the troubled sea that cannot rest are often found in Scripture. Righteousness, on the other hand, is like a rock beneath our feet, after floundering in mire and quicksands. The second reason given for “slipping”, as the word “moved” might be translated, is the foolish endeavour to carry our burdens apart from the Lord.

In Psalm xv. we have six positive and six negative qualities, the possessor of which, the Psalmist says, “shall never be moved”. The reader who wishes to “search and see” will find the following of service:

Verse 2. Three *positive* qualities.  
Verse 3. Three *negative* qualities.  
Verse 4. Three *positive* qualities.  
Verse 4, 5. Three *negative* qualities.

Psalm xvi. 8 reads: “I have set the Lord always before me; before He is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.” This Psalm speaks of resurrection, and has a bearing upon the passage in I Cor. xv., which we must consider presently.

Again, in Psalm xxi. 7 we read: “The king trusteth in the Lord, and through the mercy of the Most High, he shall not be moved.” There is also the magnificent Psalm which opens with the words: “God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble” (Psa. xlvi. 1). The earth is removed, the mountains are carried into the sea, the heathen rage, the kingdoms are moved, the earth melts. Yet, in the midst of such overwhelming confusion, we read: “God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved” (Psa. xlvi. 5).

It is encouraging to those who are naturally timid to see how the Psalmist's trust and confidence grow by experience:

"He only is my rock and my salvation; He is my defence: I shall not be greatly moved" (Psa. lxii. 2).

"He only is my rock and my salvation; He is my defence: I shall not be moved" (Psa. lxii. 6).

At the first venture of faith the Psalmist's expression is "I shall not be *greatly* moved". After having experienced something of the Lord as his rock and defence, the Psalmist omits the qualifying word and says "I shall not be moved".

We must now look at some N.T. illustrations. Let us turn first to Paul's words as his first great ministry drew to a close. Facing the future, with its bonds and afflictions, he says:

"But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24).

Do we feel as we read these words, that such a condition is beyond us? Let us remember that the unmoved state of the first sentence is largely the result of what is represented by the rest of the verse. Paul was unmoved in the face of bonds and afflictions because He did not count his soul dear to himself. He already knew that all he had and all he was belonged to his Redeemer. He was not his own; he had been bought with a price. A self-centred man is easily moved, but a man who holds self as but a means of serving the Lord will not easily be disturbed at the thought of trials and afflictions. Also the apostle had a goal in front of him. He desired to finish his course, to fulfil his calling; and in its pursuit he endured and overcame odds that to a lesser soul would have been overwhelming.

The words: "But none of these things move me" are a free rendering of the original *All' oudenos logon poioumai*, which literally means that Paul did not "make account of even one thing". The Vatican Manuscript reads: "Of no account make I life precious to myself", which crystallizes the thought already expressed above.

Another suggestive passage is I Thess. iii. 3 where Timothy is sent to the Thessalonians: "That no man should be moved by these afflictions." It is very probable that the preposition *en* translated in this verse "by" should carry its primitive meaning "in". The verb "move" here means "to fawn upon", "to flatter", "to be deceived through flattery"; and the idea seems to be that when one is enduring affliction, one is open to "fawning" and "flattering" suggestions from seeming well-wishers, and that such must be resisted by faith.

We come in conclusion to the great and triumphant exhortation of the apostle in I Cor. xv. 58. With resurrection as a glorious fact, with Christ as the mighty Victor over death and the grave, with a glorious hope before the believer, this chapter ends with the words:

“Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, *unmoveable*, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord” (I Cor. xv. 58).

These three passages from the N.T. should be continually in mind. Nothing helps us in our service so much as the possession of the unselfish spirit manifested by the apostle in Acts xx. The believer who “feels hurt” so often, is thinking too much of self. To realize the Lordship of the Risen Christ is to be free from the intimidation and the flattery of man, and with the Lord at our right hand we too can say: “I shall not be moved.”

## **#24. Symbols of Service. Vessels. pp. 112 - 114**

The first title given to the apostle Paul in Scripture provides us with the subject of the present article: “He is a chosen vessel unto Me” (Acts ix. 15).

To any one acquainted with the scriptures and with the worship of the God of Israel, the word “vessel” would be associated with the tabernacle and the temple. The Altar had its specially designed vessels of brass, such as pans to receive ashes, shovels, basins, flesh-hooks and firepans (Exod. xxvii. 13). The Table also had its appropriate vessels, and the Candlestick, or Lampstand (Exod. xxx. 27 and xxxv. 13). When the Lord called Saul of Tarsus to His service, He separated him as a vessel unto Himself. The Lord Jesus Christ fulfils the typical teaching of the Altar, the Table and the Candlestick, and we may regard Paul as a chosen vessel, serving Him in all these offices.

The Apostle was chosen by the Lord as a vessel “to bear His name”. In Acts ix. Ananias speaks of Paul as having “authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on Thy name” (Acts ix. 14). And the Apostle himself confesses in Acts xxvi.:

“I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth” (Acts xxvi. 9).

How the Apostle bore that Name and suffered for it can be learnt from his epistles. How he must have rejoiced as he wrote to the Ephesians of the ascended Lord, raised far above every name that is named (Eph. i. 21), and to the Philippians, of the coming day when, at the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow (Phil. ii. 10).

When the Apostle comes to speak of himself as a vessel, he does not speak of a vessel of gold or even of brass. So great is the glory of the Name that he has been chosen to bear, that he speaks of himself as an *earthen* vessel:

“But we have this treasure in *earthen* vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us” (II Cor. iv. 7).

It is possible that the Apostle had in mind the story of Gideon with his empty pitchers and lamps within the pitchers, which were broken at the moment of victory (Judges vii. 19, 20). The context of II Cor. iv. 6 refers to the “light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ”, and the suggestion of the broken pitcher may be behind the words of verse 9: “Cast down, but not destroyed.”

The Apostle was ever conscious of his utter unworthiness when he contemplated his past life and, at the same time, the glory of the message with which he was entrusted:

“Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given” (Eph. iii. 8).

It should be a matter for thanksgiving that the Apostle can speak in this way. The Scriptures do not present us with impossible saints and inhuman men and women. The chosen vessels of Scripture are in themselves “*earthen vessels*”, but their enabling is all-sufficient grace (II Cor. iii. 5), and that grace is still available for every “*earthen vessel*” in the service of the Lord.

The last passage to be considered in which the thought of the “*vessel*” is prominent is found in II Tim. ii. 20, 21:

“But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour and some to dishonour. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the Master’s use, and prepared unto every good work.”

There must necessarily be different grades of service, and different ways of assessing them. The aspect in view in II Tim. ii. is that of devotion, a devotion that expresses itself in “*separation from*” and “*separation to*”. There is a purging of the vessel from all contact with evil, whether with evil persons or with evil doctrines, and there is also a singleness of heart in the service of the Lord. The actual service may be performed among and to men, but in spirit it will be offered to the Lord. Its language is that of Phil. ii. 17:

“Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.”

Singleness of heart and consecration to the Master’s use, and separation from other vessels and other uses, so far from restricting and limiting, are essential elements in all true usefulness.

“Meet for the Master’s use, having been prepared unto every good work.”

To be a chosen vessel to bear His Name, to be an earthen vessel to contain His treasure, to be a vessel meet for the Master’s use, surely these things touch the very

heights of devoted service. No wonder that the Apostle blends such dignity and greatness with so much humility.

**#25. Symbols of Service.  
Witnesses.  
pp. 152 - 154**

In the first chapter of the Acts we find the apostles gathered round the risen Lord. They have been told to wait at Jerusalem until they have been endued with power from on high. They have had the unique experience of continual fellowship with Him throughout His earthly ministry. They have enjoyed a unique exposition of the O.T. Scriptures “concerning Himself”. And now, they await their commission. Out of all the symbols of service that were at the disposal of the Lord, which will he select? We find that he chooses an important title which we have not yet considered in this series:

“Ye shall receive power . . . . ye shall be *witnesses* unto Me” (Acts i. 8).

“*Witnesses unto Me.*”—In these words the Lord indicates the basic significance of all N.T. ministry. The Greek word for “witness” (*martus*) is translated three times “martyr” and twice “record”. The feminine form *marturia* is translated “record”, “report”, “testimony”, and “witness”, and each of these words is used to translate the verb *martureo*, “I witness”. The fact that the word generally translated “witness” is also translated “martyr” shows the inner meaning of all true witness.

Let us consider now the way in which the ministries of the apostles and others during the Acts were closely linked up with “witnessing”.

Immediately after the ascension, the apostles, together with the hundred and twenty, take steps to fill the gap created by the fall of Judas. Matthias, who was numbered with the eleven, possessed the essential qualification for all true witness—the ability to give personal testimony.

“Beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that He was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection” (Acts i. 22).

Matthias could say “I know”, “I saw”, “I heard”, “I was there”. Piety and eloquence, learning and gift, may all be valuable adjuncts to witness-bearing, but none of them would be of any value apart from personal testimony. The baptism of Pentecost did not give these witnesses experiences to draw upon, but power to testify what they had already seen and heard. Peter’s address on the day of Pentecost reaches its climax when he declares the fact of the resurrection of Christ, saying: “This Jesus hath God raised up, *whereof we all are witnesses*” (Acts ii. 32). And again in connection with the healing of the lame man: “Ye killed the Prince of Life, Whom God hath raised from the dead; *whereof we are witnesses*” (Acts iii. 15).

When the apostles were liberated from prison they were commanded by the angel:

“Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life” (Acts v. 20).

And we may be sure that they still spoke as “witnesses of His resurrection”.

When brought before the Council, Peter and the others answered and said:

“The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. *And we are His witnesses of these things*; and so also is the Holy Ghost Whom God hath given to them that obey Him” (Acts v. 30-32).

When Paul stood before Agrippa, and revealed the important fact that he had received a twofold commission from the Lord, the first part running concurrently with the ministry of the twelve, and the second associated with a ministry from prison, he united them together by one covering title—the title of “witness”:

“I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a *witness* both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee” (Acts xxvi. 16).

Ministry may vary in its scope, it may emphasize differing aspects of truth and purpose, and differing spheres of blessing; but whether it be Kingdom or Church, Bride or Body, it is unchangeably true that “Ye shall be witnesses unto Me”.

The greatest of all witnesses is God himself, and even His witness is “concerning His Son”:

“If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which He hath witnessed of His Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar: because he believeth not the witness that God gave of His Son. And this is the witness, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son” (I John v. 9-12).

Power from on high in order to witness to a risen Christ sums up the essence of true ministry. The reader who cares to go back over this series, taking each symbol in turn, and seeking from the Word its connection with witnessing, will discover that all the various phases of service that have been covered are but various facts of this quintessence of all ministry.

It was the great desire of the apostle that he might “finish his course with joy” and “testify the gospel of the grace of God” (Acts xx. 24). The word “testify” here is *diamartureo*, “to witness thoroughly”. This resolve was not merely the product of highly-wrought feelings, for, in summing up his previous ministry, the apostle was able, by the grace of God, to use this same word (Acts xx. 21). And when last we read of him in the Acts, the same thoroughness is manifest:

## “When the commandment came”

*(Being a series of articles based upon the testimony of readers as to the particular passage of Scripture that was used to enlighten them as to the unique character of the Dispensation of the Mystery).*

### #9. “With Abraham” and “With Christ”. pp. 18, 19

The apprehension of the truth that brought light and joy to the reader whose testimony we now give, arose out of a right division of Scripture in connection with the two phrases “With Abraham” and “With Christ”. The reader saw that both were indications of dispensational truth, and realized that those blessed with faithful Abraham, sharing with him the Heavenly Jerusalem, and those blessed with Christ, seated together at the right hand of God, must be two different companies. While the *doctrinal* position of the believer, whether in Galatians, Romans or Ephesians is the same, viz., “in Christ”, the *dispensational* position differs. Those who are found in the churches during the Acts are said to be “blessed with faithful Abraham”. On the other hand, the saved belonging to the dispensation of the mystery are blessed “with Christ”, and their hope is to be manifested “with Him in glory”.

The point that our correspondent stresses in his letter is that we must believe that God uses words “with precision”, and without the mixing of metaphors, and that He really means what He says. He comments upon the care we bestow upon the wording of a legal document, which after all belongs only to the realm of time, and contrasts it with the lax way we handle the Word of eternal truth. We are thankful for this emphasis. When once we have rightly divided the Word of truth, we are at last free to believe *all* that God has said, using *every* word He has written, and needing *no others*. It may be that those who do not distinguish these things dispensationally would resent this claim, and tell us that they too believe *all* that God has said without alteration. While we would give all such credit for sincerity, we would also point out that this is not possible while right division is ignored.

