

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 XXXI.

1941

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

TO ALL OF LIKE PRECIOUS FAITH,

The completion of another year of testimony in the midst of conflict, brings to mind Wycliffe's translation of Gen. xxxix. 2, "The Lord was with Joseph, and he was a luckie fellow".

We look back over the years that have passed, during which two "World Wars" have raged, yet with all the changes in life, outlook, work and opportunity, the Scripture has proved true, which says:--

"He hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 5, 8).

It was upon this glorious note that the Apostle Paul finished his testimony:--

"All men forsook me notwithstanding the Lord stood with me: that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion" (II Tim. iv. 16, 17).

Without assuming that there is anything comparable in our testimony with that of the Apostle, we have confidence that in so far as *The Berean Expositor* is in line with the will of the Lord, so we may expect that these precious promises will be once more fulfilled in our experience.

Yours in the bond of peace,

CHARLES H. WELCH,
PHILIP DIVE,
FREDERICK P. BRININGER

December, 1941.

INDEX

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, THE--	
Pure from the blood of all men (xx. 22-27)	5
Final counsel, example and commendation (xx. 28-38)	9
From Tyre to Jerusalem (xxi. 1-17)	14
The reception of the Apostle at Jerusalem (xxi. 18-21)	18

The apprehension of the Apostle in the Temple (xxi. 27-34)	22
BEARING OF THE CONTEXT ON WELL-KNOWN PASSAGES, THE- My times are in Thy hand	27
EPHPHATHA, OR BE OPENED--	
The opened ear: To learn	28
The opened book: To equip	30
The opened understanding: To perceive	32
EPHESIA--	
Was Ephesians a circular letter?	34
Saul, who is also called Paul (Eph. i. 1)	36
Apostolos, the Sent One (Eph. i. 1)	37
ETERNAL GOD IS THY REFUGE, THE--	
We will make mention of the name of the Lord our God (Psa. xx. 7)	39
Fear not, I am thy Shield (Gen. xv. 1)	40
The hidden ones (Psa. lxxxiii. 3)	41
FRUITS OF FUNDAMENTAL STUDIES--	
The intimate association between the senses and the processes of thought (Gen. ii. 7)	44
FUNDAMENTALS OF DISPENSATIONAL TRUTH--	
ISAIAH: Children of Sign and Wonder (vii. 1 - x. 34)	48
ISAIAH: The Rest that shall be Glory (xi. and xii.)	53
ISAIAH: The Burden of Babylon (xiii. and xiv.)	58
ISAIAH: Ephraim (xxviii.)	62
ISAIAH: Jerusalem and its trust in Egypt (xxix-xxxi.)	67
ISAIAH: Glories when the King reigns (xxxii.)	70
GOSPEL OF JOHN, THE--	
Fullness and true grace, in contrast with type and shadows (i. 15-17)	76
The Invisible and the Only Begotten (i. 18)	81
The witness of John the Baptist (i. 19-34)	85
The witnesses of John, Andrew, Philip and Nathaniel (i. 35-51)	90
IN ALL THEIR AFFLICTION, HE WAS AFFLICTED	96
LEGACY OF PEACE, THE--	
The meaning of <i>shalom</i>	98
The enmity that necessitates peace	100
Peace, and at such a time	104
MYSTERY MANIFESTED, THE--	

Musterion: a secret that necessitates manifestation	108
A group of Epistles that manifests the mystery	110
The mystery of His Will	112
The mystery, manifested through a special ministry	114
OCCASIONAL MEDITATIONS--	
Psalm li.	118
The Passover (Exod. xii. 1-20, 29-33)	119
The Ark of the Tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 10-22)	121
POWERS THAT BE, THE--	
Paul and Roman Citizenship	123
Paul before Felix	125
Paul before Festus and Agrippa	128
The voyage from Cæsarea to Rome	131
Paul's trial before Nero	134
ROMANS, THE EPISTLE TO THE--	
Salutation, Warning and Benediction (xv. 1-24)	138
The mystery that had been silenced (xvi. 25-27)	145
SELF-DRAWN PORTRAIT OF THE APOSTLE PAUL, THE--	
The portrait as a whole	152
His independence	153
His impetuosity	156
TIMOTHY, THE SECOND EPISTLE TO--	
The place of the Epistle in the outworking of the truth	159
The epistle as a whole	161
A short survey of the period	164
Salutation and Remembrance (i. 1-7)	169
WAITING ON THE LORD--	
Blessed, Good and Unashamed	176
The waiting that is silent, restful and uncomplaining	177
WAR IN HEAVEN--	
The field surveyed	178
The enemy	179

The Acts of the Apostles.

#43. The Third Missionary Journey (xix. 21 - xxi. 39). The Prison Ministry Foreshadowed (xx. 17 - 38). “Pure from the blood of all men” (xx. 22 - 27). pp. 26 - 32

From verse 18 to verse 21 of Acts xx. we have followed the Apostle's description of the nature and substance of the ministry that he commenced in Acts ix., and that was now drawing to its close. At verse 22 we are conscious of a change:

“And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there; save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me” (Acts xx. 22, 23).

“*I go bound in the spirit.*”—The fact that in the next verse the Apostle speaks of “The Holy Ghost” suggests that the earlier phrase should be interpreted in the sense that the Apostle, though still outwardly a free man, was nevertheless already “in the spirit” entering into, by anticipation, the bonds and afflictions that awaited him. His missionary journeys were always under the leading or constraint of the Spirit, either directly in relation to the immediate Person of the Holy Ghost, or by the answer of his own spirit to the leading of the Lord. He had been “separated” by the Holy Ghost (Acts xiii. 2), and had been “sent forth by the Holy Ghost” (Acts xiii. 4). Sometimes, also, he had been forbidden of the Holy Ghost (Acts xvi. 6, 7). Furthermore we read in Acts xviii. 5 that Paul's spirit was stirred within him, and in Acts xix. 21 that he “purposed” in the spirit the journey that was now leading him to Jerusalem and Rome. So here, having arrived at Miletus, we find that he was already the prisoner of the Lord “in spirit”. He was definitely bound for Jerusalem. On occasions in the past he had planned to visit some particular church or country but had been “let”, as he told the Romans. Now, however, Jerusalem is most definitely his goal. As in the case of his Lord, there came a time when he had to set his face stedfastly towards Jerusalem, even though well-meaning disciples should urge to the contrary.

The ostensible reason for this particular journey was the delivery of the collection made among the Gentiles for the poor saints at Jerusalem. Paul's journeys to Jerusalem mark definite stages in his career. In Acts ix. 2 we read that Paul planned to bring those “of this way bound unto Jerusalem”, while after his conversion we read of his assaying to join with the disciples at Jerusalem and needing the mediation of Barnabas to break down the barrier of fear and suspicion that would have kept him out. It was at Jerusalem, also, that the decisive battle was fought for Gentile exemption from the bondage of the law (Acts xv.), and it was at some such conference as this that he was asked to “remember the poor” (Gal. ii. 10). The fulfillment of this exhortation, in the shape of an offering collected in the churches, he was about to lay at the apostle's feet in Jerusalem. While this was the ostensible object of his visit, however, the Apostle began to realize that the Lord had another purpose in view. What this purpose was he did not, at

the time, fully know, except that it was connected with his ministry and would probably cost him his liberty. His attitude, however, is one of heroic acceptance:

“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).

The Received Text here reads: “That I may finish my course *with joy*”, but the Revised Text omits the last two words (*meta charis*), and there does not appear to be sufficient evidence for their retention. The Apostle might well have wished that the end of his career would be “with joy”, but he was far more concerned that he should “finish”, whether with joy or otherwise. Another point to note about this verse is that it provides us with a case in which the Greek *logos*, so often translated “word”, claims its fuller meaning, “account”. Also, in the phrase: “so that I might finish my course”, the word *os* is not, strictly speaking, “so that” but rather “as”. The rendering given by Alford seems to recognize these various features:

“I hold my life of no account, nor is it so precious to me, as the finishing of my course.”

This figure of a “course” or “race” is one that is characteristic of the Apostle, and he was able, at the close, to say: “I have finished my course.” The word translated “course” (*dromos*) is borrowed from the Greek sports, and, in a verbal form, is found in I Cor. ix. 24 and Heb. xii. 1: “They which run in a race, run all so run that ye may obtain”, and “Let us run with patience the race that is set before us”.

In his desire to “finish” his course the Apostle manifests once more of his conformity to his Lord, Who said near the beginning of His ministry: “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work” (John iv. 34), and at the close: “I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do” (John xvii. 4). It is encouraging to remind ourselves that not all the injustice represented by Rome, could prevent either the Lord or His servant from finishing their course.

In II Tim. iv. 7, the finishing of the course is associated with keeping the faith. In Acts xx. 24, it is associated with “The ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God”.

The servants of the church at Ephesus are called “presbyters” and “bishops”, but the Apostle refers to his service as *douleuo*, “the service of a bond slave”. The word he uses for his “ministry” is *diakonia*, which gives us the word “deacon”. The Apostle uses this same word when he says: “I magnify my *office*” (Rom. xi. 13), and when he describes the offering he was taking to Jerusalem as “my service” (Rom. xv. 31). Moreover, the magistrate is spoken of in Romans as a “*minister* of God” (Rom. xiii. 4), and Christ Himself as a “*minister* of the circumcision” (Rom. xv. 8). The same word (*diakonos*) is used of Phoebe, who is called “a servant”.

The same word is also used by Paul, when he claims that he had been made “a minister” in connection with the ministry of the Mystery (Eph. iii. 7 and Col. i. 23). This ministry Paul says he “received”, and, in after years, he wrote to Timothy:

“I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, Who hath enabled me, for that He counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious” (I Tim. i. 12, 13).

The ministry which the Apostle received is defined in a variety of ways. In Acts ix., the Apostle was told that he was a chosen vessel to bear the name of the Lord Jesus before Gentiles and Kings, and before the children of Israel. In Acts xxvi. 16-18, we have a very full statement concerning his ministry, which we shall have to consider when we reach this chapter. Here, in chapter xx., however, it is defined very simply as a “testimony of the gospel of the grace of God”. A man may be a wonderful speaker, and by the power of his oratory may be able to move his audience to tears or laughter. A man who “testifies”, on the other hand, may sound in the ears of those accustomed to oratory “contemptible”, and yet his words may carry conviction, and move his audience, not merely to tears but to repentance and faith. A “witness”, however, can scarcely hope for a hearing if his manner of life does not agree with his doctrine. In the N.T. preacher and teacher alike are given the title “witness”. John the Baptist was sent to “bear witness” of the Light (John i. 7), and in Acts i. 8 we read that the apostles were appointed at Jerusalem as “witnesses”, the resurrection being specially stressed as the object of their witness (Acts i. 22). The whole of Paul’s ministry is summed up by the Lord himself as a “witness”, for in Acts xxiii. we read:

“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 Apostle himself sums up his ministry in similar terms when speaking before Agrippa:

“Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come”(Acts xxvi. 22).

It was because Paul was a witness that he served with humility, for he could take no personal credit for his message. As a witness (or martyr), he was not deflected from the path of faithfulness by either tears or temptations. As a witness, he kept back nothing that was profitable. As a witness he “testified” to both Jews and Greeks. Even though at Jerusalem bonds and afflictions awaited him, these things could not hinder his witness, though they might completely prevent other forms of service.

Resuming the description of his ministry, the Apostle continues, in verse 25:

“And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men” (Acts xx. 25, 26).

We must defer consideration of the phrase “the kingdom of God” until we reach the end of the Acts. It is obvious, however, from the passage quoted above, taken in conjunction with verses 19-21, that the preaching of “the kingdom of God” included “repentance” and “faith”.

With the words “ye all shall see my face no more”, the Apostle reaches the particular part of his address that was personal both to himself and to the Ephesian Church. This is evident in verse 38 where we read: “Sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more.” Because of certain obscure references in the Epistles to Timothy, it has been assumed by some that Paul did in fact see the Ephesian Church again. In I Tim. i. 3 we read: “As I besought thee to abide still in Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia.” These words have been construed into meaning that Paul himself had been in Ephesus. The passage is an example of an “interrupted structure” in a sentence, a feature that finds many illustrations in the Apostle’s vivid writing. As examples that are fairly obvious to the English reader we may quote Gal. ii. 4 and ii. 6. The words *kathos paraklesa* (“As I besought”) are without an apodosis.* (* - The apodosis is the concluding clause of a sentence, usually conditional, e.g., “If thine enemy hunger, *feed him*”). The thought seems to be: “As I besought thee *then*, so I beseech thee now.” Paul does not say that he “left Titus” at Crete. There is no evidence that Paul visited Ephesus again. The passage is explained sufficiently if we understand that on some particular occasion, when sailing by Asia, Paul made this request to Timothy.

Again, in I Tim. iii. 14, the Apostle writes: “These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly.”

Inasmuch as Paul sailed by Ephesus, and arranged to meet the elders of that church at Miletus on one occasion, there is every probability that he would make the same arrangement when he wished to see Timothy. Moreover, it is suggestive that, whereas the Apostle, writing from prison, expresses a confident hope that he would revisit the Philippian Church (Phil. i. 25; ii. 24), and in the epistle to Philemon he asks him to prepare him a lodging (Philemon 22), there is no such suggestion in the epistle to the Ephesians, or in regard to the neighbouring church at Colosse, though he writes in Col. ii. 1: “For them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh.” We have no need, therefore, to defend the Apostle in any way. We believe that his words were true to fact, and that the Ephesian Church saw his face no more.

It is clear from Scripture that the Apostle realized, as perhaps few have done since, the solemn responsibility that attached to his position as minister. In Acts xviii. 6 we read:

“And when the Jews opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be on your own heads: I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.”

The Apostle, whose knowledge of the O.T. is apparent from his writings, had evidently pondered the solemn words of Ezekiel and had taken them to heart. In chapter xxxiii. we read:

“If when he seeth the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet, and warn the people; then whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning; if the sword come, and take him away, *his blood shall be upon his own head* But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman’s hand” (Ezek. xxxiii. 1-6).

In Acts xx. 26 the Apostle declares: “I am pure from the blood of all men”, and the ground of his confidence is expressed in the following verse:

“For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God” (Acts xx. 27).

There are some who clutch at this statement in their endeavour to moderate the teaching of Scripture concerning the Mystery, pointing to this passage as a proof that “all the counsel of God” had been made known, as though this expression covered truth which at the time of utterance had not been revealed. Those who take this view seem to forget that Paul makes another equally important statement concerning his ministry in Acts xxvi. 22:

“Saying none other things than those which the Prophet and Moses did say should come.”

The “whole counsel of God”, at the time of Acts xx., was limited to the testimony of the Law and Prophets. If there was still further truth to be revealed, truth unknown to the O.T. scriptures, and not yet revealed to the Apostle, no one could possibly blame Paul for not making it known, and he could obviously have no responsibility in the matter.

We must conclude our survey of this important speech in our next article.

**#44. The Third Missionary Journey (xix. 21 - xxi. 39).
The Prison Ministry Foreshadowed (xx. 17 - 38).
Final counsel, example and commendation (xx. 28 - 38).
pp. 45 - 51**

In his examination of the teaching of the apostle Paul, the student of the Scriptures will have recognized that it is rare to find either believer or fellow servant exhorted to follow a particular course, without, either in the near or remote context, the Apostle himself being found practicing the precepts he preached. The elders of Ephesus had witnessed this balanced exhibition of “doctrine and manner of life” (Acts xx. 17-27), with its challenge concerning Paul’s faithfulness as well as his tenderness and courage, so that the Apostle had no hesitation in introducing his correspondingly searching exhortation with the word “therefore”.

“Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood” (Acts xx. 28).

It is comparatively easy to warn a company concerning the evil character of those who are without, or of those who differ from them, but this the Apostle did not do. He bade them take heed unto themselves, and said further in verse 30: “Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”

Evidently it was a customary thing for Paul, when addressing those who held any office of responsibility in the church, to use the word *prosecho*, “take heed”, for it is found only twice outside the pastoral epistles. To Timothy and to Titus he wrote:

“Neither give heed to fables” (I Tim. i. 4).

“Not giving heed to Jewish fables” (Titus i. 14).

and revealed that the apostacy of the last days would result from “giving heed to seducing spirits” (I Tim. iv. 1). As a counter to this, the same section of I Timothy emphasizes the importance of giving heed “to the reading” (I Tim. iv. 13). In the Gospels, this same word is translated a number of times “beware”, as in the exhortations “beware of false prophets”, “beware of the leaven of the Pharisees”. The hand of Luke in the writing of Acts, or, conversely, the influence of Paul on the writing of Luke is indicated by the expression *prosechete heautois*, “take heed unto yourselves”, for it occurs only in Luke’s writings (Luke xvii. 3; xxi. 34; Acts v. 35; and xx. 28).*

[NOTE: * - We must defer full consideration of this subject until the closing article of the series, when we hope fully to demonstrate that such an influence is not a matter of conjecture but to fact.]

The overseers of the church were “bishops”, *episkopoi*, and we have seen that such were practically synonymous with “pastors” or “shepherds” (see Volume XXX, page 164-169). The church is therefore appropriately referred to here as a “flock”. The Greek words for “feed” and “flock” are from the same root. The word for “flock” is *poimne* and occurs five times in the N.T. In five other places, however, the diminutive *poimnion* is used:

“Fear not little flock” (Luke xii. 32).

“All the flock not sparing the flock” (Acts xx. 28, 29).

“Feed the flock ensamples to the flock” (I Pet. v. 2, 3).

The word “shepherd” is *poimen* (Luke ii. 8), and the word translated “feed” is *poimaino*. While the idea of “feeding” is prominent in this word, and Davison deduced it from Homeric word *pou*, “flock” and *mao*, “to care”, the following passages will show that the thought of the exercise of “the rod and the staff” is not absent from the word.

“Out of thee shall come a Governor that *shall rule* My people Israel” (Matt. ii. 6).

“He shall *rule* them with a rod of iron” (Rev. ii. 27).

“Who was *to rule* all nations with a rod of iron” (Rev. xii. 5).

“He shall *rule* them with a rod of iron” (Rev. xix. 15).

These passages are quotations from O.T. Scriptures, those in the Revelation quoting Psalm ii., while that in Matthew quotes Micah v. Where the A.V. of the N.T. reads “rule” the A.V. of Psalm ii. 9 has “break”, *raa*, which is a word indicating severe

chastisement upon evil, and in the Hiphil* is translated “to bring evil”, “to afflict” and “to punish” (Jer. xxv. 29; xxxi. 28; Zech. viii. 14). On the other hand the Hithpoel is translated “must show himself friendly” (Prov. xviii. 24), so that the affliction, though it seem evil, is for good. The word translated “ruler” in Micah v. 2 is the Hebrew *mashal*, which not only means to rule, to govern, or to have dominion, but “to speak or to use, parables or proverbs” (Ezek. xvii. 2; xxiv. 3) and so suggests the ruling of a people by wisdom and warning. It may be that Peter knew this double meaning, and the association of rule or dominion with the idea of a shepherd, and to save the overseers from a false assumption of power, he said:

“Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; *neither as being lords* over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock” (I Pet. v. 2, 3).