If we “rightly divide the Word of truth” we must believe that “earth” means “earth” in Matt. v. 5, and vi. 10; and that the “heavenly places” of Eph. i. 3 are “far above” the earth. However sincere we may be, if we insist that the Sermon on the Mount is addressed to the same company as the Epistle to the Ephesians, we *cannot* avoid confusing “earth” with “heaven”. And this is but one example. The recognition of dispensational truth goes hand in hand with the acknowledgement that God uses His words with precision—or, as our correspondent writes at the end of his letter:

“Thy words are pure words  
(Words of the earth)  
As silver is tried in a furnace of fire  
Purified seven times.”

**#10. “In Christ” and “With Christ”.**  
**pp. 38, 39**

The testimony to be considered in this article cannot, we feel, be adequately presented without quoting from the letter concerned. We do not propose to disclose the identity of any of our correspondents in this series, but in this particular case, as our brother (since deceased) printed and published his testimony to the glorious truths of the Mystery, and was in many ways called upon to pay the price of faithfulness, it may be that the writer will be recognized.

We are glad to be able to record this testimony, which is not only concerned with the dispensation value of the words “*With Christ*”, but also fully rejoices in the grace that resides in the doctrinal phrase “*In Christ*”.

“As you have opened a column in the B.E. for a series of articles based upon the testimony of readers as to the particular passage of Scripture that was used to enlighten them as to the unique character of the dispensation of the mystery, I want to add mine if it could be of any service.

God has got His own and different ways in leading His elect to the knowledge of the truth. With reference to my personal leading:

I was in Church service for about fourteen years, but was never at rest and satisfied with the doctrine of salvation as interpreted by the Church and preached by myself. While I preached to others, I myself did not enjoy the rest of heart and assurance that salvation ought to bring to the sinner. A dear brother from overseas, Pastor Beaupré, visited the Town where I tried to minister the gospel. Happily I was not too conservative to act as his interpreter at his services, interpreting from English into Dutch.

The gospel of the finished work of Christ as preached by him struck my seeking soul at once, and gave me a fuller understanding of a salvation by grace without the meritorious works of man. The scripture passages then used to put my feet on an eternal rock of truth were the two most precious words in Scripture, so often repeated in Paul’s epistles, *viz.* “IN CHRIST”, to which very soon the other preposition was added, *viz.* “WITH CHRIST”. These two scripture words spoke volumes to me, as it involves our glorious position “Complete in Him”. Our union with Christ became and will remain the one great subject of meditation. Oh! that wonderful God-created union, with our blessed Lord, exalted far above principality and power. How it lifts our hearts in adoration to the God of love and all grace! How shall we realize to the full *that* work of grace? The *traditional* church doctrine of salvation mingled with so much meritorious works was left behind for the doctrine of the grace of God, as taught in His own Word. Tradition (the grave clothes) lost its hold (what grace!) and I was at once on the liberated road from where I could view scriptural truth *as it is written*. (The suffering involved in that gracious liberation of God I hardly need mention).

The next scripture passage that brought fuller light was Eph. i. 3: ‘Blessed be the God and Father . . . . Who hath blessed us’, etc.

The original scripture passage used to lead me to the knowledge of the dispensation of the mystery was the oft-repeated “IN CHRIST”; after that, “WITH CHRIST”; and Eph. i. 3.

Now, as the days go on, I marvel at the sovereignty of God. The sovereign way in which He created the three spheres of blessing, and the sovereign grace that elected the objects for that sphere of blessing out of the fallen race of Adam.

May you be strengthened, dear brother, in your ministry.

Kind regards to members of that wonderful God-created unity.”

## **#11. Ephesians i. 13. pp. 58, 59**

“In Whom ye also trusted, upon hearing the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in Whom also upon believing ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise” (Eph. i. 13).

The verse quoted above was the passage that brought light and understanding in the knowledge of the dispensation of the mystery to the reader whose testimony we now record. It was not, as in some cases, the application of some rather remote text, but the full blaze of positive truth.

The “sealing” and the “earnest” here are differentiated from the “sealing” and the “earnest” of II Cor. i. 21, 22. The latter, belonging to the dispensation of supernatural gifts, were not complete without the added “confirming” and “anointing”, both of which have reference to spiritual gifts (*cf.* I Cor. i. 6; Heb. ii. 3; and I John ii. 20, 27).

Again, while the phrase “the gospel of your salvation” might be used of any believer under any dispensation, the mind in this case is directed to the particular “word of truth” revealed to the Apostle as the Lord’s prisoner, which is particularly the revelation that brings salvation to the believer at the present time. Further, there is no interval between the “hearing”, the “believing” and the “sealing”. The word “after” in the A.V. here is misleading.

The phrase “the holy Spirit of promise” might be rendered “the holy promissory Spirit”, and refers, not to the Pentecostal gift, but to the new nature with its pledge of future glory.

It is impossible to read and be influenced by Eph. i. 13 without a knowledge of the context. Our reader has focused our attention upon the thirteenth verse, because this verse brings the issue to an experimental stage, but he would be the first to acknowledge that this wonderful fruit cannot grow apart from an equally blessed root; and he rejoices in the knowledge of Eph. i. 3-14 as the charter of the church of the mystery. Before the “believing” and the “sealing” and the “promise” could be possible, there had to be the Father’s choice “before the overthrow of the world”, and the accomplishment of redemption by Christ, through the shedding of His blood. The peculiar sphere of this

church, which is “blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ”, is entered as we “hear” and “believe” the testimony of the Lord’s prisoner.

## **#12. The value of the dividing line. p. 159**

“After it was pointed out to me that Ephesians was written *after* the Acts closed, *then* Eph. iii. 1-11 was ample evidence that Paul had a distinct message. Of course there were details to add, such as Eph. i. 3, 17-23, ii. 13-15, Phil. iii., Col. i., with Acts xxviii. 23-28 as a definite dispensational line, but with all that, the conviction was established that the dispensation of the mystery was distinct. The comprehension of the *pre-prison* epistles upon Acts ground, and the *prison* epistles after Acts xxviii., did as much for me at the beginning as any verse in particular, for after that I could *place* the Scripture upon a progressive programme.”

The testimony given above is splendid. It states quite clearly that, as a result of rightly dividing the Word of truth and believing that the setting aside of Israel in Acts xxviii. was a crisis in the outworking of the purpose of the ages, the full acceptance of the apostle’s claim to have received by revelation the mystery of Eph. iii. was both simple and necessary. As this reader says, many other scriptures had to be considered and put into place, but the one great fact of a dividing line at Acts xxviii. solved all problems.

The realization that, however, much affinity there may be between the *doctrinal* teaching of Romans and that of Ephesians, the two epistles rest upon distinctly different dispensational grounds is most important. There are some who appear to have seen that there was revealed after Acts xxviii. a unique dispensation, and yet to them it is but an evolution of the earlier ministry of the apostle. Such bring over the hope of I Thess. iv. as the hope of the Church of the Mystery, and fail to distinguish between what was permanent and what was transitory in the ministry of Paul during the Acts. The writer whose testimony we are considering raises the question, in a part of his letter which we have not quoted, as to how far elective grace accounts for the differences between believers. This we cannot say. We most surely recognize that “what we are, we are by the grace of God”, but, at the same time, we must be careful to avoid any appearance of minimizing the believer’s responsibility to believe *all* and *only* what God has said.

**#13. Things that differ.**  
**pp. 198, 199**

The writer of the following testimony has been a stalwart supporter of the witness of the Berean Expositor for many years and we are glad to be able to include his contribution. We have kept practically to his own words.

“The first thing that arrested my attention as to the importance of right division was the fact that not all those who are raised at the great white throne judgment will necessarily perish (as many teach), but those whose names are *not* in the book of life.”

“From the realization of the importance of right division I was soon led to see the truth of the mystery. I noticed that in the unity of Eph. iv. there was but *one* baptism, and realized that it must be spiritual. This indicated a change from kingdom teaching, which has two baptisms, viz., one in water and one in spirit. Following this the connection between the Lord’s Supper and the New Covenant exercised my mind. The New Covenant (quoted in Heb. viii. from Jer. xxxi.), connected with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, has not yet been put into effect, and will not be until the church of the mystery has been manifested with Christ in glory.”

“Perhaps the passage that helped me most in my studies in a rightly divided Word of truth was that of Acts xxviii. I saw that Acts xxviii. 25-28 was the dispensational boundary, dividing Paul’s epistles into two sets of seven, the early set relating to the kingdom, and the later set relating to the mystery. Before this boundary we have numerous references to Jew, Israel, Abraham, tongues, miracles, prophecy, and other gifts. After the boundary these are all conspicuous by their absence, the very isolated references being of a negative character.”

“Having thus been set free from the binding and blinding power of traditional teaching, I was able to leave all these things, and to go on to know Christ and the glories of His exalted position as Head over all things to the church which is His body, blessed in the heavenlies; in short, a Saviour and Lord Who has not only died on our behalf and risen because of our justification, but has ascended far above all, and His church potentially seated with Him and waiting the day of His and their manifestation in glory. To Him be praise and glory, Amen.”

**#14. Galatians iii. 8.**  
**pp. 218, 219**

“And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed” (Gal. iii. 8).

We have only to read this passage in Galatians to be sure that the inclusion of the Gentile in the blessings of the gospel and the promises of Abraham is no “mystery”. Quite a number of objections to the truth of the mystery, however, have arisen out of this misconception. We are glad, therefore, to be able to quote from a letter received from a reader the following testimony:

“I might add my testimony to the many others that the particular Scriptures which more than any others opened my eyes to the Dispensation of the Mystery are: Gen. xii. 1-3, and Eph. iii. 2-7. When the Holy Spirit opened my eyes to the fact that salvation for the Gentiles was included in God’s programme as given to Abraham, as such was no new revelation given to Paul, then I saw that Paul’s ministry must be something beside that given to Abraham and his seed.”

“If this can be of any help in your articles on ‘When the Commandment Came’ I should be glad to have you use it.”

The same misunderstanding is at the bottom of the criticism which has been made of our attitude to Romans. Because we believe and teach that the dispensation of the Mystery finds no exposition outside Paul’s prison epistles, we have been criticized as self-contradictory for turning back to the Epistle to the Romans. We find in Romans the gospel of the grace of God. This gospel, as our brother says, was not a new revelation given to Paul, for its basic teaching of “justification by faith” was to be found in “the law and the prophets” (Gen. xv. 6 and Hab. ii. 4), but it is carried over into the dispensation of the Mystery (Phil. iii. 9). The revelation that is found in Eph. iii. 2-7 speaks of a calling and constitution, and not the initial message of free salvation, that is the great distinguishing feature of the apostle’s prison ministry.

In bringing this series of articles of personal testimony to a close, we should like to express the gratitude that many readers have felt and passed on, to all those fellow-members, who out of their varied experiences of the illuminating power of God, have given encouragement to others by allowing us to use their written witness.

We shall be wise if we learn one lesson well—that, just as God has spoken in the past and sundry times and in divers manners, so to-day He is pleased to use a variety of passages of Scripture, some of them to us most unlikely, in carrying conviction to the seeking soul. Let us all be thankful that the commandment “came”, whatever may have been its particular form.

## Wisdom; Human and Divine.

*Being a comparison of the groping after the truth of the ancient philosophers with the truth as it is revealed in Scripture, in order that the believer may the better appreciate the Word of God.*

### **#7. Anaximines: His conception of the “first principle” approaches the Scriptural “Spirit”, but fails to reach it. pp. 8 - 11**

As the theory of Thales was rejected by Anaximander, so Anaximander's theory was rejected by Anaximines (born B.C.588). He rejected the water of Thales as being too determinate, and the infinite substance of Anaximander as being too indeterminate, and assumed air to be the *arche*, or ground of all things. This was rather in the nature of a compromise between the two. He conceived the principle of the universe to be “the unlimited, all-embracing, ever-moving air” from which by rarefaction (fire) and condensation (water, earth, etc.) everything else is formed.

To the student of Chemistry, this attempt of Anaximines will be seen to contain more than a wild guess at the truth. Many of the solids and liquids with which we are familiar contain the gaseous elements Oxygen and Nitrogen, which are the principal constituents of the air we breathe; and both these gases can be liquefied and solidified. The idea that air in rarefaction causes fire contains an element of truth, for we now know that no combustion is possible without oxygen.

If the modern chemist finds some food for thought in Anaximines' choice of air as the primal substance, the student of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures is equally impressed. We have already turned back to Gen. i. when considering the theory of Thales and the theory of his successor. We do so again for the third time.

Following the description of chaos, we read in Gen. i. 2: “And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.”

The word “Spirit” here is the Hebrew *ruach*, which occurs in the following passages:--

“The *breath* of life” (Gen. vi. 17).

“God made a *wind* to pass over the earth” (Gen. viii. 1).

“The *blast* of Thy nostrils” (Exod. xv. 8).