[NOTE: * - These terms and others used in concordances, etc., are indications concerning the “voice”, “mood” and “tense” of Hebrew verbs. While the reader need not burden himself with these terms, he should on the other hand avoid acceptance of dogmatic assertions based merely upon a list of words. For instance, the comparison of Hiphel (causative) with say the Niphal (or middle voice) would lead to erroneous deductions.]

With these facts in mind, we can the better appreciate the meaning of the Apostle in his exhortation to the elders of Ephesus. The R.V. has the marginal note against the words “church of God”: “Many ancient authorities read, *the Lord.*”

From one angle, it makes very little difference to us whether the Apostle called the church, “the church of God” or “the church of the Lord”, but it is of importance to us to see to it that we do not allow the displacement of one single word of inspired Scripture and especially in a passage that has to do with the Person of the Saviour. If the word *kuriou*, “Lord”, had occurred in the original it is difficult to understand why anyone should alter it to read *Theou*, “God”, for the statement, “which He hath purchased by His Own blood”. In the early church there were also many who held Arian and Socinian views who would have exposed the alteration in one of their writings or controversies. If *Theou*, “God”, was the original word, Alford says:

“But *one reason* can be given why it should have been altered to *Kuriou*, and that *one was sure to be operated*. It would stand as a bulwark against Arianism*, an assertion which no skill could evade, which must therefore be modified. If *Theou* stood in the text originally, it was sure to be altered to *Kuriou.*”

[NOTE: * - Named after Arius, of the ivth century, who taught that the Son was created by the Father.]

Further, there is no other instance in the writings of Paul, where he speaks of the “church of the Lord”, whereas the title the “church of God” is frequently used. We have already demonstrated that Paul’s speech recorded in Acts xx. abounds in Pauline expressions, and this fact has some weight with us now. It is unsettling for the English reader to be told in the margin of the R.V. about “many ancient authorities”. It might mean much or little, but inasmuch as the Revisers themselves failed to find sufficient evidence to make an alteration, the marginal note seems to us a disturbing intrusion. We

would also mention for what it is worth that the finding of the “Numeric Version” favours the A.V. in its translation of the title.

Believing, then, that the original text read “church of God”, we meet a very extraordinary statement.

“The church of God, which He (i.e. God) hath purchased with His (i.e. God) own blood.”

This has not been allowed to pass unmodified. There is no manuscript evidence for adding the word *hiou*, “son”, after *Tou idiou*, “His own”, but Dr. Hort was an adept, to use his own language, “in the art of conjectural emendation”. Speaking of this mischievous practice, Dean Burgon commenting on Acts xx. 28, says:

“We charitably presume that it is in order to make amends for having conjecturally thrust out *To pascha* (the Passover) from S. John vi. 4, that Dr. Hort is for conjecturally thrusting into Acts xx. 28, *Hiou* (after *Tou idiou*), an imagination to which he devotes a column and a half, but *for which he is not able to produce a particle of evidence*. It would result in our reading, ‘to feed the Church of God, which He purchased’—(not ‘with *His Own* blood’, but)—‘with the blood of His OWN SON’: which has evidently been suggested by nothing so much as by the supposed necessity of getting rid of a text which unequivocally asserts that CHRIST is GOD.”

The unusual expression *haima Theou* (blood of God) met with in Ignatius, who wrote to the Ephesians, and its equivalent in the Latin of Tertullian *Sanguine Dei* (blood of God) seem to demand Acts xx. 28, as its warrant. The word “purchase”, *peripoieomai*, was to be used in writing to this same assembly (*see* Eph. i. 14) where *peripoiesis* is used for “the purchased possession”. Such a church, purchased at such a price, demanded the utmost care on the part of its overseers, and the very strangeness of the Apostle’s wording but strengthens his appeal. Wolves were to take advantage of the Apostle’s absence, and enter in, and “out from” their own selves, self-seeking and ambitious men would rend the church.

Paul had experienced the power of “perverse things”, for we meet with the word *diastrepho* in Acts xiii., where Elymas seeks “to turn away” the deputy from the faith, and where Paul charges him with “perverting” the right ways of the Lord. He uses the word also in Phil. ii. 15, where he speaks of a “perverse” nation.

For the space of three years the Apostle had not ceased to warn every one night and day with tears, but that witness now drew to its close. What could he do more? However faithful a testimony may be, it is marked with mortality, and by the transient nature of all flesh. But if Paul must cease, God abides, and so the Apostle points them away to the one and only source of all grace and ground of all hope, God and His Word.

“And now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified” (Acts xx. 32).

Paul’s influence upon Luke is evident in the record of Acts xiv. 3, where we read:

“Long time therefore abode they speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the *Word of His grace*, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands.”

We have already drawn attention to the similarity of language in Acts xx. 32 with passages in Ephesians and Colossians.

Without clearer revelation it is impossible for us to decide whether the Apostle, with the new ministry in front of him with its impending change, spoke prophetically, commending these believers to “that word of His grace which build inheritance”, but which had not yet been made known.

As Peter, it will be remembered, exhorted those who were in charge of the flock not to serve for filthy lucre but rather to be ensamples, so Paul repudiates any idea that he had been prompted by covetousness, and asserts that he was an example, saying:

“Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have showed you all things, how that so labouring, ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the word of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive” (Acts xx. 34, 35).

How truly the Apostle could say: “I have showed you.” With an available choice of five different compounds of the word and with *dieknumi* itself making a sixth, the word he used for “show” was *hupodeiknumi*. Let us endeavour to understand the reason for his choice. He could have used *deiknumi*, “to show”, which would have been a perfect parallel with the example of the Lord, Who, when He had spoken the word of peace “showed them” His hands and His side (John xx. 20). Paul, too, could supplement his saying in the same way, though not in the same blessed degree. *Anadeiknumi*, “to show up by raising aloft, hence to indicate”, would hardly fit his purpose, for the word is used to indicate the choice of someone to fill an office (Acts i. 24). *Apodeiknumi* means “to point away from other things”, with the object of focusing upon one, and so “to prove” (Acts xxv. 7), but that was not quite the suitable word. *Epideiknumi* means “to show up, as a specimen”, “to exhibit”. This the Apostle might have used, for Luke xxiv. 40 uses it of Christ showing His hands and His feet.

But Paul passes all these by, and selects the word *hupodeiknumi*, “to show under”, to give a glimpse, to suggest, as it were, without making too much “show” in the process. Truth demanded that the Apostle should remind the Ephesians of the consistency that had always existed between his doctrine and his practice, but in giving that needful reminder a beautiful humility constrained him to seek out a word that would not be too “showy”. Such is the wonder of the inspired Scriptures, their every word and part of speech yielding a full measure of teaching. The Apostle refers in the latter part of verse 39 to a saying of the Lord that is not recorded in any of the four Gospels. This is not surprising, for Luke, under the influence of Paul, in the preface to the Gospel that bears his name, makes it very evident that there were many attempts to retain the words which the Lord spoke, and John goes so far as to say that he supposed that the world itself could not contain the books that would have to be written were everything the Saviour had taught recorded. In connection with the exhortation to “support the weak” we must remember that it is only after centuries of Christian teaching, the world has become conscious that

the weak have some claim for protection, and that this doctrine would have been rejected by the ordinary Roman citizen of the Apostle's day.

To revert to the narrative, the Apostle then knelt down and prayed with the little company of elders. They wept sore, falling on Paul's neck and kissing him, for he who roused undying enmity inspired also undying friendship, for they "sorrowed most" because of his words, "that they should see his face no more". "And they accompanied him to the ship."

Paul would have been the last to have rebuked these sorrowing saints. He ever blended "natural affection" with the more austere graces of his calling. He knew what it was to desire to see the face of his son Timothy once more before his death (II Tim. i. 4), and he had already written to the Thessalonians that he had "endeavoured" the more abundantly to see their face with great desire (I Thess. ii. 17), and again, in the next chapter, he wrote "Night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your face" (I Thess. iii. 10).

The full bearing of this chapter upon Paul's prison ministry will be better realized when we read chapter xxviii., and can view it shorn of the wealth of detail that has nevertheless made our study of it so precious. Like the Apostle himself, we have to "drag" ("gotten from", xxi. 1) ourselves away, for time and space have gone and we must draw to a close.

**#45. The Third Missionary Journey (xix. 21 - xxi. 39).
From Tyre to Jerusalem (xxi. 1 - 17).
pp. 77 - 81**

"And it came to pass, that after we were gotten from them, and had launched, we came with a straight course unto Coos, and the day following unto Rhodes, and from thence unto Patara. And finding a ship sailing over unto Phenicia, and went aboard, and set forth" (Acts xxi. 1, 2).

We have now reached the last stages of the fateful journey to Jerusalem. The believers seem to have clung to the Apostle up to the very point of the launching of the ship, for the words, "were gotten from them", translate *apospao*, a word actually used in Acts xx. 30 by the Apostle when speaking of those who would "draw away" disciples after them. "Tearing himself from them" is the translation suggested by Farrar. The wind was favourable, and they ran with a straight course to Coos. Rhodes is famous for the vast colossus which bestrode the harbour. At the time of the Apostle's visit, only the two legs remained on their pedestals, the huge body of a man in bronze which formed the upper portion of the statue having been previously hurled down by earthquake. This figure, like the Temple of Diana, was one of the seven wonders of the world, and we can well imagine that the Apostle, with recent memories of Ephesus, and the decline in the number of its idolatrous worshippers, would look upon this fallen colossus as another

Dagon. We do not know the reason which caused the Apostle to disembark at Patara. It may be that Paul desire a more direct journey than by the coastal route. This is suggested by the expression, “finding a ship sailing *out* to Phenicia”, where *diaperon* is used. The fact that this word is chosen to describe a journey across a lake (Matt. ix. 1) reveals the intention of Luke here in Acts xxi. 2. If the reader will take a map of Paul’s journeys and join Patara on the sea coast of Asia Minor with Tyre on the coast of Palestine, the line so drawn will pass Cyprus, which will be “on the left hand” (Acts xxi. 3). Upon arrival at Tyre, the Apostle “sought out” some disciples, and tarried there seven days. *Aneurischo* means not merely “to find” but “to find out”.