“O remember that my life is *wind*” (Job vii. 7).

“By His *Spirit* He hath garnished the heavens” (Job xxvi. 13).

“All the while my breath is in me, and the *spirit* of God is in my nostrils” (Job xxvii. 3).

These examples are representative of the use of *ruach* throughout the O.T. The N.T. equivalent is *pneuma*, and its usage is similar.

“The wind (*pneuma*) bloweth where it listeth . . . . so is every one that is born of the Spirit (*pneuma*)” (John iii. 8).

God is “Spirit”, but “Spirit” defies definition. There are no terms in human language, nor ideas that the mind can conceive that do not limit and confine the reality for which the word “Spirit” stands. Throughout the Scriptures God has used the air, the wind, the breath, as symbols setting forth the figure what it is possible for us to know of the Spirit, which in itself lies beyond our ken.

Diogenes of Apollonia added the idea of Intelligence to Anaximenes’ theory of the Air, and with him this school (known as the “Milesian School”) came to an end. If these men did not get very far, they did at least break away from the superstition of their times, and went back as far as their limitations would permit to the witness of creation. Somehow they missed their way: and without wishing to be uncharitable, we cannot help feeling that Rom. i. and I Cor. i. indicate the source of their failure.

“Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not AS GOD (This marks the wrong turn that all these philosophers took), neither were THANKFUL (We can only be thankful to a Person; “principles” and “infinite substance” leave us unmoved. No one has ever fallen down and worshipped a mathematical principle or the law of gravity). But they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be WISE (We shall come presently to the Sophists—“The wise”—who were Atheists) they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible MAN” (The Sophists taught that “Man is the measure of the Universe”, and so, while scorning the images of wood and stone, created metal images and magnified themselves) (Rom. i. 19-23).

If only they had known! There *is* ONE MAN Who is the measure of the Universe, but He is the Son of God.

It is a relief to turn from the darkness of philosophy to the light of Scripture:--

“O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth; Who hast set Thy glory above the heavens . . . . 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? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels” (Psa. viii. 1-5).

If Thales, Anaximander, and their fellows had had this revelation, what a difference it would have made. Yet *we* can read freely of these things, which even David saw only dimly.

“We see Jesus, Who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour: that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. ii. 9).

And we also know, that this same One Who stooped lower than the angels for the suffering of death, is the One Who is praised by the Psalmist as the Creator of all:--

“Unto the Son He saith . . . . Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of Thine hands” (cf. “The works of Thy fingers” Psa. viii.) (Heb. i. 8-10).

Human wisdom could never penetrate to this depth or scale this height. We bow before the only wise God, and gratefully thank Him for the revelation He has given us of Himself, and His creation, His purposes, and His goal. We glory in the blessed fact that it all pulsates with life and love. There are no cold abstractions. To quote a recent writer:--

“The Universe is not a spiritual vacuum, a mathematical abstraction; it is OUR FATHER’S HOUSE OF MANY MANSIONS.”

Human wisdom is cold and lifeless. Divine wisdom breathes the breath of life and love. Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift—a Person, and that Person, His beloved, only begotten Son. He is all the Philosophy that we shall ever need.

## **#8. The “Formless Being” of Xenophanes and the Scriptural revelation of Him Who was “in the form of God”.**

**pp. 46 - 49**

The Milesian school of philosophy was succeeded by the Eleatics, founded by Xenophanes and named after Elea, a town in Italy. The system was developed by Parmenides, and owed its completion to Zeno.

The primitive conceptions of Thales and his correctors seem to have produced a somewhat humbler frame of mind in his successors, for Xenophanes is at pains to tell us that philosophy is but “reasonable opinion”, “probability”, and not “certain knowledge”.

“There never was a man, nor will be, who has certain knowledge about the gods, and about all the things of which I speak. Even if he should chance to say the complete truth, yet he himself knows not that it is so.”

Philosophy, therefore, is a self-confessed failure. Nothing but a Divine revelation can supply us with sufficient knowledge to enable any one of us to say regarding these things: “I know.” Let the reader ponder some of the passages of Scripture written, “*that ye may know*”, and let him praise God for the light of His Word.

We must not forget the time at which Xenophanes lived. All around him were men who worshipped gods, whose attributes were those of mortal men, and whose actions were as immoral as those of their worshippers. In his search for “the One”, and the

dawning consciousness that the one great Cause of all must be infinitely removed from all limitations of time and sense, he not only ridiculed the man-like gods of his day, but threw such doubt upon the external world of sense as practically to annihilate it altogether. Speaking of the gods, he writes:--

“If oxen and lions could paint, they would make the pictures of their *gods in their likeness*. Horses would make them like horses, oxen like oxen.”

Xenophanes' witness against graven images and idolatry is remarkable, and would have gladdened the heart of Moses, who wrote, by inspiration of God: “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image” (Exod. xx. 4). The irony of his remarks about oxen and lions reminds one of the irony of Isa. xlv. 9-20, where the idolater makes his god out of one part of a tree, and with the rest makes a fire to bake his bread. The Saviour Himself testified concerning the Father: “Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape” (John v. 37).

Xenophanes was unconsciously crying out for the Son of God. Had he known the truth of Phil. ii., that Christ was originally and by right “in the form of God”, and that He was the “Image of the invisible God” (Col. i. 15), the empty void in his philosophy would have been filled.

When he spoke of “gods in their likeness”, he knew nothing of Gen. i. and its statement concerning the affinity between God and man: “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness” (Gen. i. 26).

Xenophanes' objection to anthropomorphic gods may have been justified in his own day and circumstances, but we hope to show later in this series that *Anthropomorphism* (This Figure of Speech is discussed in Volume XXIV, pages 145-147 and 208-211), is vital to our understanding of God.

“There is one God supreme among gods and men, resembling mortals neither in form nor in mind.”

He distrusts the evidence of the senses. The external world is but “seeming”, and reality belongs only to “the One”—a doctrine very similar to Pantheism.

Xenophanes was very much concerned with *Antitheses*—“The one and the many”, “The permanent and the changing”, ascribing reality to the one, and denying it to the other. In this he was not altogether wrong as a reference to II Cor. iv. 18 will show: “The things which are seen are *temporal*; but the things which are not seen are *age-abiding*.”

Unless it has been forced upon our notice, the idea of distrusting the senses may sound absurd. We well remember a lesson at school that showed how necessary it is to have some standard other than that of our own sense perceptions. Three pails were placed in the class room, and the scholar first plunged each of his hands at the same time into each of the two pails on either side, one containing ice-cold water, and the other hot water.

After a moment or two he lifted his hands and simultaneously plunged them into the central pail, containing ordinary tap water. One hand gave the verdict, "This water is cold"; the other, "This water is hot". Sense perception, therefore, is misleading. The thermometer has to decide.

Xenophanes' "God" was simply "pure Being". Such an abstraction could have no reference to anything finite, and no possible connection with the vicissitudes of existence. Xenophanes had got rid of the "gods" in human form, only to find a cold, shapeless, motionless abstraction, having no resemblance to the "God and Father" Whom we know through Christ.

The Scriptures do not speak of God apart from His relation to man and creation. From Genesis to Revelation, there is no attempt to explain God. He is Spirit, He is invisible, He is immense (immeasurable), He is everywhere always. These things are stated, but not explained, and wherever they are stated, it is only because of some relationship demanded by the context. A few examples will illustrate this.

"He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi. 6).

Philosophy would discuss the "being" of God. Genesis assumes His being, and proceeds to His works and ways.

"Thus saith the high and lofty One, that inhabiteth eternity" (Isa. lvii. 15).

Here, at first sight, is the beginning of a philosophical disquisition on the "Infinite", but a second glance at the verse shows that it is written to emphasize God's condescension:--

"I dwell in the high and holy place, *with him also* that is of a contrite and humble spirit."

Another passage that might be quoted is Psa. cxlvii. 5: "His understanding is infinite." This understanding extends to the number and names of the stars, an understanding that makes the minds reel, but it is introduced into this Psalm much in the same way as the parallel statements in the N.T. concerning the numbering of the hairs of the head, and the sparrow's fall. If the attributes ascribed to God are collected together, it will be found that they do not form a complete whole. They are but the fringe of a mighty subject, and speak of God only as He comes into relation with man. All else is left unexplained.

What Xenophanes did not know was the condescension of this Great and Holy One. He did not realize that He Who created heaven and earth has entered deeply into its progress and its pain—in other words, he had no knowledge as we have of the mystery of godliness: "God manifest in the flesh."

**#9. The condescension of the great “I AM”  
Moses and Parmenides.  
pp. 90 - 92**

The Eleatic Philosophy which originated with Xenophanes, was systemized by Parmenides, and completed by Zeno. Parmenides was largely concerned with the idea of “being”, and opposed this idea to all that is complex and mutable. He maintained that, while the reason led to truth, the senses, which were occupied with impressions received from an ever-changing unreal world, were deceived. His arguments were chiefly directed to proving that reality as a whole cannot change.

“If we consider everything that is, it is clear that it cannot become more than it is, except by the addition of something else; but if we start with literally everything, there is nothing left that can be added to it . . . . It follows that the whole cannot change in the parts is, therefore, an illusion” (C. E. M. Joad).

In his endeavour to preserve intact the notion of “pure being”, he denied the reality of creation. The subject was too immense for the unaided human mind.

The theme is touched upon in the Scriptures in Exod. iii., but only to be set aside for a lower aspect of truth to be revealed in its place. A momentary revelation of the “being” of God is given to Moses, but this is immediately followed by the name whereby the Most High is revealed in the O.T.

Moses enquires what he shall say to the children of Israel when they ask for the name of the God Who had sent him. And the reply comes:--

“And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you” (Exod. iii. 14).

Here we have expressed what Xenophanes and Parmenides sought for, Absolute Unconditioned Being. But what would a nation of slaves, who had spent their days making bricks, know of “Unconditioned Being”? Such knowledge is too wonderful for us all; it is beyond us. We are so constituted that the unconditioned and the non-existent, to us, much the same. That which is not bounded by space, and is not conditioned by time, cannot be realized by the human mind. And so the Lord, in the fullness of time, was born of a virgin, and bore the name Immanuel “God with us”. More than once He revealed that He was the “I AM” of Exod. iii., but He usually condescended to the conditions imposed by our human limitations and associated the unconditioned I AM with some other title. To us He is not only the “I AM” but we also read:--

“I am the good shepherd.”  
“I am the door.”  
“I am the bread of life.”  
“I am the way.”  
“I am the light of the world.”

These things Philosophy could never have discovered. As we have said so many times already, God's gracious solution of life's enigma is found in the personal Christ.

Returning to Exod. iii., we find that the Lord modifies His original title:--

“The Lord God of your father . . . . hath sent me unto you: this is My Name *unto the age*, and this is My memorial *unto all generations*” (Exod. iii. 15).

The timeless “I AM” is replaced by a name that is “unto the age”. The Infinite condescends to the limitations of men.

The word “Lord” here is the name “Jehovah”, which is made up of parts of the verb “to be”. Its composition is unfolded in Rev. i.: “Grace be unto you . . . . from *Him which is, and which was, and which is to come*” (Rev. i. 4).

The title “Jehovah” is further explained in Gen. xxi. 33, where the words “The Lord, the everlasting God” are in the Hebrew, *Jehovah, El Olam*—“Jehovah, God of the age”.

It is simple to believe that God is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and many other high and wonderful things, but it is the glorious peculiarity of the Christian revelation that it turns our worshipping gaze to a lowly cradle, a virgin's Son, a crucified Redeemer. These things are utterly beyond the power of human wisdom to discover.

The philosophy that denied the pulse of life and the joy and sorrow of a teeming creation, carried within itself its own death sentence, and came to an end with the teaching of Zeno. It would serve no useful purpose to occupy space and time in dealing with his empty dialectics. Some readers may know how, in order to disprove the reality of “things seen”, he invented the problem of Achilles and the Tortoise, and sought to disprove the reality of motion. Such jugglings as these led at length to skepticism and sophistry, and failed altogether to meet either the cry of the living, or the dreadful need of the dead. Any attempt to discover God apart from Christ is doomed to failure.

To the despised and afflicted captives in Egypt, a revelation was given (Exod. iii. 14, 15) that would have provided a complete answer to the quest of a generation of philosophers. And yet there will probably be some believers, who will consider that the few minutes required to read and weigh over this simple article are almost a waste of time. May we never need to learn the value of the Word of God by being compelled to do without its light and teaching.

**#10. A world of change, without Him, Who changes not.  
The philosophy of Heraclitus.  
pp. 132 - 134**

Human wisdom, in its brief course from Thales to Zeno, had entered in mist and darkness. God had been shorn of every personal attribute, and the world had been whittled away into illusion. Without being uncharitable, we feel that across the labours of these wise men might be written the words: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no god." A reaction was inevitable, and found expression in the teaching of Heraclitus (B.C.535-475).

In the philosophy of Heraclitus, we find the pendulum swinging to the other extreme. He denies the permanent and affirms the changeable. The key-word of his philosophy is "becoming"—a word of great importance in the first chapter of John's Gospel, where we read, if we translate literally: "All things through Him *became*, and without Him not one thing *became* that did *become*" (John i. 3). Heraclitus affirmed the fact of the changing world, but only dimly realized Him "through Whom" it became, and "without Whom" it could not exist. In the fragments of his writings we read:--

"The *Logos* existeth from all time, yet mankind are unaware of it, both before they hear it, and while they listen to it."

This a remarkable anticipation of John i. 1-5, and enables us to perceived that, while the Jews had the privilege of the Law and the Prophets, the Greeks, in the interval of Israel's rejection, were being used to prepare the way for the wisdom of God in Christ. We hope to give the place of the *Logos* more definite consideration later.

Centuries before Heraclitus, Solomon, King of Israel, had surveyed the world and observed its incessant change.

"Into the same river no man can enter twice, ever it disperses and collects itself again"  
(Heraclitus).

"All rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again. All things are full of labour: man cannot utter it: the eye is not satisfied with seeing nor the ear with hearing" (Eccles. i. 7, 8).

As part of the revolt against the teaching of the Eleatic school, Heraclitus asserted that we do not become cognizant of "becoming" or "change" by the exercise of reason, but by the evidence of the senses. Dialectic methods—the methods of formal reasoning as opposed to experiment and observation—were therefore inadmissible. Ecclesiastes, however, had tried the empirical method before him, and has left on record the result: "The eye is not satisfied with *seeing*, nor the ear with *hearing*." Heraclitus, however, in spite of his insistence upon the senses as opposed to formal reasoning, had to confess that the ears and the eyes were capable of deception, referring probably to the idea that what

appears to the senses solid and unchanging is in reality as surely passing as the swiftly flowing river. In this he anticipates modern science with its waves and electrons.

In Ecclesiastes we read:--

“The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun” (Eccles. i. 9).

Heraclitus speaks of fire as a principle that underlies all “change” or “becoming”; fire that for ever extinguishes itself and again rekindles, an all-consuming, all-transmuting, all-vivifying element. The two processes of extinction and ignition in this fire-power alternate, according to Heraclitus, in perpetual rotation with each other. “In stated periods the world resolves itself into primal fire, in order to re-create itself out of fire again.”

One cannot avoid comparing the teaching of Heraclitus with the testimony of the apostle Peter:--

“But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men . . . . The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless, we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” (II Pet. iii. 7-13).

In Heraclitus’ teaching, however, there is nothing to be looked for but a “perpetual rotation”; in Peter’s teaching, there is a goal and an end in view. Moreover, the whole passage in Peter’s epistle is not the *development of a philosophical theory*, but the *fulfillment of a promise*, the promise of the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ. The passage is introduced by the words of the scoffer: “Where is the promise of His coming?” (II Pet. iii. 4).

Rotations of never-ending time in the philosophy of Heraclitus are “days” in the teaching of Peter, “the day of the Lord” and “the day of God”, days intimately associated with a Person. The personal note constitutes the essential difference between all philosophy at all times, and the testimony of Scripture. The glory of the Word of God is that the fullness of the Godhead is not an abstraction, but dwells “bodily” in the Lord Jesus Christ. The Word of Life has been “seen” and “handled”.

We do indeed, with Heraclitus, see a world of change, but, by the grace of God, we also see “Him Who changes not”. Philosophy may turn our attention to change and decay, but God along illuminate the darkness with the light that shines in the face of Jesus Christ.

“Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of Thine hands. *They shall perish, but Thou remainest . . . . Thou art the same . . . .* Jesus Christ, the *same* yesterday, and to-day, and for ever” (Heb. i. 10-12; xiii. 8).

## #11. Empedocles, and the need of a Mediator. pp. 171 - 173

Before dealing with the next step taken by human wisdom in its attempt to discover the nature of ultimate reality and the origin of force and life, let us turn to the fountain of all truth, and read once again with growing wonder the simple facts that two hundred years of intense thought, from Thales to Heraclitus, had failed to discover:--

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth became without form and void: and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light; and there was light” (Gen. i. 1-3).

These are words of revealed truth that scatter the darkness of human philosophy as the rising sun scatters the mists of night.

“*In the beginning*” (Greek: *arche*).—Over and over again we come across this word in the writings of the early philosophers. What is the “first principle”, the *arche*? According to Thales it must be water. According to Anaximander it cannot be anything so determinate as water; it must be an unbounded substance like our ether. Then comes Anaximenes, who teaches that it cannot be either, but must be something rarer than water, and yet not so indeterminate as “infinity”—it must be *air*. Pythagoras, rejecting all three theories, discovers that number is the *arche*, for mathematical relations are found everywhere.

The Scripture make two definite statements concerning “the beginning” (*arche*) in the New Testament:--

- (1) “*In the beginning* was the Word . . . . all things were made by Him” (John i. 1-3).
- (2) “These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, *the Beginning of the Creation of God*” (Rev. iii. 14).

Philosophy missed its way because it knew nothing of the personal element that is one of the chief glories of the true Revelation of God. The beginning of the creation of God is not merely “time”, but Christ Himself. When, therefore, Gen. i. 1 speaks of “the beginning”, we must understand not only the beginning of time, but that all creation was created “in Christ”. The problems of philosophy with regard to the apparent impossibility of absolute unconditioned Being having any point of contact with the passing and changing creation are fully answered in the Person of Christ, “the Firstborn of all creation”. Later we hope to deal with this teaching more fully; at present we are still reviewing the wisdom of man.

The subject that seemed to present itself at the juncture in the history of philosophy which we have now reached was the question of the origin of movement, force, change

and growth. How was it possible for the “Being” of the Eleatics to have any contact with the “Becoming” of Heraclitus? Empedocles (B.C.490-430) assumed the existence of four radical elements, fire, air, water and earth, and set beside inert matter a twofold moving force, likened by him to love and hate, or, as we should say to-day, attraction and repulsion. In this Empedocles seems to have had a glimmering of the truth revealed in Gen. i. There, the moving force is said to be “the Spirit of God”, and a very definite process of division follows:--

“God divided the light from the darkness . . . . Let it divide the waters from the waters . . . . Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together in one place”  
(Gen. i. 4-9).

Empedocles also held that the *knowing* subject, and the *known* object must be of like nature. This we shall find is a valuable truth, but we will reserve comment upon it until this review is concluded. He was also the first psychologist, and declared God to be “pure spirit without body or members”. But he pursued the matter no further. How could he, or any man? He needed Christ the Mediator.

Empedocles seems to have had some idea of the principle of Gen. i. 2, for he taught that at first the four elements existed together, absolutely at one with each other, until gradually “strife” penetrated, breaking up the unity, and so the world of darkness and light, life and death, and the many opposites that belong to everyday experience came into being. The student of Scripture knows that the present world is the battle-ground of the conflict of the ages, that there is a real enemy at work and that not until strife ceases, and righteousness reigns, can true unity or peace be possible. This, however, we rejoice to know, will not be brought about by the working of elementary forces, but by love, the love of the Father, the love of the Son, and the love of the Spirit, involving Sacrifice and longsuffering beyond the understanding of the mortal mind.

There is probably not one reader of these lines whose mentality and intellectual powers surpass, or even reach, the level of these men whose findings we have attempted to analyse—yet the simplest of us all is wiser than the whole world of philosophers, if it can truly be said that “we have the mind of Christ” (I Cor. ii. 16).

**#12. Chance or Intelligence?  
The Final Phase.  
Democritus and Anaxagoras.  
pp. 211, 212**

We observed in our last article that Empedocles endeavoured to discover some mediating force that would bring together the “Being” of the Eleatic philosophers with the “Becoming” of Heraclitus. John i. 1-3 supplies this mediating force in the Person of “The Word”, Who was “with” God, Who “was” God, and through Whom all “became”. This mighty truth, however, was not discoverable by human wisdom, and so we find other attempts to solve the problem.

Democritus (B.C.460) was the exponent of the atomic theory of the universe, a theory that is still held by chemists and physicists to-day. The atoms of Democritus were uncaused and eternal, and by their falling together and impinging upon one another he supposed the present universe to have been formed. No sufficient reason could be given for the marvelous fitness of things, but only “necessity”, or “chance”, in contrast with a final Cause. The philosophy of Democritus became, therefore, naturalistic and atheistic, and culminated in the Sophists, of whom we hope to speak later. The great failure in all the systems of philosophy that we have reviewed is that no adequate Cause can be discovered for the world as we see it, and no final goal or purpose.

In contrast with Democritus’ theory of blind “chance” we have the system of Anaxagoras, who lived at the same time. Anaxagoras makes an attempt to remove the difficulty by introducing the idea of a “designing intelligence”. After two hundred years of intense thought philosophy dimly perceived the possibility of that which is expressed very simply in Gen. i. 1.

Anaxagoras writes:--

“All things were together, infinitely numerous, infinitely little; then came the *nous* (‘mind’ or ‘intelligence’) and set them in order.”

There seems to be some vague realization here of the chaos and subsequent order of the six days’ creation.

Speaking of Anaxagoras and his teaching, Aristotle says:--

“When a man said that there was in nature, as in animals, an intelligence, which is the cause of the arrangement and order of the universe, this man alone appeared to have preserved his reason in the midst of the follies of his predecessors.”

Anaxagoras, however, fails, for his “nous” is simply a “mover of matter”. Socrates complains that in the hope of being brought beyond merely occasional and secondary causes up to final causes, he had applied himself to the study of Anaxagoras, but instead

**“With all thy getting, get understanding” (Prov. iv. 7).**

**#27. Figures of Speech.**

**Figures involving Change: Simile, Metaphor, Hypocatastasis.  
pp. 11 - 15**

We pass over a number of lesser figures of speech involving change among separate words (such as Hyperbaton), and change in sentences and phrases (such as Antithesis) and come to the series of figures which affect the *application* of words. These constitutes a very important section of our subject.

The figures of change that affect the application rather than the position of words, are divided into a number of sub-sections:--

	/	SENSE (16).
	/	PERSONS (6)
Those that affect the application of words as to	/	SUBJECT (5).
	\	TIME (1).
	\	FEELING (23).
	\	ARGUMENTATION (19).

The figures in brackets at the end of each line denote the number of varieties in each section noted in Dr. Bullinger’s *Figures of Speech*. The three figures of chief importance in this classes are Simile, Metaphor, and Hypocatastasis, and as these three figures are related as “good”, “better” and “best” are related, we shall consider them together, even though we shall be obliged to occupy a little more space than usual.

SIMILE is concerned with *Resemblance*. Its key-words are “like”, “as” and “so”.  
METAPHOR is concerned with *Representation*. Its key-words is the word “is”.  
HYPOCATASTASIS is concerned with *Implication*. There is no special key-word.

Simile differs from Comparison, for Comparison admits of dissimilitudes. It also differs from Metaphor. While Simile says “All flesh is *as* grass”, Metaphor more boldly says “All flesh *is* grass”. Simile also differs from Hypocatastasis, for while the latter *implies* resemblance, Simile actually states it. Metaphor is the language of feeling. It does not merely say that one thing is *like* another; it says that one thing *is* another. When we point to a picture and say, “This is my mother”, or when we say, “We are the sheep of His pasture” we are using the figure Metaphor. The reader will realize that to refer to *any* figure of speech as “metaphorical language” is, therefore, rather misleading.

Hypocatastasis is derived from the Greek word meaning “substitution”. The word is a compound of *hupo* “underneath”, *kata* “down”, and *stasis* “a stationing”. Hence a “putting down underneath”. The idea is that one of the names is given, but the other is only implied; it is “put down underneath” and left to the imagination.

If Metaphor is more forceful than Simile, Hypocatastasis is more forceful than either. Had Macduff said to Macbeth “Turn, thou man, that art like a hound out of hell”, it would have been a strong expression, and yet not true to the language of passion. Had Shakespeare used the figure Metaphor instead, Macduff would have cried “Macbeth, you are a hell-hound”. But neither Simile nor Metaphor are sufficient here. True to the feeling and language of a man whose wife and little ones had already suffered at the hands of Macbeth, Macduff throws aside all reserve, and uses the figure of Implication, Hypocatastasis: “Turn, hell-hound, turn.”

This is the superlative degree of comparison, implying without stating the comparison.

Let us now consider a few examples of each figure.

### **Simile.**

“He shall be *like* a tree planted by the rivers of water” (Psa. i. 3).

“The ungodly . . . . are *like* the chaff which the wind driveth away” (Psa. i. 4).

“Ye were *as* sheep going astray” (I Pet. ii. 25).