There was now no cause for anxiety as to reaching Jerusalem in time for Pentecost, since the providential discovery of the ship at Patara, and the favourable journey which they had made, left him with a fortnight to spare. There was no reason why the Apostle should proceed immediately to Jerusalem, for he knew only too well that every day he remained in Jerusalem would increase the possibility to passionate opposition and enmity arising. Had Paul the slightest uncertainty regarding his mission to Jerusalem, or had he been desirous of finding a “reason” for altering his place, he, like the tested souls of whom he wrote of Heb. xi., “might have had opportunity to return”. During the seven days which he spent at Tyre, some of the disciples there, speaking through the Spirit, intimated that he should not go up to Jerusalem. This has been interpreted by some to indicate that when Paul thereafter proceeded to Jerusalem, he did it in disobedience to the Spirit’s warning; we will deal with this point when we reach verse 11.

At the end of the seven days the little band moved on to their goal, and the disciples who earlier had heard the warning “not to go up”, now “brought” the Apostle and his companions on their way. The Greek word *propempo* translated here “*brought us on our way*”, is translated “accompanied” in Acts xx. 38. “And *being brought on their way* by the church” in Acts xv. 3; see also Rom. xv. 24, I Cor. xvi. 6, Titus iii. 13, and III John 6. This appears to indicate that maturer consideration had revealed the will of the Lord, and that the words spoken by the Spirit in Acts xxi. 4 were in the nature of a test and a warning—not a prohibition.

From Tyre, the last stage of the voyage was made, and the little band landed at Ptolemais, now known as Acre. The Apostle, having saluted the brethren, stayed one day. The journey to Cæsarea, a distance of some 40 miles, was probably accomplished overland. Here the Apostle waited until the eve of the feast, and found delightful and encouraging fellowship in the house of Philip the evangelist, one of the seven (Acts vi. 1-5) who was intimately linked with the fortunes of Paul, through Stephen the first Christian martyr. Philip was a Hellenist (Acts vi. 1-5), and had manifested the same spirit which moved the Apostle to the Gentiles, in that he carried the gospel to the hated Samaritans and preached it to the despised Ethiopian. What heart-searching conversation these two servants of the Lord must have had. The persecution that arose about the stoning of Stephen influenced the career of Philip, but it also was associated with the conversion, the conviction and the commission of Saul of Tarsus.

Had the writer of this article been treated with more human kindness and sympathy in his early years, he might still have been found in the ranks of the strictly orthodox, using possibly his talents to combat the teaching of the mystery; as it happened the Lord overruled painful circumstances to close many doors of so-called “opportunity”, and to lead in everything but actual fetters and chains to a “prison ministry”. With what joy, nevertheless, do we look back on those overrulings, and so must Philip the Evangelist and Paul the Apostle have humbly yet victoriously praised God for “sovereign grace o’er sin abounding”.

Philip had four unmarried daughters, and these believing women possessed the gift of prophecy. We are not told that they uttered any specific prophecy during Paul’s stay at the house, but we do read of the coming of another prophet, and what he said:

“And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judæa a certain prophet named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul’s girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles. And when we heard these things, both we, and they of that place, besought him not to go up to Jerusalem” (Acts xxi. 10-12).

We meet with this prophet Agabus earlier in the narrative of the Acts, for in Acts xi. 28 he is found foretelling a famine in the Roman world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius. Agabus adopted the manner of some Old Testament prophets; and enforced his spoken prophecy with dumb show. Zedekiah made horns of iron to visualize his prophecy (I Kings xxii. 11), and Isaiah walked “naked and barefoot” as a sign to the people (Isa. xx. 2).

Until now, Paul knew that bonds and afflictions awaited him, and this had been the testimony of the Holy Ghost in every city (Acts xx. 23), but now at Cæsarea, for the first time, definite particulars are given. “Jews at Jerusalem” would bring about the binding of the Apostle, and he would be delivered “into the hands of the Gentiles”. Upon hearing this, both the writer of the Acts—the other companion of Paul, and the believers assembled at Cæsarea, besought him “not to go to Jerusalem”. In Acts xxi. 4, no particulars are given, but they are in verses 11 and 12, and in the latter case we are sure that the urgent request “not to go up to Jerusalem” immediately followed the hearing of the prophecy.

In many particulars the apostle Paul followed the footsteps of His Lord, Who when the time came set His face as a flint to go up to Jerusalem, Matt. xx. 17, 18; Mark x. 32; and Luke xix. 28. We know, too, how Peter rebuked the Lord, when he first heard of His prospective death at Jerusalem (Matt. xvi. 21, 22), to whom the Lord had to say:

“Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto Me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men” (Matt. xvi. 23).

This word “savourest” might be considered by a literalist too free a translation of *phroneo*, yet with the marginal note of Isa. xi. 3 in mind the translation of Matt. xvi. 23 is seen to be almost an inspiration:

“And shall make Him of quick understanding”, margin “Scent, or, smell”.

Paul, too, was given a keen scent with regard to things of God, for while fellow-believers might judge after the sight of their eyes, or argue from expediency, he had but one purpose to accomplish, and that was to go to Jerusalem, leaving the rest with His Lord. That Paul was right is made evident by the sequel:

“Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying **The will of the Lord be done**” (Acts xxi. 13, 14).

What a light these few words throw upon the character of the Apostle and the strength of the temptation that beset him: “Mean ye to break my heart?” Not “cross my will” or “thwart my desire”. What else could his companions say than: “The will of the Lord be done?” This incident having passed, the little party proceeded to Jerusalem. The introduction of so prosaic a fact as “we took up our carriages” (verse 15)—or in modern English: “we packed our bags”, is of importance, for it shows that Paul acted with deliberate calmness, showing no symptoms of fanatical enthusiasm.

The city of Jerusalem was always crowded at the time of the feasts, and so, like the Saviour, Paul was not entertained by any of the high officials of the Church at Jerusalem, but Mnason of Cyprus, an old disciple, gave him a lodging. Mnason, with one or two other believers from Cæsarea, appears to have accompanied the Apostle, and as he was aware of the adverse prophecy, it was all the more praiseworthy that he gave such a dangerous guest hospitality. As the result his name is read, where the New Testament has penetrated, while the memory of men who commanded obeisance at the time have been forgotten. It is possible that the words *archaio mathete* may mean “an original disciple”, i.e., one who had been brought into the light of the gospel at the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Cyprus on their first missionary journey; or it may refer to the day of Pentecost, as the word *arche* indicates in Acts xi. 15. With Mnason the Apostle rested upon his arrival in Jerusalem, and gathered strength for the approaching conflict. It was the Apostle’s Bethany:

“And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly” (Acts xxi. 17).

This was the fifth and last recorded visit of the Apostle to Jerusalem since his conversion.

The structure of the section before us is simple:

Acts xxi. 1-17.

- J | 1-3. From Miletus to Tyre.
- K | 4. Prophecy. “Not go up to Jerusalem.”
- L | 5, 6. Departure. Accompanied.
- J | 7-9 Tyre to Cæsarea.
- K | 10-14. Prophecy. “Not go up to Jerusalem.”
- L | 15-17. Departure. Accompanied.

How intimate is the record of these days:

“Both the state of the weather and the direction of the wind are known. We can point to the place on the map where the vessel anchored for the night, and trace across the chart the track that was followed, when the moon was full. Yet more than this. We are made fully aware of the state of the apostle’s mind, and of the burdened feeling under which this journey was accomplished” (Conybeare and Howson).

All is now ready, Pentecost has come, Paul is at Jerusalem, the city teems with fanatics and enemies, but a purpose that goes back before the overthrow of the world is about to emerge, and grace beyond dreams is to be made known through this same Paul, as the prisoner of Jesus Christ for us Gentiles.

We therefore prayerfully anticipate our study of the remainder of this section of the Acts, which must occupy our attention in another article. May our sense of gratitude to the earthen vessel, and our appreciation of his loyalty amid temptation and sufferings for “His body’s sake which is the church”, be none the less, because, in these days so far distant from the throbbing events recorded, we are able to lift serene eyes to the unseen hand that guided and upheld the Apostle, that we through his ministry might learn of heavenly places in Christ Jesus.

**#46. The Third Missionary Journey (xix. 21 - xxi. 39).
The reception of the Apostle at Jerusalem (xxi. 18 - 21).
pp. 113 - 117**

We left the Apostle in the care of the old disciple Mnason, with whom he spent the last peaceful night that he was to know for, perhaps, the rest of his tumultuous life.

“And the day following Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present” (Acts xxi. 18).

Before examining this new section in detail, let us see the structure.

Acts xxi. 18-26.

- M | 18. Went in. Paul and his companions.
- N | 19. Gentiles. What God had wrought.
- O | 20. Many thousands zealous of the law.
- P | 21, 22. Informed. False statement.
- P | 23, 24. Informed. Prove that they are nothing.
- O | 24. Thou, thyself, keepst the law.
- N | 25. Gentiles. What the Elders and Apostles had written.
- M | 26. Entered in. Paul and the man who had a vow.