These are examples of the simplest form of Simile, and require no further explanation. Sometimes, however, the figure is used rather differently, and then demands care.

“And when the people were *as* murmurers” (Num. xi. 1, Margin).

“Jerusalem is builded together *as* a city that is compact together” (Psa. cxxii. 3).

In both these cases the actual fact was true. The people were actually murmurers and Jerusalem was actually a compact city.

Sometimes the word “as” is followed by “so”. A repeated alternation of this kind is found in Isa. xxiv. 2:--

“*As* with the people, *So* with the priest;  
*As* with the servant, *So* with the master;  
*As* with the maid, *So* with the mistress;  
*As* with the buyer, *So* with the seller;  
*As* with the lender, *So* with the borrower;  
*As* with the taker of usury, *So* with the giver of usury to him.”

### **Metaphor.**

We must now give our attention to the more robust figure of Metaphor. *Meta* means “beyond” or “over”, *phero* “to carry”; hence the idea of transference.

There is one point that should be carefully noticed here. The whole of the figure lies in the verb; the nouns remain literal and unchanged. For example, “All flesh is grass.” Here the words “flesh” and “grass” remain unchanged. Both are literal. The figure resides in the verb “is”, and in the statement that one *is* the other.

Again, there may often be an element of surprise in a Metaphor. Two quite unrelated subjects may be found to agree in some point. For example, both Christ and Satan are likened to a lion.

Let us remind ourselves of some simple Metaphors first before dealing with one or two that are more problematic.

“The Lord *is* my Shepherd.”  
“The Lord God *is* a Sun and Shield.”  
“I *am* the door.”  
“The field *is* the world.”  
“The reapers *are* the angels.”

These statements are obvious and require no explanation. No one would be foolish enough to ask whether the Lord was actually a door, or a vine. The expression is obviously figurative. Yet there is one such figure that has caused more misery than almost anything else in the realm of religious controversy. Anyone who has read Foxe’s Book of Martyrs cannot fail to have been impressed with the number of saints who were burned at the stake because they believed that the words of Christ, “This is My body” were spoken metaphorically. The Church of Rome maintained that they were to be taken literally, and upon this mistaken interpretation built its blasphemous doctrine of the Mass. As many of the martyrs affirmed, one might just as well believe that “the cup” was the “new testament”. The statements, “This *is* My body” and “This cup *is* the new testament” must both be translated similarly, and both are metaphors.

We must now turn our attention to the third figure.

### **Hypocatastasis.**

The following are examples. In each case the resemblance is implied; it is not actually stated as in the Simile and the Metaphor.

“Dogs have compassed me about” (Psa. xxii. 16).

The Psalmist does not say that his enemies were like dogs, or that they were dogs; he implies it.

Every plant which My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up” (Matt. xv. 13).  
“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees” (Matt. xvi. 6).

The context reveals that the “leaven” represented the “doctrine” of the Pharisees and Sadducees, but it would have been a cold statement of fact to have said: “The doctrine of the Pharisees is *like* leaven.” The Lord might have said, “The doctrine of the Pharisees *is* leaven”. That would have been stronger, but the implication of the figure Hypocatastasis is stronger still. It forced attention, and we read that the disciples “reasoned among themselves”.

Space will not permit us pursue our subject further. We would draw attention in closing to the fact that an Allegory is a continuation of both Metaphor and

Hypocatastasis, for in an Allegory the comparison is substituted and implied. A Parable is a continuation of the Simile.

**#28. Figures of Speech.**  
**Figures involving Change: “As to Persons.”**  
**pp. 49 - 52**

We cannot, in this series, deal with all the varied Figures of Change involving sense, of which Simile, Metaphor, and Implication are the most important cases. Other examples, however, that should be included by the interested student are the following:--

- PARABOLA (or PARABLE).—Comparison by continued resemblance.  
PAROEMIA (or PROVERB).—A wayside saying in common use.  
TYPE.—A figure of something future.  
SYMBOL.—A material subject substituted for a moral or spiritual truth.  
GNOME (or QUOTATION).—A subject of great importance, and partly explored in the series “*The Volume of the Book*”—See *Volumes XXII and XXIII*.  
EIRONEIA (or IRONY).—An expression that conveys its opposite.  
OXYMORON (or WISE-FOLLY).—A wise saying that seems foolish.  
IDIOMA.—The peculiar usage of words and phrases. A vast subject, and occupying forty pages in Dr. Bullinger’s work.

With this brief notice, we must leave those figures that deal with “sense”, and turn to those figures of change that deal with persons. There are five cases:--

- (1) PROSOPOPOEIA (or PERSONIFICATION).—Things represented as persons.
- (2) ANTIPROSOPOPOEIA (or ANTI-PERSONIFICATION).—Persons represented as inanimate things.
- (3) ANTHROPOPATHEIA (or CONDESCENSION).—Ascription of human attributes to God.
- (4) ANTIMETATHESIS (or DIALOGUE).—A transference of speakers.
- (5) ASSOCIATION (or INCLUSION).—When the writer associates himself with those whom he addresses.

*Prosopopoeia* is made up of the Greek words *prosopon*, “face” or “person”, and *poiein*, “to make”. This figure may be subdivided into six classes:--

- (1) Those that use the members of the human body.
- (2) Animals.
- (3) Products of the earth.
- (4) Inanimate things.
- (5) Kingdoms, countries and states.
- (6) Human actions, etc.

We will give one or two examples under each of these headings:--

### (1) Human.

“When the ear heard me, then it blessed me” (Job xxix. 11).

Here the ear not only exercises its natural function of hearing, but is personified, and “blesses”.

“Their tongue walketh through the earth” (Psa. lxxviii. 9).

### (2) Animal.

“At the hand of every beast will I require it” (Gen. ix. 5).

If beasts are personified because of responsibility, how much more must man be held accountable.

“Ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee” (Job xii. 7).

### (3) Products of the earth.

“Ye shall count the fruit thereof as uncircumcised” (Lev. xix. 23).

“The land mourneth . . . . the oil languisheth” (Joel i. 10).

### (4) Inanimate things.

“The nakedness of the land” (Gen. xlii. 9, 12).

“I will make mine arrows drunk with blood” (Deut. xxxii. 42).

### (5) Kingdoms, etc.

“The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint” (Isa. i. 5, 6).

“Daughter of Zion . . . . Daughter of Jerusalem” (Zech. ix. 9).

### (6) Human Actions.

“Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other” (Psa. lxxxv. 10).

“When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin” (James i. 15).

*Antiprosopoeia*.—Persons who are living are represented by inanimate things.

“Then said Abishai the son of Zeruah unto the king, Why should *this dead dog* curse my lord the king? Let me go over, I pray thee, and take off his head” (II Sam. xvi. 9).

The figure here has a vivid intensity, although when looked at in the cold light of reason it may appear absurd to speak of a dead dog cursing at all.

*Anthropopatheia* is made up of the Greek words *anthropos*, “man”, and *pathos*, “affection” or “feeling”. The Latin name for this figure, *Condensio*, is very expressive. It is indeed a condescension for the Most High God, Who is Spirit, to speak in terms of such intimacy that we can in our small measure understand Him, Whose fulness is beyond all mortal apprehension. In one sense it might be said that the Lord

Jesus Christ, Who is the Word, and the Image, God manifest in the flesh, is the living example of God's gracious Condescension to poor frail mankind.

Dr. Bullinger sub-divides this figure into nineteen sections. We cannot stay to tabulate these divisions, or to give examples of each, but the passages below are fairly representative of the figure as a whole:--

"I will guide thee with Mine *eye*" (Psa. xxxii. 8).  
"Let Thine *ears* be attentive to the voice of my supplications" (Psa. cxxx. 2).  
"At the blast of the breath of Thy *nostrils*" (Psa. xviii. 15).  
"Jehovah hath made bare His holy *arm*" (Isa. lii. 10).  
"Through the *bowels* of the mercy of our God" (Luke i. 78, Margin).  
"It *repented* Jehovah that He had made man on the earth" (Gen. vi. 6).  
"They provoked him to *jealousy* with strange gods" (Deut. xxxii. 16).  
"Where art thou?" "Where is Abel thy brother" (Gen. iii. 9; iv. 9).  
"And God *remembered* Noah" (Gen. viii. 1).  
"I even I, will utterly *forget* you" (Jer. xxiii. 39).  
"He that sitteth in the heavens shall *laugh*" (Psa. ii. 4).

"Years" and "days" are attributed to God (Psa. cii. 24; Dan. vii. 9); and weapons of war, such as bow and arrow, sword, spear, shield and chariot. The Lord is spoken of as a lamb, as a lion, and as a vine. God is spoken of as a light and a fire, as a rock, a hiding place, a "portion" and a shade. In all these and many other ways has the Lord condescended to our low estate.

The two figures that remain need not occupy much space.

*Antimetathesis* (or *Dialogue*).—A good illustration is found in Rom. iii. 1-9, where the Jew is represented as asking a series of questions, which are answered by the apostle Paul.

*Association* (or *Inclusion*).—This is a figure in which the speaker, after addressing others, turns and includes himself.

"And *you* hath He quickened . . . . among whom also *we all* had our conversation in times past" (Eph. ii. 1-3).

This concludes our study of the Figures of Change involving persons. We must next consider those figures that deal with subject-matter.

**#29. Figures of Speech.**  
**Figures involving Change: “Subject-Matter” and “Time”.**  
**pp. 92 - 95**

We have already considered the five figures that affect the application of words with regard to persons, and must now turn our attention to the six figures that affect the application of words with regard to subject-matter. They are as follows:--

- (1) *Apostrophe*.—A turning aside to address others.
- (2) *Parecbasis*.—A turning aside from one subject to another.
- (3) *Metabasis*.—A passing from one subject to another.
- (4) *Epanorthosis*.—A recalling of what has been said.
- (5) *Amphidiorthosis*.—A setting right of both hearer and speaker.
- (6) *Anachoresis*.—A return to the original subject.

Those of our readers who possess Dr. Bullinger’s *Figures of Speech* (1898 Edition) should correct a mistake that occurs in the analytical index. On page xli. *Apostrophe* is included in the list of figures that deal with persons; while in the body of the book it is assigned to its right place, with reference to subject-matter.

*Apostrophe*.—This word is derived from the Greek *apo* “away from”, and *strephein* “to turn”. The speaker turns away from the real auditory to address an imaginary one. Neh. iv. 4 is an example of the use of the figure in relation to God; and Psalm xxvii. 14, of its use in relation to men. I Kings xiii. 2, and Jer. xxii. 29 are examples of *Apostrophe* in relation to inanimate things.

*Parecbasis* or “Digression”, is derived from the Greek *para* “beside”, *ek* “out of”, and *basis* “a stepping”. As an example, we may take Gen. xxxviii. On either side of this chapter, we have the story of Joseph, the end of chapter xxxvii. coinciding with the opening of chapter xxxix.

“And the Midianites sold him into Egypt unto Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh’s, and captain of the guard” (Gen. xxxvii. 36).

Then comes chapter xxxviii., as a digression. And chapter xxxix. opens:--

“And Joseph was brought down to Egypt; and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, an Egyptian, bought him of the hands of the Ishmeelites, which had brought him down thither” (Gen. xxxix. 1).

There can be no doubt, however, as to the purpose of this digression. Joseph was submitted to a great temptation and triumphed. Judah, in rather similar circumstances, and with less temptation, failed. Both Joseph and Judah leave behind them articles of apparel or personal possessions that are used as a means of identification. In Joseph’s case, his garment is used as a means of convicting him falsely; in Judah’s, his pledges

are used to convict him justly. Judah represents the people of God; and Joseph the Redeemer—Who, though He did no sin, was sold into bondage, was falsely accused and punished, and finally was the instrument in the hands of God for the restoration of his fallen brethren. Such is the lesson to be learnt from this “Digression”.

*Metabasis*, or “Transition”, is derived from the Greek words *meta* “beyond” and *bainein* “to step”. It indicates a stepping from one thing to another. In I Cor. xii., the apostle is dealing with spiritual gifts, and in verse 31 hints that there is something more excellent. This he elaborates in his magnificent chapter xiii. concerning love.

*Epanorthosis*, or “Correction”, is derived from the Greek *epi* “upon”, *ana* “up” or “again”, and *orthoun* “to set straight”. This correction” may be of three kinds: absolute, partial, or conditional. As an example of absolute Epanorthosis, we may take Rom. xv. 4:--

“Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.” (And then, remembering the blessed fact that the security of all the redeemed is assured, the apostle adds) “*Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand*”.