“James and all the elders were present” (Acts xxi. 18).

There is something about this statement that calls up the words of Gal. ii. 6: “These who seemed to be somewhat.”

“It must have been with an almost painful shyness—that ‘timid provincial neophytes’ like Timothy and Trophimus (the latter especially, an uncircumcised Gentile, whom his teacher had encouraged to regard himself as entirely emancipated from the Jewish law)—found themselves in the awful presence of James, the Lord’s brother—James, the stern, white-robed, mysterious prophet, and the conclave of his but half-conciliated Judaic presbyters” (*Farrar*).

The apostle Paul, however, who had witnessed Peter to the face, and had yielded by subjection no, not for an hour, went forward without hesitation to meet this council and “saluted them”. He then “declared particularly”, that is, gave a fairly detailed account, of “what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry”. Paul had been absent about four years (Acts xviii. 21); he referred to “the space of three years” as the duration of his ministry in Asia, and he would have much to tell concerning Ephesus, Philippi, Galatia and elsewhere. We cannot tell whether Paul alluded to the antagonism, not only of the unbelieving Jews, but of the believing Jews, which had attempted to wreck his work at Corinth and Galatia, but in either case the freedom and grace enjoyed by the Gentile churches would have been made very manifest by his report, and the disclosure would act like breath on glowing tinder. Ever since James, Cephas and John had asked Paul to “remember the poor” (Gal. ii. 10), it had been his intense desire that he should be able to bring an offering from the Gentile churches to Jerusalem as evidence of their recognition of indebtedness and a manifest token of their fellowship and goodwill. In pursuit of his desire he had arranged that each church should select their own representative and personally deliver the love gift of the churches to the leaders at Jerusalem.

That Paul entertained very serious doubts concerning his reception at Jerusalem, is made clear in his epistle to the Romans. The full structure of Rom. xv. 8 - xvi. 23 will be found in Volume XXX, page 81. From it we lift those members that reveal the fears entertained by the Apostle in connection with this visit to Jerusalem.

And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy (Rom. xv. 9).

Might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost (Rom. xv. 16).

May be accepted of the Saints (Rom. xv. 31).

The offering up of the Gentiles to God, *was acceptable*, for they were sanctified by the Holy Ghost. But of the offering sent by the Gentiles to Jerusalem, Paul can only earnestly express the hope, *may it be accepted* by those who are saints, not by nature, but by grace. O the tragedy of the sectarian spirit! No doubts were entertained as to the acceptableness of the poor Gentile converts by a holy God, but grave doubts were entertained as to whether those self-same converts would be acceptable to certain other sinners saved by grace! Paul’s fears seem to have been only too well founded. The offerings had been in his charge throughout the journey. Had they been lost, stolen or left behind, Luke would have recorded the fact.

“One by one he would call forward the beloved delegates, that they might with their own hands, lay at the feet of James, the sums of money which his Gentile Churches had contributed out of their deep poverty, and which in many and many a coin bore witness to weeks of generous self-denial. There lay all this money, a striking proof of the faithfulness with which Paul, at any rate, had carried out his share of the old compact at Jerusalem and on this occasion, if ever, we might surely have looked for a little effusive sympathy, a little expansive warmth, on the part of the community which had received so tangible a proof of the Apostle’s kindness. Yet we are not told about a word of thanks, and we see but too plainly that Paul’s hardly disguised misgiving as to the manner in which his gift would be accepted, was confirmed” (*Farrar*).

We are certainly told that when the Elders at Jerusalem heard Paul’s report, “they glorified the Lord”, but this was immediately followed by words that must have well nigh quenched any glow of anticipation those first words of the Elders had kindled:

“And they said unto him, Thou seest brother, how many thousands of the Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law. And they are informed of thee”

Let us pause at this word “informed”. The structure brings it into prominence, for it is repeated in verse 24. “Studiously indoctrinated” or “sedulously informed” have been suggested as conveying the veiled threat that, with all the charity in the world, one feels to have been behind the words. Zeal can alas be the outcome, not only of love and faith, but of envy. *Zelotes* would remind the Apostle that once, as a Pharisee, he had been “zealous” for the tradition of his fathers (Gal. i. 14), and what a bitter sectarian it had made him. The verb *zeloo*, while it is used in a noble sense in the New Testament, is mostly used for the cruel emotion of “envy”. The two occasions where it comes in the Acts are:

“The patriarchs, *moved with envy*, sold Joseph” (Acts vii. 9).
“But the Jews which believed not, *moved with envy*” (Acts xvii. 5).

Zelos, too, though it stand for a “zeal of God”, may also stand for zeal “not according to knowledge” (Rom. x. 2). So then, the introduction of such words as “zealous of the law” and “they are informed of thee” would stifle any uprising of joy at the brief doxology that had first been uttered.

“They are informed of thee that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs” (Acts xxi. 21).

How near, and yet how far from, the truth, false charges arising from sectarian zeal can be! For instance, the Christian public have been “informed” or “studiously indoctrinated” that *The Berean Expositor* takes away all Scriptures from the church, except four short epistles, and that as an inference from our teaching concerning the Lord’s Supper, we have very little regard for the doctrine of the atonement. We also understand that we are said to deny the Second Coming of the Lord. Further, like misstatements are made, which become weapons and stumbling-stones to the unwary. We may not expect to find much in the theology of Kipling that we could endorse, but we can enter very really into the words:

“If you can bear to hear the truth you’ve spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools;
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build ’em up with worn-out tools.”

Had Paul known these lines, we think he would have felt that they were almost a part of his biography.

Did Paul, at this time, remember Stephen, with whose death he was so intimately associated? Did he remember how the truth Stephen had stood for had been “twisted”?

“Then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law; for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us” (Acts vi. 11, 13, 14).

Most certainly the Apostle had not taught *the believing Jew* to “forsake Moses”. He had taught him to see that his hope of righteousness by his own attempts to keep the law was vain, but he had spoken not a word about the circumcision of the children of the believing Jews, and had actually circumcised Timothy. What he had resisted was the attempt to force the yoke of the law upon believing *Gentiles* and to compel them to be circumcised, but such distinctions would be brushed aside by a partisan. Seven times do we read of “customs” in the Acts (vi. 14; xv. 1; xvi. 21; xxi. 21; xxv. 16; xxvi. 3, and xxviii. 17), and any teaching that touched the sacred “rites” of either Jew or Roman was sure to arouse intense antagonism. The word translated “forsake” in the phrase “forsake Moses” has an ugly sound in the original. It is *apostasia*, a word that occurs but once more in the New Testament where it is used for the awful “falling away” that is associated with the days of the Man of Sin (II Thess. ii. 3). *Apostasion* moreover is translated “divorcement”, and this would also be uppermost in the mind of a Jew.

Here, then, was the state of affairs at Jerusalem, and the Apostle, however he might endeavour to conciliate such opposition, would know that out of this condition would arise the circumstances which prophets had foretold in every city through which he had passed on his journey to Jerusalem. Paul knew what it was to fear, he knew what it was to pray for boldness, and he required all the grace and strength that his faith could muster as he listened to this accusation and foresaw its consequences. We watch him going to the temple at the request of the rulers, as a lamb to the slaughter. He was, however, to hear “the night following” the encouraging words:

“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).

We have however anticipated our subject a little, and must return to follow the steps of the Apostle as recorded in the section we are examining. This we will do in our next article.

**#47. The Third Missionary Journey (xix. 21 - xxi. 39).
The Apprehension of the Apostle in the Temple (xxi. 27 - 34).
pp. 149 - 154**

When we examine Paul's epistles, we find they contain two contemporaneous lines of teaching, which, if taken as two parts of a whole, make an intelligible presentation of truth, but if segregated, could easily become the tenets of two opposing factions.

One of the objects of the Apostle's ministry was the conciliation of the church at Jerusalem without yielding any of the peculiar truth that constituted both the glory of his message among the Gentiles, and its offensiveness to those that believed, but who were still zealous of the law.

In his then recently written epistles to the Corinthians and the Romans, this conciliatory spirit is especially manifest, not only "to the Jew", but "to the Greek" and "to the Church of God" (I Cor. x. 32). He had not only urged respect for the conscience of one who failed to shake off his earlier feelings regarding idols (I Cor. x. 27-29), but had counseled the same charitable attitude to the believing, yet ceremonial, Jew (Rom. xiv.). He had expressed his attitude in the well-known words:

"Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews: to them that are under the law as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. To them that are without the law, as without the law (being not with the law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without the law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some" (I Cor. ix. 19-21).

This represented one side of the apostolic character and attitude. But there was another aspect of his teaching necessary to complete the whole, and that was his unsparing opposition of all attempts on the part of Judaizers to bring his converts under bondage. He had called these Judaizers "false brethren", "deceitful workers" and even "dogs". He had declared that those who had gone back to "the weak and beggarly elements" of the law were comparable with those who returned to the rites and ceremonies of heathen gods; he had spoken of the "curse" and the "wrath" that must be associated with the law, and had even declared that any believer who submitted to circumcision would fall from grace, and that Christ would profit such an one, nothing.

Unless, therefore, we see Paul and his doctrine as a whole, we shall not be able to understand what is recorded of him in Acts xxi.

"A modern writer has said that he (Paul) could not do this without untruth; and that to suppose the author of the epistles to the Romans and Galatians standing seven days, oil cakes in hand, in the temple vestibule, and submitting himself to all the manifestations with which Rabbinic pettiness had multiplied the Mosaic ceremonials which accompanied the completion of the Nazarite vow—to suppose that in the midst of the unbelieving Priests and Levites, he should have patiently tolerated all the ritual nullities

of the temple service of that period, and so have brought the business to its tedious conclusion in the elaborate manner above described, is just as credible as that Luther in his old age should have performed a pilgrimage to Emsieden with peas in his shoes, and that Calvin on his death bed should have vowed a gold-embroidered gown to the Holy Mother of God" (*Farrar, ref. to Hausruth*).

But in view of the Apostle's avowed willingness to be made "all things to all men" already expressed in the quotation from I Cor. ix., we can see that for Christ's sake he would have endured, with pity and with prayer, the tedious ceremonial attached to the liberation of a Nazarite vow, could he thus disarm those who misunderstood and attacked his testimony of the grace of God to the Gentiles. We must remember, moreover, that the Temple still stood at Jerusalem, that Israel, as Israel, were still a people before God, that, until the apostle reached Rome, the hope of Israel was not deferred, and that while the law as a means of salvation had been set aside by the sacrifice of Christ, yet the Jew, during the period of the Acts did not cease to be a Jew by becoming a Christian. He still worshipped the God of his fathers, and continued to do so until the dispensation changed.

Paul had never taught the Jew to "forsake Moses" in the sense that his adversaries alleged; neither had he said that they ought not to circumcise their children, but much of his teaching could easily be so misrepresented as to convince the zealot of the law that he was a most dangerous heretic.

"What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together, for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads; and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself walkest orderly, and keepest the law" (Acts xxi. 22-24).

Let us acquaint ourselves with the meaning of this proposition. The word *agnizo*, "purify thyself with them", is the word used in the LXX for *nazar* in Numb. vi. 3. We have already seen that Paul had "polled his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow" (Acts xviii. 18), but he still needed to complete that vow, for the word *keiramenos*, "to poll the head", is not the same as *xuresontai* "shave the head" of Acts xxi. 24. The former word, used in Acts xviii. 18, is never used by the LXX of the final Nazarite *shaving* of the head at the expiration of a vow. The fact that a vow had been taken in Cenchrea which demanded fulfillment at Jerusalem, seemed to the leaders at Jerusalem a heaven-sent opportunity which they immediately seized. Let the whole thing be done as publicly as possible, and let Paul undertake the cost attaching to the ceremonial purification of these four men, as others had done before him; "be at charges with them". It was the custom for a wealthy Jew to assist his poorer brethren in this way. *Lewin* says: "There was not a more charitable act in the estimate of the Jews, or one more calculated to acquire popularity, than to assist the poor Nazarite by supplying the necessary funds." Josephus records the return of Agrippa from Rome, and how he "offered all the sacrifices that belonged to him, and omitted nothing which the law required; on which account he ordered that many of the Nazarites should have their heads shorn" (Ant. xix. 6, 1).

What a wonderful exhibition this action of grace on Paul's part! A mere doctrinaire would have repudiated the humiliating conditions suggested by the leaders at Jerusalem. He would also feel resentment at the very casual acceptance of the gift to gather which he had spent so much time and prayer. He could easily have hidden behind the evident fact that he had stood for complete emancipation from all such dead ceremonial works. But Paul knew better. He believed and taught that true grace was Christ-like, and this overcame all objections, leading him meekly to submit where he might have waged war against "those who seemed to be somewhat".

"And when the seven days were almost ended" (Acts xxi. 27).—In Acts xxiv. 18 the apostle said that they who arrested him found him "purified in the temple, neither with multitude nor with tumult". In the law seven days is a usual period for purification (Exod. xxix. 37; Lev. xiv. 8; Numb. xii. 14), and in the law concerning the Nazarite provision is made for anyone contracting ceremonial impurity, which enjoins upon him the necessity of waiting for seven days till offerings be made and restoration effected. So also at the close of the vow, it seems that to make doubly sure the priests demanded a lapse of seven days before release could be given. Towards the close of this period

"The Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people and laid hands on him, crying out, Men of Israel, help: This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere, against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple and hath polluted this holy place (For they had seen before with him in the city Trophimus an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the temple)" (Acts xxi. 27-29).

To understand why the people could be so easily inflamed some acquaintance will be necessary with the conditions that obtained at the time of Paul's visit. The populace had but recently been infuriated by Claudius under whose orders the golden robes of the High Priest had been locked away in the tower of Antonia. Such an exhibition of fury resulted that the presence of the Prefect of Syria with a large force was required to keep the peace. Claudius yielded to pressure, and the obnoxious order was cancelled. Josephus, moreover, tells us that during the Procuratorship of Cumanus a Roman soldier had expressed his contempt for the Jewish ceremonies, by a gesture of the most insulting indecency, thereby again plunging the Jews into turmoil. The Procurator was cursed and the soldiers were stoned. This brought upon the Jews such punishment that the number trapped and cut down by the sword is variously stated at ten and twenty thousand. Again, a Roman soldier roused the Jews by the burning of a copy of the Scriptures in public, and so insistent was the Jewish opposition that, this time, Cumanus thought it best to sacrifice a common soldier to gain time and keep the peace. Cumanus was finally banished, and at the time of Paul's visit, Felix was Procurator of Judæa. Felix was guilty of several outrages and, moreover, only seven weeks before Paul's arrival at Jerusalem, an Egyptian, posing as a Messiah, had raised 30,000 followers, who expected the walls of Jerusalem to fall down flat at his approach. Four thousand of his poor dupes actually accompanied him to the Mount of Olives, where Felix killed four hundred and took a number of prisoners.

It will, therefore, be perceived that abundant material existed for another outburst, and the arrival of some Jews from Asia provided the spark. "Men of Israel, help!" From one

to another passed the words “The people!” “The Law!” “The Holy Place!” “Here is the hated renegade!” Having seen Paul walking in the streets with the Gentile Trophimus, these fanatical Jews jumped to the conclusion that Paul had taken him into the Temple.

“To defile the Temple was what every enemy of the Jews tried to do. Antiochus, Heliodorus, Pompey, had profaned it, and very recently the Samaritans had been charged with deliberately polluting it by scattering dead men’s bones over the precincts. Instantly the rumour flew from lip to lip that this was Saul, of whom they had heard—Paul the *mesith*—Paul, one of the Galilean *Minim*—one of the believers in “the Hung”—Paul, the renegade Rabbi, who taught and wrote that Gentiles were as good as Jews—the man that blasphemed the Torah—the man whom the synagogues had scourged in vain—the man who went from place to place getting into trouble with the Romans; and that he had been caught taking with him into the Temple a Gentile dog, an uncircumcised *ger*. The punishment for that crime was death—death by the full permission of the Romans themselves; death even against a Roman who should dare to set foot beyond the *chel*” (*Farrar*).

The Talmudic writers themselves have said that the cause of the destruction of the second Temple was “groundless hatred” (Joma, f 9.2).

Had not the sanctity of the Temple disallowed the shedding of blood within its precincts, Paul would have been killed on the spot. To avoid profanation therefore the Jews dragged him down the steps into the outer court, through the “Beautiful Gate”, which the Temple police shut behind the surging throng. This momentary delay was providential. A Roman soldier was always stationed at the western cloister during festivals, and he gave immediate warning of the tumult. Lysias, the Chief Captain, then appeared with centurions and soldiers, and the Jews, now faced by disciplined soldiers, “left beating Paul” and, as the first hand of a Roman soldier was laid upon the prostrate Paul, he became “the prisoner of Jesus Christ”, prophetic warnings of what awaited him at Jerusalem were verified, and the first steps that were to eventuate both in Roman imprisonment and wondrous revelation were taken.

At this point we will pause and set out the structure of the section before us.

Acts xxi. 27-40.

- M | 27. Jews of Asia.
- N | 27. Stirred up the people.
- O | 28. Charge. He brought Greeks.
- P | 29. Supposition. Paul and Trophimus.
- Q | 30, 31. Paul. Drawn out about to be killed.
- R | 32. Chief Captain and soldiers.
- Q | 32. Paul. They left beating him.
- R | 33-36. Chief Captain. Borne of the soldiers.
- O | 37. Question. Canst thou speak Greek?
- P | 38. Supposition. Art thou that Egyptian?
- M | 39. Jew of Tarsus.
- N | 40. A great silence.

The Chief Captain having secured the Apostle, binding him by two chains, demanded “who the man might be, and what he had done?” receiving however but a confused and contradictory reply. Probably afraid that they were to be cheated of their prey, the mob cried out “Away with him!” (*Aire auton*), using the identical words of the yelling crowds who demanded the crucifixion of Christ, as recorded in Luke xxiii. 18. The Chief Captain had ordered Paul to be taken to the barracks, but the surging mob carried the fettered apostle off his feet, and he was only saved from being torn limb from limb by the presence of the soldiery. In the midst of all this tumult, one man remained calm—the poor battered prisoner.

“May I speak a word to you?” said a voice speaking in Greek. Lysias had evidently assumed that he had at last laid hands on the false Messiah already mentioned and who had eluded pursuit since Passover, but he knew that this Egyptian impostor could not speak Greek like that which he now heard. “I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city, and I beseech thee, suffer me to speak unto the people” (Acts xxi. 39). The request was strange, and in all probability would have been refused, had not some dignity and authority made themselves manifest beneath the battered appearance of the prisoner. To gain attention and command respect the Apostle had given at length the fact of his citizenship of Tarsus, adding, as further weight, the comment as to the importance of the city. Moreover, the Romans, if brutal, were also brave, and the fact that a prisoner, and a Jew, just snatched from a violent death, should request leave to turn and face his persecutors would impress them in his favour.