As an example of partial or relative Epanorthosis, we may take Gal. ii. 20: “Nevertheless I live: *yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.*” Or again, in Gal. iv. 9: “But now, after that ye have known God: *or rather, are known of God.*”

For an example of the figure of conditional Epanorthosis we may turn to Gal. iii. 4: “Have ye suffered so many things in vain? *If it be yet in vain.*”

An example of the figure *Amphidiorthosis*, or “Double Correction”, is found in I Cor. xi. 22: “What am I to say to you? *Commend you herein? No, indeed.*”

*Anachoresis*, or “Regression”, is derived from the Greek *ana* “back”, and *choresis* “withdraw”. An example of this figure which will be of interest to all believers of the dispensation of the mystery occurs in Eph. iii.:--

“FOR THIS CAUSE I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles—  
(*This comes a long parenthesis, in which the apostle justifies the claim made in verse 1 by revealing the truth concerning his reception of the mystery and its stewardship. He then returns to his original statement in verse 14*).

FOR THIS CAUSE I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Eph. iii. 1-14).

To this list of figures dealing with subject-matter we will add the one figure that deals with “time”. This is *Prolepsis*, or “Anticipation”, from *pro* “before” and *lambano* “to take”. In this figure the future is spoken of as though it were actually present. A familiar example is found in the prophetic Psalms, especially those that commence with the words “The Lord reigneth”.

In our next article we hope to conclude this brief survey of the Figures of Speech used in Scripture, but would remind the reader that we shall only have been able to deal with a tithe of the complete subject.

**#30. Figures of Speech.**  
**Figures involving Change: “Feeling” and “Argumentation”.**  
**pp. 134 - 137**

The figures that remain are those dealing with “Feeling” and “Argumentation”. Under the heading of “Feeling”, twenty-three figures are listed; and under the heading “Argumentation”, nineteen. We give a few examples of each kind.

*Anamnesis* or “Recalling”—from the Greek *ana*, “again” and *mineskein*, “to put in mind”.—An example occurs in Rom. ix. 3. According to the A.V., Paul expresses a wish in this verse that in viii. 38, 39 he is persuaded could never be fulfilled. We observe, however, that the verb “to wish” is in the imperfect tense and should be translated “I used to wish”. All is then clear. The apostle recalls the time when he too acted as his fellow-countrymen were still acting, and so, instead of bitterly accusing them, he looks at them with sympathy and with tears, realizing the grace that alone has made the difference in his own attitude.

It should, perhaps, be mentioned here that many commentators do not adopt the rendering “I used to wish” given above, but adhere to the text of the A.V. For a fuller discussion of this point the reader is referred to the series on *The Epistle to the Romans*, No.65, which will appear in the August issue.

It would be a good thing if we all practiced the figure of *Anamnesis* more often. In Eph. ii. 11 we have the apostle’s call to “remember”; and many a time it would be salutary for us to remember the pit from which we were taken.

Other Figures of Feeling, which we cannot now consider, deal with Blessing, Prayer, Exhortation, Wishing, Exclamation, Reprimand, Imprecation, and the like.

*Erotasis* or “Interrogating”, from *erotan*, “to ask”.—*Dr. Bullinger* draws attention to the fact that out of the 1,189 chapters of the Bible, there are only 453 which are without a question, and that there are no less than 3,298 questions. No system of sub-division seems quite adequate or complete. Many attempts have been made, but overlapping or omission seem almost inevitable. *Dr. Bullinger* suggests a system of 19 classes, e.g.:--

*Positive Affirmation*.—“Wilt not Thou deliver my feet from falling?”  
*Negative Affirmation*.—“Is not the whole land before thee?”  
*Affirmative Negation*.—“Is anything too hard for the Lord?”

The reader will find it a fruitful exercise to attempt the classification of all the questions that occur in a single book or epistle.

*Dialogismos*, or “Dialogue”.—The name of the figure needs no explanation. As an example, we may take Isa. lxiii. 1-6, where we have an alternation of question and answer.

A | Who is He?  
B | I that speak.  
A | Wherefore art Thou red?  
B | I have trodden the winepress.

*Aetiologia*, or “Cause shown”, from *aitia*, “a cause”, and *logos*, “a description”.—This is a most important element in argumentation, and is often introduced by the words “for” or “therefore”. For example, in Rom. i. 16-18:--

“I am ready . . . . FOR I am not ashamed . . . .  
FOR it is the power of God . . . .  
FOR therein is revealed righteousness . . . .  
FOR the wrath of God is revealed . . . .”

The apostle Paul is the most argumentative writer in Scripture. Every occurrence of the words “for”, “that”, “therefore”, “wherefore” is a challenge, and should be carefully noted.

Another important Figure of Argumentation is *Synchoreosis* or “Concession”, from the Greek *sunchoreo*, “to come together”, or “agree”.—The figure is used when a *concession* of one point is made in order to gain another. A recognition of this figure is necessary for a true understanding of the great parenthesis of Rom. i. 18 - iii. 20. The apostle’s supreme object is to convict the Jew of his need of a righteousness without works, and, in order to gain his point he “fetches a wide compass” and begins with the awful sinfulness of the Gentile world (Rom. i. 18-32). Again, in Rom. ii. 17-20 he concedes the claim of the Jew as knowing the law, and being able to lead the blind, but only to give weight to the argument that follows—that the Jew, with his self-confessed advantages, was more desperately in need of righteousness than the Gentile who had no revelation of truth to guide him. The reader should be on the look-out for this figure of Concession, but should be careful not to confuse it with *Epitrophe*, which is a figure of Admission. When a point is “conceded” we do not “admit” that we are wrong.

The figure *Prolepsis* or “Anticipation”, which we considered at the end of our last article must be considered again here. When it deals with Argumentation, it anticipates the argument that it sees is being formulated. The figure has two forms, “Closed” and “Open”. In the Closed Prolepsis, we have the anticipated objection merely stated but not answered. In the Open Prolepsis, the anticipated objection is both stated and answered.

First the Closed form: “I say then, Hath God cast away His people?” (Rom. xi. 1).

## Words of Comfort.

### #1. Suffering is but for a season (I Pet. i. 6). pp. 181, 182

While we rejoice in the glorious revelation of God's love that teaches us concerning the fullness of Christ and our acceptance in Him, and while we may be persuaded that neither death nor life shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, there are times when circumstances are such that even words of comfort are not despised, but, rather, eagerly received. In the general body of our witness the reader must expect to find much that will be the strong meat of the Word, but in these smaller articles we seek to pass on those words of comfort that are found scattered throughout the pages of Scripture and which are the preserve of no one particular dispensation.

In his epistles the apostle Peter has much to say of suffering, and while some of his statements have particular reference to "the dispersion scattered abroad", there are also some which constitute mitigation of misery, palliatives in persecution, balm in Gilead, available for every one of the redeemed, whatever may be his hope and calling. The first word of comfort that Peter gives is found in I Pet. i. 6 where he says:

"Though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations."

*For a season.*—What a difference it makes to us in sorrow or distress to be able to look beyond the present darkness, to the future dawn that we know must come. Manifold as temptations may be, they are limited, they are "but for a season". The R.V. translates the passage: "For a little while"; Weymouth gives: "For a short time", and Moffatt: "For the passing moment". Primarily the word means "few" as contrasted with "many". It is used of number, "Few there be that find it" (Matt. vii. 14); of place, "A little farther thence" (Mark i. 19); of time, "It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away" (James iv. 14); of quantity, "Use a little wine" (I Tim. v. 23); and of magnitude, "No small stir" (Acts xii. 18).

It is evident that the Spirit of God would minister comfort to all that are in distress for Christ's sake, by drawing their attention to its comparative brevity. We say "comparative brevity" advisedly, for we all know that some hours of our experience have seemed like centuries, and we do well to let this relative element work for good as well as for ill. Look at the two points of view, and their effect upon mind and heart, that dominate the words that follow. One child of God under the pressure of his suffering cries out:

I see no hope of alleviation, the long lone road stretches out in front of me, on and on to the utmost limit of human endurance. I am doomed to suffer for the remainder of my life.

while the language of another who, despite his suffering, retains a sense of perspective, is:

I see no hope of alleviation in this life, but although the flesh is weak and the time sometimes seems long, what is the longest human span down here, to the endless ages of glory that await me. Even though weeping endure for the night, and for the whole night, joy cometh in the morning.

The burden of both is that their suffering is for life. But one says: “I must suffer *all* my life”, the other says “Never mind, it is *only* for a life-time”; the same span of years in each case, but what a different point of view! Which point of view is ours? There is no doubt as to which is the Scriptural one. The apostle Paul, who knew perhaps more of what suffering meant than any follower of Christ since his day, said:

“For our light affliction, which is *but for a moment*, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” (II Cor. iv. 17).

So, also, Peter. Using the same word as is found in I Pet. i. 6, he says:

“But the God of all grace, Who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered A WHILE, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you” (I Pet. v. 10).

Let us, fellow pilgrim appropriate this word of comfort. Manifold temptations are but for “a moment”; suffering is but for “a while”. “Joy”, however, “*cometh in the morning*”.

## **#2. Suffering is for a Reason (I Pet. i. 6). pp. 221, 222**

Our first “word of comfort” was the fact expressed by Peter in I Pet. i. 6 and v. 10, that temptation and suffering are but for a season. In the same verse in chapter i. we may discover another source of comfort, for the apostle writes:

“Though now for a season, IF NEED BE, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations” (I Pet. i. 6).

Not only are sufferings limited, but they have a “need be”. It must surely minister comfort to any in distress to be assured that however strange the affliction may seem, it is for a season, and it is for a reason. The “need be” may have no direct reference to ourselves. It does not follow that every affliction is a chastisement. We are to apt to take the attitude of Job’s friends, or that of the disciples when they said: “Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?” and leave too little margin for the Lord’s reply: “Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him” (John ix. 2, 3).

Let the afflicted believer take comfort from the reference to the Lord Jesus Himself in Luke xxiv. 46, where the same word is used:

“Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved* Christ to suffer” (Luke xxiv. 46).

And in Acts xvii. we read:

“Christ *must needs* have suffered” (Acts xvii. 3).

Such a “need be” was true also of the apostle Paul:

“He is a chosen vessel unto Me, to bear My name before the Gentiles . . . . I will shew him how great things he *must* (it behoveth, it is needful) suffer for My name’s sake” (Acts ix. 15, 16).

In Acts xiv. 22, the writer, instead of continuing in narrative form and telling us in his own way what Paul said, departs from this form to give a quotation, so important does he consider the message to be:

“And when they had preached the gospel to that city . . . . they returned . . . . confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we *must* through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God” (Acts xiv. 21, 22).

Take as an example the “need be” realized by the apostle Paul concerning himself. He had some dreadful affliction that he called “a thorn, or stake, in the flesh”, “a messenger of Satan sent to buffet me”. Three times he besought the Lord that this affliction might leave him, and then he learned the “need be”. It was apparently necessary for him to have this continual thorn in the flesh, lest he should be unduly exalted by the fact that so many wonderful revelations had been given to him. Spiritual pride is far worse than any “messenger of Satan” can ever be. It was for Paul’s good that the thorn remained. Moreover, it was needful for Paul to have continual and increasing experimental acquaintance with the main theme of his own doctrine, namely, the all-sufficiency of grace and the utter inability of self. It was necessary for him to realize increasingly the fact that while the Lord’s strength is *exhibited* in deliverance, it is *perfected* in our endurance, and the blessed fact that the words “if need be” and “for Christ’s sake” may be synonymous.

“And He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for My strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me: Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ’s sake; for when I am weak, then am I strong” (II Cor. xii. 9-10).

God does not afflict His children without reason. If we can be assured, as we may, that the unpleasant experiences of this life are necessary, either for our own discipline and correction, as an example to others, or for the working out of the great purpose of God, surely this will illuminate the darkness, and turn our weeping to joy—even as the

apostle could turn from beseeching that his troubles might go, to taking pleasure in them, for, he says, “When I am weak, then am I strong”.

“For a season”, and “if need be”—let us “comfort one another with these words”.

## Our Young People's Page.

### Weekly Bible Readings for January, 1937.

#### Subject: The Holy Scriptures.

*(The notes are for the guidance of those superintending the Young People's reading).*

p. 20

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>January 3rd.</i> II Timothy iii. How Scripture was given.</p>	<p>SCRIPTURE: Child and Salvation (15); Man and Service (17); Scripture, <i>Graphe</i> = Written (16). Inspire, <i>Pneuma</i> = Breathed (as in pneumatic).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>January 10th.</i> II Peter i. How Prophecy came.</p>	<p>Purpose of Prophecy: Lamp in Dark (19): "Private interpretation" means "own unfolding" (20); "Moved" = "Drive" (Acts xxvii. 15, 17, 21).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>January 17th.</i> Luke xxiv. The O.T. and Christ.</p>	<p>Moses and all Prophets (27); Opened eyes (31); Opened Scriptures (32); Opened Understanding (45); Moses, Prophets, Psalms—concerning Himself (44).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>January 24th.</i> John xvii. Inspired "words" made up "the Word".</p>	<p>The words (8); The Word (14); Thy Word is truth (17).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>January 31st.</i> Psalm cxix. 1-16.</p>	<p>Every verse contains a reference to the Word and uses a variety of titles such as "law", "testimonies", etc.</p>

Verses to memorize (one each week):

II Tim. iii. 16; II Pet. i. 21; Luke xxiv. 27; John xvii. 17; Psa. cxix. 1.