Lysias apparently ordering one of Paul’s hands to be unchained, the prisoner, standing on the stairs, with arm uplifted, made signs that he wished to speak. His voice fell upon their ears with quieting effect, for the “Hebrew tongue”, in which Paul spoke (*Te Hebraidi dialekto*) was the Syro-Chaldaic, the language of the native population of Palestine. Had the Apostle spoken in Greek the majority would have misunderstood him, but hearing what, to them, would be “the holy tongue”, a stillness fell upon them all.

Here we must stay. The address which the Apostle gave, and its sequel, constitutes the opening of the last great section of the Acts, which closes in Rome, with the imprisoned Apostle “teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him”. With this closing section of the Acts is bound up that ministry with which, through electing grace, all our hopes are associated.

The Bearing of the Context on Well-Known Passages.

#1. “My times are in Thy hand.” pp. 146, 147

Many a believer during periods of trial has breathed the words of the Psalmist, “My times are in Thy hand” (Psa. xxxi. 15), and we are sure that the slightest movement towards a more implicit trust in the Lord will always receive His encouragement. Yet, like many other oft-quoted passages of Scripture, there is a qualifying context, and our knowledge of this will make the committal all the more real and wonderful.

We observe first that the words “My times are in Thy hand” refer to the external circumstances of life rather than to the more fundamental inner realities. We have a very clear expansion of what these “times” involve in the first eight verses of Eccles. iii.:

“A time to be born, and a time to die A time for war, and a time for peace”
(Eccles. iii. 1-8).

Here, in a series of fourteen pairs of opposite facts, we have a summing-up of our “times”. These “times”, says the Psalmist to the Lord, “are in Thy hand”—all my outgoings and incomings, all the movements of daily life. If we know anything of the Word, however, we shall also realize that it is impossible for any man to commit his whole life to the Lord unless his heart and soul go with it. If we look back to verse 5 of the same Psalm we shall find that this thought has already been expressed:

“Into Thine hand I commit my SPIRIT; Thou hast redeemed me” (Psa. xxxi. 5).

Here we have the inner aspect of the matter. Before we can truly say “My *times* (that is, the externals of life) are in Thy hand” we must also be able to say: “Into Thine hand I commit my *spirit*.”

If the reader will refer to verse 15 he will see that the phrase “My times are in Thy hand” is followed by a reference to deliverance “from the hand of his enemies”. Following the reference to the “spirit” in verse 5, on the other hand, we have the words: “Thou hast redeemed me.” The two references, to the “hand” of the Lord, and the “hand” of the enemy, are suggestive, and further study reveals the following arrangement:

A | Psa. xxxi. 5. “Thine hand.” Spirit committed.
B | 8. “The hand of the enemy.” Not shut up.
A | 15. “Thy hand.” Times.
B | 15. “The hand of enemies.” Deliver me.

Let us by all means, and with all our heart, say unto the Lord, “My times are in Thy hand”, but let us also commit our spirit to Him too.

EPHPHATHA, or Be Opened.

#1. The Opened Ear: “To Learn.” pp. 111, 112

A common expression, belonging to no one aspect of service is that of an “opening” being found for a person who has sought employment. The word is used in several suggestive ways in connection with the greatest of all service, the service of the Lord. It may be a word in season to some of our readers if we give the usage of this expression a consideration. In what order shall we deal with the many “openings” that are discovered, is the first question that presents itself. Of what use is an “open” door, if our mouth is closed? Or what use is an “open” mouth, if we have nothing to say? Consequently, before we think of the openings for service that await the believer, we must pay attention to the messenger himself. Our first study therefore is associated with

THE OPENED EAR.

A twofold charge is brought against the “Hebrews” in chapter v.—they were “dull of hearing” and they “ought to have been teachers”. This suggests that the opened ear is a very important factor in the equipment of a teacher. The Apostle makes it very plain, when speaking of the gospel which he preached, that he was but passing on a message that he himself had received:—“For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received” (I Cor. xv. 3), and whatever way the Lord chose to reveal the truth to His servant, the figure of the opened ear is suggestive.

The greatest of all Servants, wonderful to say, is the Lord Himself, and it is in the prophetic record written by Isaiah long before His first advent, that we find our perfect illustration.

“The Lord God hath given Me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary: He wakeneth morning by morning, He wakeneth Mine ear to hear as the learned. The Lord God hath opened Mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back” (Isa. l. 4, 5).

What a full passage is this. First of all we observe that the “tongue” is intimately associated with the “ear”. It is a physical truth that many are dumb simply because they are deaf. The Lord once had a man brought before Him who was deaf and who had an impediment in his speech.

“He put His fingers into his ears, and He spit, and touched his tongue: and looking up to heaven He sighed, and said unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. Straightway his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue loosed, and he spake plain” (Mark vii. 33-35).

In this miracle we may see a picture of the believer, who because he has not “the hearing ear” has an impediment also in his speech. The Lord said Ephphatha, “Be

opened”; He had no need to utter the words “be loosed”, for with the opening of the ear, the tongue was loosed, and he “spake plain”.

The expression “the tongue of the *learned*” is a trifle misleading. “Learned” conjures up before the mind great scholarship, venerable age, and all the accompaniments of “learning”. The word before us would be better translated “learner” or “disciple”, one who is a willing follower, rather than one who has attained great scholarship. This gift conveys to the possessor that priceless ability “to know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary”. When we remember the grace of the Lord, His patience and longsuffering, and withal His pity and His love, and when we compare that with our own sharpness, our own lack of tact, our abruptness, we may perhaps be led to acknowledge how much we need the opened ear so that we may have a tongue that shall speak in season.

“Lord speak to me, that I may speak,
In living echoes of Thy tone.”

is a prayer that we may all pray with profit, and with assurance of blessing when the answer is given.

The ear, in Isa. l., is said to be both “wakened” and “opened”. The wakening is “morning by morning”, and is suggestive of continual communion with the Lord. The idea conveyed by the word “open” is clearly perceived when we remember that it gives us the word “key” in Isa. xxii. 22. The added clause, “and I was not rebellious”, is really an expansion of the idea already presented by the wakened and opened ear. To hear, and especially to hearken, in the Scriptures often meant to obey.

“*To obey* is better than sacrifice, and *to hearken* than the fat of rams” (I Sam. xv. 22).
“They refused to hearken, and pulled away the *shoulder*” (Zech. vii. 11).

Here then is one of the foremost “openings” in Christian service, the opening of the ear, so that the message to be given may be received, and from the close association of hearkening with obeying, there may be some correspondence between doctrine and practice on the part of those who seek to serve their God.

#2. The Opened Book: “To Equip.” **pp. 144 - 146**

In our first article we considered the question of the opened ear, and realized that the Scriptures teach that apart from the opened ear, we shall not learn the truth, and consequently shall not be equipped for service. The opened ear, however, is but one side of the truth; there must be another, namely, something for the ear to hear. However eager we may be to learn, or however ready to hear, there must be some one who speaks, there must be something to be taught. Now the figure of the opened ear demands the corresponding figure of the voice. Yet, the majority of those who have been equipped for service, have been equipped and prepared by the written Word, and would hesitate seriously before they yielded submission to any spoken *voice*.

It is evident that the words, “Who hath ears to hear, let him hear” have a wider application than to those who actually were within the sound of the voice of the Lord. “He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life” (John v. 24) is most certainly not to be limited to the hearing of a voice. There is, however, no need to pursue the matter, for all will agree that the figure of the ear is not to be limited to the physical act of hearing, but stand for ready reception through whatever channel it be mediated. To-day we are guided neither by vision, dreams, voices nor angels. We are guided by the written Word, and as we read its pages and obey its teaching we are “hearing” in the truest sense. Consequently our next item in this series of “openings” must be. “The Opened Book.”

Those of our readers who are at all acquainted with the writings of the late Dr. E. W. Bullinger will remember that a favourite expression of his, when involved in any argument concerning the faith, was one borrowed from Neh. viii. 5, “Open the Book”. Over and over again when debate has run high we have seen strong feeling quieten and sweet reasonableness follow the opening of the Book. Another passage of Scripture of constant use in Dr. Bullinger’s writings is that of Rom. x. 17:

“Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”

There are several ways in which we may think of the Scriptures as an open book. First, it is an open book because it has been freely given to all the people of God. We rejoice that the reading of the Bible is the exclusive privilege of no class or person. Secondly, it is an open book because it speaks frankly. There are depths and heights in its teaching that baffle the holiest and the wisest. There are mysteries and parables, prophecies and visions, that leave the mind impressed with the fact that its author is none less than “The only wise God”, yet granting all this, how plainly, how simply, how openly it speaks of sin, of salvation, of the Saviour, of life, of death, of judgment.

While quite a number of features like the two given could be brought forward to underline the fact that the book is indeed an open book, there is nevertheless another aspect of the Scriptures wherein these self-same scriptures need to be opened. Our

thoughts travel immediately to that closing chapter of Luke's Gospel, where the disciples were led to exclaim:

“Did not our hearts burn within us, while He talked with us by the way, and while He opened to us the Scriptures” (Luke xxiv. 32).

If we enquire as to the way in which the Lord opened the Scriptures with such enriching consequences, we have not far to seek. In verse 27 we shall find His method.

“And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself” (Luke xxiv. 27).

The subject is of such importance that we find it repeated in verse 44:

“These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning Me” (Luke xxiv. 44).

We find other Spirit-led servants of the Lord following these steps. Philip found the Ethiopian eunuch reading a part of Isa. liii., and the eunuch asked the question: “I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?” (Acts viii. 34). Philip began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus.

Paul, on more than one occasion is found “opening the book” in this same way.

“And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus Whom I preach unto you, is Christ” (Acts xvii. 2, 3).

It is not our object to write at length upon these themes, but rather to stimulate the interest of the reader, in the hope that the riches of the book may be sought and found individually.