#### "Search and See" Section.

*These "search and see" questions are based upon the weekly readings. Boys and girls from the age of 7 years to 11 form Group I, and those from 11 to 14 form Group II. All who receive 50 percent marks or more will receive a certificate at the end of the year, and a prize will be given to a boy and girl in each Group who gets the highest marks. The name, address and age should be written upon each paper, and the monthly sets sent each month to "Win", "Shalom", Main Road, Hutton, Essex.*

- II Timothy ii.--
- (1) What does the word Scripture mean?
  - (2) How was Scripture given?
  - (3) Will Scripture help a child? How?

- II Peter i.--
- (1) What is prophecy like?
  - (2) How did it first come?
  - (3) Who is prophecy mostly about?
- Luke xxiv.--
- (1) How much of the O.T. refers to Christ?
  - (2) What was the effect of the “opened Scriptures” on the two disciples?
- John xvii.--
- (1) When was this prayer offered? and for whom did the Lord Jesus pray?
  - (2) What work did He do on earth? and whose words did He speak?
  - (3) Can we understand the *Word* of God if we neglect the *words* He uses?
- Psalm cxix. 1-16.--
- (1) In what way can God’s Word help us?
  - (2) What do these verses say about “Way” and “Ways”?

## Weekly Bible Readings for February, 1937.

### Subject: Salvation.

p. 40

<p><i>February 7th.</i> Romans i. 1-17. “The gospel, the power of God unto salvation.”</p>	<p>Notice purport of “for” in 16, 17. “Power” is translated “Miracle”. We are “saved” because “righteousness” has been provided.</p>
<p><i>February 14th.</i> Acts i. 1-22. “Salvation through Christ alone.”</p>	<p>“Salvation” in verse 12 is “the healing”. The miracle sets forth the “salvation” of the nation. Stress “none other name”. Give parallels, e.g., John xiv. 6.</p>
<p><i>February 21st.</i> Isaiah xii. “God is my Salvation.”</p>	<p>Prophetic “in that day” (1); “God”, “Jehovah”, (2); “Wells of salvation” (<i>see</i> John iv. 14); “Salvation”, “Strength”, “Song”.</p>
<p><i>February 28th.</i> Psalm cxix. 113-128.</p>	<p>“Hiding Place”; “Shield”; “Safe”; “Surety”; “Salvation.”</p>

### “Search and See” Section.

- Romans i.-- (1) Why was Paul not ashamed of the gospel he was so ready to preach?  
(2) To whom is salvation given?  
(3) What is revealed to us in the gospel?
- Acts iv.-- (1) Did Peter heal the man by his own power,  
or did he acknowledge some other power?  
(2) Are we saved by our own works?  
(3) Who is the only One Who can save?
- Isaiah xii.-- (1) Why can we trust and not be afraid when troubles come?  
(2) Is there only a small supply of salvation, and  
(3) Why is it likened to water?
- Psalm cxix. 113-128.-- (1) Mention in what ways God helps us and saves us in these verses?  
(2) What does it mean by saying that God is “surety” for us?

Verses to memorize (one each week):

Rom. i. 16; Acts iv. 12; Isa. xii. 12; Psa. cxix. 114.

**Weekly Bible Readings for March, 1937.**  
**Subject: The Saviour.**  
**p. 60**

<p><i>March 7th.</i>  Matthew i.  The Saviour—"Jesus",  "Emmanuel".</p>	<p>Name JESUS is N.T. way of spelling "Joshua"  (see Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8).  Name EMMANUEL interpreted in passage  as "God with us".  A true recognition of the Person of the  Saviour is essential.</p>
<p><i>March 14th.</i>  Luke ii. 1-32.  The Saviour—  "Christ the Lord."</p>	<p>The Saviour is "Christ the Lord" (11).  The Salvation which old Simeon saw was  the Saviour Himself (30);  note "all people" (10 and 31).</p>
<p><i>March 21st.</i>  Titus ii.  The Saviour—  "Our Great God."</p>	<p>Note reference to "Saviour" in Titus (i. 3;  ii. 10; iii. 4—"God");  (i. 4; ii. 13; iii. 6—"Christ").  Note the "appearing of Salvation" (11) and  the "appearing" of the Saviour (13).</p>
<p><i>March 28th.</i>  Isaiah xlv.  The Saviour—  "A Just God."</p>	<p>Cyrus, a deliverer raised up by God, a type  of Christ.  "None else" (5, 14, 18, 21, 22).  "Just" and "Saviour" See Rom. i. 16-17.</p>

**"Search and See" Section.**

- Matthew i.-- (1) What are the names given to Christ in this chapter, and what do they mean?  
(2) Was Christ born into a king's family, and what was the king's name?
- Luke ii.-- (1) What title does the angel give when telling the shepherds that a baby is born?  
(2) How many people were to hear the news of the Saviour's birth?  
(3) What did Simeon mean when he said he had seen God's salvation?
- Titus ii.-- (1) What should we be looking for if we believe the Saviour?  
(2) When did Christ give Himself for us?
- Isaiah xlv.-- (1) Can you tell from this chapter if there is more than one God and Saviour?  
(2) What kind of God is our God?

Verses to memorize (one each week):  
Matt. i. 21; Luke ii. 21; Titus ii. 13; Isa. xlv. 22.

**Weekly Bible Readings for April, 1937.**  
**Subject: The Sin-Bearer.**  
**p. 80**

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>April 4th.</i> John i. 19-51. The sin of the world.</p>	<p>“Taketh” (29) = “beareth”; Lamb of God is Son of God (29, 34); Sin borne by Him (29); Dove abides on Him (32); He bare <i>our</i> sins, but He knew no sin.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>April 11th.</i> I Peter ii. He bare our sins.</p>	<p>He “did no sin” (22). He “bare our sins” (24); Note “sin” in John i. 29, “sins” in I Pet. ii. 24; “Own body” (24) <i>see</i> Heb. ii. 14, 15; x. 5, 10; “The Tree” (24) <i>see</i> Gal. iii. 13.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>April 18th.</i> Isaiah liii. Justify many . . . . . bare sin of many.</p>	<p>“Borne griefs”, “carried sorrows”, “laid on Him iniquity”, “He shall bear their iniquities”, “He bare the sin of many”.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>April 25th.</i> II Corinthians v.</p>	<p>“Not imputing <i>their</i> trespasses unto <i>them</i> . . . For He hath made Him . . .” (19, 21); “He knew no sin.” Note again how justification is associated with the bearing of sin (21) (ref. to Isa. liii.).</p>

**“Search and See” Section.**

- John i. 19-51-- (1) Why is Christ called “The Lamb” when it refers to bearing our sins?  
Can you compare it with anything in the O.T.?  
(2) What did Christ bear and for how many did He bear this?
- I Peter ii.-- (1) In what way did Christ bear away our sins?  
(2) Did He commit sin Himself, and what did He do as our example?
- Isaiah liii.-- (1) Find three references to do with bearing sin.  
(2) What is the difference between the sheep in verse 6 and the sheep in verse 7?
- II Corinthians v.-- (1) What does the word “impute” mean? (*See* Rom. iv.).  
(2) “Not imputing their trespasses unto them”—  
What became of their trespasses?

Verses to memorize (one each week):  
John i. 29; I Pet. ii. 24; Isa. liii. 11; II Cor. v. 21.

**Weekly Bible Readings for May, 1937.**  
**Subject: Redemption.**  
**p. 100**

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>May 2nd.</i> Romans iii. 19-31. The <i>Redemption</i> that is in Christ Jesus.</p>	<p>“Freely” (24)—without a cause (John xv. 25); The word “redemption” literally means to “set free”; Type—Israel in Egypt “set free” by blood of the Passover lamb.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>May 9th.</i> Ephesians i. <i>Redemption</i> is by blood.</p>	<p>Forgiveness (7) means “to set free”; Type as above—“the Passover.” Redemption comes again in verse 14; Type—Ruth iv.; Rom. iii. 24 and viii. 23 set forth the two.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>May 16th.</i> Exodus vi. <i>Redemption</i> of stretched out arm.</p>	<p>“I am” (2); “I have” (4); “I will” (6); “Bring out from under”; “Rid you”; “Take you” = phases of redemption.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>May 23rd.</i> Psalm xlix. No man can <i>redeem</i> his brother.</p>	<p>Redemption involves “living for ever” and “not seeing corruption” (9). Redemption is by “ransom” (7). No earthly wealth or power is of any avail (6-8). God will do what man cannot (15).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>May 30th.</i> Galatians iii. 1-14 and iv. 1-7. <i>Redemption</i> and the price paid.</p>	<p>“Redeem” in iii. 13 and iv. 5 is a word that means to pay the price in the market to set a slave free (<i>see</i> I Cor. vi. 20).</p>

**“Search and See” Section.**

- Romans iii. 19-31-- (1) Can we be saved by keeping the law?  
(2) How much have we to pay?  
(3) Something is “declared”. Can you explain? (verses 25, 26).
- Ephesians i.-- (1) “We have redemption”. Where? How? Why?  
(2) Redemption (Eph. i. 7) and Justification (Rom. iii.) come by what?  
Can you say why?
- Exodus vi.-- (1) What was God going to “redeem” the people from,  
and how did he say he would do it?  
(2) How is the redemption of the Israelites  
a picture of the redemption of Christ Jesus?
- Psalm xlix.-- What does it say here is impossible for a man to do for his brother?  
Who *can* do this? What is it that God redeems and from what power?

Galatians iii. 1-14 and iv. 1-7.--

- (1) Why is redemption necessary for all under law? (See iii. 10 and 13).
- (2) Why did the Lord Jesus die upon a "tree" or cross?

Verses to memorize (one each week):

Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7; Exod. vi. 6; Psa. xlix. 6-7; Gal. iii. 13.

## Weekly Bible Readings for June, 1937.

### Subject: Faith.

p. 120

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>June 6th.</i> Romans x. Faith cometh by hearing.</p>	<p>Note the questions to verses 14 and 15; “Report” (16) = The thing you hear; “Believe” (in Isa. liii. 1) is “Say Amen to”. Faith and the Word (II Tim. iii. 15).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>June 13th.</i> Ephesians ii. 1-10. Faith links grace and works.</p>	<p>The word “that” in verse 8 does not refer to “faith”, but to the whole scheme of salvation. “Faith” leads to “Works”—Not of works . . . . His workmanship . . . . unto good works.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>June 20th.</i> Hebrews xi. 1-31. Faith the title deeds.</p>	<p>“Substance.” This word has recently been discovered among ancient documents and means “title deeds”. Abraham’s tent = title deeds; Abraham’s city = thing hoped for. Note seven examples in 4-11 and seven examples in 17-31.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>June 27th.</i> Habakkuk i. 1-4; ii. 1-4; iii. 17-19. The Just shall live By faith.</p>	<p>Habakkuk’s test. “How long shall I cry” (i. 2). Habakkuk’s trust. “Though it tarry, wait” (ii. 3). Habakkuk’s triumph. “Yet I will rejoice” (iii. 18).</p>

### “Search and See” Section.

- Romans x.-- (1) How does faith come?  
(2) How is confessing the Lord related to believing?  
(3) What is the result of faith?
- Ephesians ii. 1-10-- (1) Can salvation by grace through faith be earned?  
(2) What is it that we cannot do in order to be saved  
and yet we should do after we are saved?
- Hebrews xi. 1-31-- (1) In what way is faith the “substance” of things hoped for?  
(2) Can you give another meaning for the words “By faith”  
which come in connection with the people in this chapter?  
(3) What did this faith do for them and what will it do for us?
- Habakkuk i., ii., iii.-- (1) Is prayer always answered at once? (i.).  
(2) What are we to do in (ii.), and what will help us to do this?  
(3) If we have faith in the Lord, what can we do although  
things go wrong around us? (iii.).

Verses to memorize (one each week):

Rom. x. 17; Eph. ii. 8; Heb. xi. 1; Hab. ii. 3.

**Weekly Bible Readings for July, 1937.**

**Subject: "Children of God."**

p. 140

<p align="center"><i>July 4<sup>th</sup>.</i> John i. 1-18. Children of God.</p>	<p>“Received . . . . believed” (11, 12). Power = the right or authority. Sons here = children, not full grown sons (I John iii. 1, 3, also children).</p>
<p align="center"><i>July 11<sup>th</sup>.</i> Romans viii. 1-17. If children then heirs.</p>	<p>Sons instead of slaves (15). No slave was permitted to use the word <i>Abba</i>. Every child of God is an heir (17). Suffering for Christ is rewarded by “joint-heirship”.</p>
<p align="center"><i>July 18<sup>th</sup>.</i> Hebrews ii. 5-18. Children . . . . He . . . . the same.</p>	<p>Sons (10), Brethren (11). Children (13, 14). Not angels (5), (7, 9), (16). “All of one” (11, 14).</p>
<p align="center"><i>July 25<sup>th</sup>.</i> Isaiah xi. A little child shall lead them.</p>	<p>The child should be taught some of the characteristics of the future kingdom on earth though blessed in another sphere.</p>

**“Search and See” Section.**

- John i. 1-18.-- (1) What does the word “sons” mean in verse 12 and the word “power”?  
(2) How can we become “children of God”?
- Romans viii. 1-17-- (1) What do we receive when we are no longer in “bondage”?  
(2) What do we become if children of God,  
and how can we be “joint-heirs” with Christ?
- Hebrews ii. 5-18.-- (1) What does Christ call those who are sanctified (verses 11 and 13)?  
(2) How did Christ make Himself like “the children”,  
and what did He do for them?
- Isaiah xi.-- In what way does this make you think of the Garden of Eden?

*Write out from memory John i. 12.*

## Weekly Bible Readings for August, 1937.

### Subject: "Holidays."

p. 160

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>August 1st.</i> Mark vi. 1-31. Rest awhile.</p>	<p>Mark's Gospel represents the "Servant" of the Lord. It has no genealogy, but begins and ends with service (Mk. i. 14, xvi. 20). The invitation of verse 31 should be read with that of Matt. xi. 28-30.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>August 8th.</i> Nehemiah viii. A Real Holiday.</p>	<p>The occasion of this "holy day" (10) was the finding of the law, and its reading and explanation to the people (8). "Eat the fat, drink the sweet, send portions, make great mirth" (10, 12).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>August 15th.</i> John xxi. The Sea Shore.</p>	<p>The disciples and the Lord on the sea shore. His provision (5, 6, 9). Proof of His resurrection (14). What He said to Peter on the sea shore (15).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>August 22nd.</i> Matthew vii. The Sand Castle.</p>	<p>After the fun of building a sand castle comes the consciousness that the incoming tide will leave not a trace. The rocks, however, will be there next morning (24-27).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>August 29th.</i> John vi. 1-27. A Meal in the Open.</p>	<p>Mark vi. 39 notes the <i>green</i> grass, so giving an idea of the time of year. The disciples "gathered up the fragments", and no Christian will spoil the country with "litter". Daily bread is a symbol of the gift of life (27).</p>

### "Search and See" Section.

- Mark vi. 1-31.-- (1) What did Christ tell his disciples to do besides go out and work for Him?  
(2) Why was it necessary to "rest a while"?  
(3) How can we find rest?
- Nehemiah viii.-- (1) Why did the people keep this day as a "holy day"?  
(2) What was the feeling among them all at this time?
- John xxi.-- (1) What happened when Jesus Christ appeared on the sea-shore?  
(2) John ii. is the first sign; John xxi. is the last. Show where they are alike.
- Matthew vii.-- What is the most important part of the house? What does a wise man do?
- John vi. 1-27.-- (1) How much bread did Philip reckon, and how much did Christ use?  
(2) What is the difference between the two kinds of meat in verse 27?

## Weekly Bible Readings for September, 1937.

### Subject: "School."

p. 180

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>September 5th.</i> Gal. iii. 15-29. <b>THE SCHOOLMASTER.</b></p>	<p>The thought to follow out is the place of the law. The law cannot alter previous promise (17). The law was "added" (19). The law cannot give life (21). The law acted as a Schoolmaster until Christ came, but ceases after faith is come (24, 25).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>September 12th.</i> II Timothy i. <b>THE TEACHER OF THE GENTILES.</b></p>	<p>Point out that the word "doctrine" (iii. 16, iv. 3) means "teaching". Compare II Tim. i. 11 with I Tim. ii. 7. Teachers were included in special gifts to the Church (Eph. iv.11).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>September 19th.</i> Isaiah I. <b>THE LEARNER.</b></p>	<p>In verse 4 "learned" means a "learner". Note that in order to "speak" one must "hear". Note the four references to the "Lord God". He <i>gives</i> (4), <i>opens</i> (5), <i>helps</i> (7 and 9). Isaiah speaks of Christ. Let us "learn of Him".</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>September 26th.</i> II Timothy ii. <b>STUDY.</b></p>	<p>The prime object of study: "approved unto God". The character of the student: an unashamed "workman". The method of this study: "right division" (15).</p>

Verses to memorize (one each week):

Gal. iii. 24, 25; II Tim. i. 13; Isa. I. 4; II Tim. ii. 15.

### "Search and See" Section.

- Galatians iii. 15-29.-- (1) When did the law cease to be a "schoolmaster"?
- (2) What did Christ give which the law could not?
- (3) What did the law do (verse 24)?
- II Timothy i.-- (1) Who is the teacher in verse 11 and who did he teach?
- (2) What is "the form of sound words"? The answer is in verse 13.
- Isaiah I.-- (1) What will God do for us if we are willing to learn (verses 4, 5, 7, and 9)?
- (2) What can we do when God has given us the "tongue of the learned"?
- (3) What (in your own words) does a "word in season to him that is weary" mean?
- II Timothy ii.-- (1) What do you say the word "study" means in verse 15?
- (2) What are the three things we are told to study especially?

## Weekly Bible Readings for October, 1937.

Subject: "I am."

p. 200

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>October 3rd.</i> John vi. 27-51. I AM the Bread of Life.</p>	<p>"This is the work of God" (29) refers to the miracle of the feeding of the 5000. The request, "What sign showest Thou . . . . Thee", springs from it. This leads to the type of the Manna, and the fact that God, not Moses, gave it to the fathers.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>October 10th.</i> John ix. I AM the Light of the World.</p>	<p>Note "sent" (7). Christ "The Sent One" (<i>see</i> ix. 24, v. 24, xi. 42, xvii. 3, 21, etc.). Note the growth of the blind man's faith: a) "A man called Jesus" (11). b) "He is a prophet" (17). c) "Lord, I believe" (38). Can I say "One thing I know?" (25).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>October 17th.</i> John x. 1-18. I AM the Good Shepherd.</p>	<p>Note "Cast out" (ix. 34) same words as "putteth forth" (x. 4). No need to fear man. He "gives", "lays down" His life (x. 11, 15, 17, 18). So preach the cross as to leave room for the words, "No man taketh it from Me" (18). The "other sheep" are around us to day (16). Not of Israel's fold</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>October 24th.</i> John xi. 1-46. I AM the Resurrection and the Life.</p>	<p>Martha thought not only of the "last day" (24). "Is living and believing" at the second coming?" (26; <i>see</i> I Cor. xv. 51). Note how belief in resurrection power leads to full faith in Christ (xi. 27).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>October 31st.</i> John xiv. I AM the Way.</p>	<p>The wording of verse 6 necessitates in English, the following, "I am the <i>true</i> and <i>living</i> Way". "No man . . . .but by Me" (<i>see also</i> x. 9). "Another" Comforter indicates that Christ also is one. The word "Comforter" is "Advocate" in I John ii. 1.</p>

Verses to memorize (one each week):

John xi. 35; John viii. 12; John x. 11; John xi. 25; John xiv. 6.

### **“Search and See” Section.**

- John vi. 27-51.-- (1) What O.T. “type” is referred to here?  
(2) What are the difference between the “type” and Christ? (49-51).
- John ix.-- (1) What did the man do? (7).  
(2) What did he know? (24-25).  
(3) What did he believe? (35-38).
- John x. 1-18.-- (1) What are the differences between the Good Shepherd and the hireling?  
(2) What did the Good Shepherd do for us? (11, 15).  
(3) Does the Shepherd drive His sheep?
- John xi. 1-46.-- (1) What does it mean by “though he were dead yet shall he live”?  
(2) What did Martha say? (27).  
(3) What is connected with resurrection? (40).
- John xiv.-- (1) What kind of way is Christ?  
(2) To Whom does this way lead us?  
(3) Why did Christ tell the disciples to rejoice? (28 and 2-3).

## Weekly Bible Readings for November, 1937.

### Subject: "Peace."

p. 220

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>November 7th.</i> Rom. v. 1-11. PEACE WITH GOD.</p>	<p>Note, the basis is a <i>fact</i> not a <i>feeling</i>. "Being . . . . . we have" (1). Justified = declared righteous. <i>See</i> "Righteousness and Peace" (Isa. xxxii. 17; Psa. lxxxv. 10). No peace, where no righteousness (Isa. lvii. 21).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>November 14th.</i> Philippians iv. PEACE OF GOD.</p>	<p>"Moderation" (5) = "yieldingness"; Not holding on to our "rights." "Careful." "Nothing . . . . . everything" (6). "Shall keep" (7) = keep, as a garrison of soldiers. "The God of peace" (9).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>November 21st.</i> John xx. THE BASIS OF PEACE.</p>	<p>"Jesus saith . . . . . He showed . . . . . hands . . . . . side" (19, 20). Thomas had not the peace (25). So again "He said . . . . . hands . . . . . side." Result; "My Lord and my God" (28).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>November 28th.</i> Ephesians ii. 11-22. THE BOND OF PEACE.</p>	<p>The middle wall stood in the courts of the temple and divided Jew and Gentile. "The both" are now "one" and this is "the bond of peace" which binds the "unity of the Spirit." (Eph. iv. 3, 13).</p>

Verses to memorize (one each week):

Rom. v. 1; Phil. iv. 7; John xx. 19; Eph. ii. 14.

### "Search and See" Section.

- Romans v. 1-11.-- (1) What must there be before we can have peace?  
(2) With whom do we have peace and how? (verse 1)
- Philippians iv.-- (1) Put in your own words what the "peace of God" is like (verse 7).  
(2) How can we have peace? (verses 6, 7).
- John xx.-- (1) When Christ said "Peace be unto you", what did He show them and why?  
(2) Why did Thomas refuse to believe the disciples?  
(3) What title did he give Christ when he did believe?
- Ephesians ii. 11-22.-- (1) Before Christ made this peace what was the Gentile called? (12).  
(2) In verse 16-18 what two words tell us that we are at peace?

**Weekly Bible Readings for December, 1937.**  
**Subject: "Gifts."**  
**p. 240**

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>December 5th.</i> John iii. GOD SO LOVED . . . . . THAT HE GAVE.</p>	<p>“As Moses” (14). The brazen serpent a type. Point out the acrostic in John iii. 16. <b>G</b>od so loved the world that He gave His <b>O</b>nly begotten <b>S</b>on, that whosoever believeth in Him should not <b>P</b>erish, but have <b>E</b>verlasting <b>L</b>ife.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>December 12th.</i> Galatians ii. THE SON OF GOD LOVED . . . . . GAVE.</p>	<p>Verses 19 and 20 are Paul’s personal testimony as to why he had finished with all attempts to save, sanctify or justify himself. (If pressure is brought to bear upon your children to be “christened” etc., etc., use this passage to expose its futility). “Me . . . . . me”, “I am . . . . . yet not I” (20).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>December 19th.</i> Romans vi. THE GIFT OF GOD.</p>	<p>Confessedly difficult chapter, but you will be surprised how young people understand. Verse 23, Wages earned, <i>see</i> Rom. iv. 4—Death. Gift unearned, <i>see</i> Eph. ii. 8.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>December 26th.</i> II Corinthians ix. THE UNSPEAKABLE GIFT.</p>	<p>Note the figure of “sowing” (6). Give with the heart and cheerfully (7). Unlimited sufficiency to draw on (8). All christian giving but a faint reflection of God’s unspeakable gift.</p>

Verses to memorize (one each week):  
John iii. 16; Gal. ii. 16; Rom. vi. 23; II Cor. ix. 15.

**“Search and See” Section.**

- John iii.--
- (1) Why was a brazen serpent lifted up?
  - (2) Why is Christ compared with this?
  - (3) What was the reason for God’s wonderful gift? (verse 16).
- Galatians ii.--
- (1) John iii. says ‘world’: What does Paul say?
  - (2) John iii. says ‘everlasting life’: What kind of life did Paul speak of?
  - (3) John iii. says ‘God loved and gave’: What does Gal. ii. 20 say?
- Romans vi.--
- (1) What is the difference between ‘wages’ and ‘gift’?
  - (2) Can we earn eternal life?
  - (3) Through whom does God’s gift come?
- II Corinthians ix.--
- (1) What is an ‘*unspeakable*’ gift!
  - (2) How are we to give and why? (verse 7)
  - (3) Write any verse you know that speaks of God’s gift.