We might perhaps draw attention to the fact that an opened book is seen at the time of the end. When the time comes for the Lord to take the Kingdom and reign, He alone is found worthy to “open the book” (Rev. v.), and when the millennial Kingdom has run its course, and the great white throne is set, even then the destiny of man is still involved in the opening of books.

“The books were opened: and another book was opened which is the book of life” (Rev. xx. 12).

Returning to our theme. The opened *ear* is first of all necessary so that we may learn, but the opened *book* is likewise necessary if the truth is to be made known to us. The equipment of the child of God for service that the Word of God accomplishes is so complete, that the word “perfect” used in II Tim. iii. 17 is one used in connection with a dockyard, having reference to the fitting out of a ship. We need therefore:

- (1) The opened ear.—To learn.
- (2) The opened book.—To equip.

#3. The Opened Understanding: “To Perceive.” pp. 183, 184

We have seen that the opened ear, and the opened Book constitute an important part of the equipment of the believer for service, but we have not yet given attention to all that needs to be “opened”, if that equipment is to be complete. There is the added need of an “opened understanding”.

“And Ezra opened the book and caused them to understand the reading”
(Neh. viii. 5-8).

The physical opening of the Book was followed by its “opening” in a fuller sense, and it will help us if we observe what Ezra and the assembled company did upon the great occasion recorded in Neh. viii.

“When he opened it, all the people stood up” (Neh. viii. 5).

To rise when the Book was opened was an act of reverence. On another occasion even Eglon, king of Moab, though his heart may have been far from God, “arose out of his seat” when Ehud announced, “I have a message of God unto thee” (Judges iii. 20).

“And Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God, and all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the Lord, with their faces to the ground” (Neh. viii. 6).

The opening of the Book was the signal for the worship of its Author. We reverence the Word of God, because we reverence the God of the Word.

“So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly” (Neh. viii. 8).

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, said the Apostle Paul, who shall prepare himself for battle? Writing later to his son Timothy the Apostle said, “Till I come, give attendance to reading” (I Tim. iv. 13). To the Ethiopian eunuch Philip said, “Understands thou what thou readest?” (Acts viii. 30).

In the R.V. margin the word “distinctly” in Neh. viii. 8 is translated “with an interpretation”. The word thus translated is *parash* and means to unfold, spread out or extend, and has the same meaning as our word “exposition”. A person who merely recognizes the different letters of a word does not “understand”. A person who is able merely to spell out the Hebrew letters P, A, R, A, S, H, does not “understand”. Understanding has to do with *meaning*, and unless we arrive at the meaning of a passage or word of Scripture, it will remain a dead letter to us. It is therefore a distinct ministry to “spread out” the meaning of God’s Word. It may take the form of analysis or it may take the form adopted by Philip when he “preached Jesus”, but, in every case, to understand

involves getting beneath the surface to essentials, or, as Neh. viii. 8 adds, “they gave the sense and caused them to understand the reading”.

On page 145 we have referred to Luke xxiv. for the “opening” of the Scriptures, and to that passage we must again refer for the added “opening of the understanding”.

“Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures. And He said, Thus it is written and thus is behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead” (Luke xxiv. 45, 46).

The Lord was evidently concerned that His words should be understood. On more than one occasion He said to His disciples,

“Have ye *understood* all these things?” (Matt. xiii. 51).
“Perceive ye not yet, neither *understand?*” (Mark viii. 17).
“How is it that ye do not *understand?*” (Mark viii. 21).
“Love Him with all the heart, and with all the *understanding*” (Mark xii. 33).

The Apostle Paul followed his Lord in this particular, saying, “I will pray with the understanding” (I Cor. xiv. 15); “I had rather speak five words with my understanding” (I Cor. xiv. 19).

We may well conclude this brief article with the Apostle’s words to Timothy, “The Lord give thee understanding in all things” (II Tim. ii. 7).

To sum up, therefore, as far as we have gone, we need:--

- (1) The opened EAR.—To Learn.
- (2) The opened BOOK.—To Equip.
- (3) The opened UNDERSTANDING.—To Perceive.

EPHESIA.

#1. Was “Ephesians” a circular letter? pp. 106 - 108

To every believer, who has by grace become a member of the Body of Christ, and who has appreciated the distinctive character of the present dispensation of the mystery, the epistle to the Ephesians must ever be held in high esteem. We have, in early volumes of *The Berean Expositor*, attempted an exposition of this epistle, which occupies the greater part of the Volume entitled “The Testimony of the Lord’s Prisoner”. We return to its pages, again and again in the course of our ministry, and now, in the present series we approach the epistle from yet another angle. In the course of exposition, much that needs explanation is crowded out, much has to be omitted because of the fact that all readers have not attained the same degree of advancement. We therefore commence a new series, and entitle it *Ephesia*, which we hope indicates the character of these studies. We are here concerned with the *material* out of which the epistle is built. We want to provide the reader with information, points of grammar, number of occurrences, and various details that cannot be introduced in the ordinary way.

To the Ephesians.—The Revised Version retains the words “at Ephesus” in chap. i. 1, but includes in the margin the note: “Some very ancient authorities omit *at Ephesus*.”

We learn from Col. iv. 16 that Paul had written a letter to the Laodiceans, and Marcion believed it to be the same as the epistle to the Ephesians. It has been suggested that Colossians was a similar letter to be sent round the other churches (Col. iv. 16), but it must be remembered that this epistle contains the words: “To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse” (Col. i. 2), and that the authority for this designation has never been questioned. Ephesians consequently could have been a circular letter, and yet retain the “at Ephesus”.

There is a passage in Basil (A.D.350) which shows that the words “at Ephesus” were omitted from the epistle as he read it, for he says that Paul spoke of the saints “who exist” (*Tois ousin*) and his comment is:

“Truly united by knowledge of the Existing One (*to onti*) denominating them in a singular manner (*idiazontos*), as existing (*ontas*).”

Origen (A..D230) had observed earlier:

“We found this expression ‘to the saints that exist’, used only in the case of the Ephesians.”

Jerome, speaks of Origen’s explanation (he goes back to Exod. iii. 14):

“as too subtle, and he affirms that other Expositors are of the opinion that the true reading here is not ‘to those who *are*’, but ‘to those who are holy and faithful *at Ephesus*’.”

Wordsworth says:

“Origen, who, as far as we know, was the first person who made the remark above cited, recognizes the epistle as addressed to the Ephesians even when he is making the remark, and comments upon it *as such*.”

Regarding the reference to Marcion, Tertullian tells us that Marcion, the heretic, desired to alter the title of the epistle so as to read “To the Laodiceans”. This, however, implies that the words “at Ephesus” were in use, otherwise they could not be “altered”. Tertullian adds:--“According to the verity of the church, we have this epistle address to the Ephesians, and not to the Laodiceans”.

The words “at Ephesus” are not found in the *text* of the Vatican Manuscript, but they have been added in the margin by a later hand. The same is the case with the Sinaiticus, and the words have been erased from one cursive manuscript.

Over against this entirely negative evidence we must place the following:

(1) No copies now in existence have any other name than that of Ephesus; and all the extant manuscripts, including the Vatican Manuscript, which have any title prefixed to the Epistle, exhibit the words ‘To the Ephesians’.

(2) That all the extant manuscripts, except those just mentioned, have the words ‘at Ephesus’ in verse 1.

(3) That the ancient church universally received this epistle as addressed to the Ephesians” (*Wordsworth*).

Lardner wrote:

“That this epistle was sent to the Church at Ephesus, we are assured by the testimony of all catholic Christians of all past ages. This we can now say with confidence, having examined the principal Christian writers of the first ages, to the beginning of the twelfth century; in all which space of time, there appears not one who had any doubt of it.”

Ignatius, in a letter to the Ephesians, says:

“Ye are the companions in the mystery of the gospel of Paul the sanctified who throughout all his epistle, makes mention of you in Christ.”

This epistle of Ignatius was written in the 10th of Trajan, according to Bishop Pearson, and if so, there are only forty-five years between the writing of Paul and Ignatius.

When we read in Eph. vi. 21, 22, that the Apostle intended sending Tychicus to make known all things to them concerning himself, one wonders to whom Tychicus would have gone, had the letter been unaddressed.

The truth of the matter seems to be that the epistle was originally addressed to Ephesus, but that copies of it were circulated among the churches, and that in some few of these copies a space had been left so that the name might be filled in. The matter is of

no importance from one point of view, but of great importance if the omission of the words “*at Ephesus*” leads to the fantastic interpretation, “The saints which *are*”.

**#2. Saul, who is also called Paul (Eph. i. 1).
pp. 140, 141**

Ephesians is the Epistle of the glorified Christ. In it He is seen raised, ascended, seated. All things are under His feet. He is Head; He is Lord. Yet the words with which the glorious revelation opens refer not to God, nor to Christ, but to the earthen vessel through whom the truth of the mystery was made known. Evidently it is not a matter of indifference who writes the Epistle, and the claims put forward by the Apostle in Eph. iii. make it imperative that we should know something of the instrument through whom such a revelation was made.

Paul (*Paulos*).—The Epistles contain thirty occurrences of the name Paul, one being found in II Pet. iii. 15. It occurs more often in I Corinthians than in any other epistle, largely because of the faction that said “I am of Paul”. When he first appears on the page of Scripture, Paul’s name is Saul, and it is a matter of speculation as to whether,

- (1) Saul was his Hebrew name, and Paul his Gentile name from the first. This view was held by Origen.
- (2) He took the name Paul, when he began to preach. This was the opinion of Augustine.
- (3) Like Peter, he received a new title at his ordination at Antioch. This was the teaching of Chrysostom.
- (4) He received the name of Paul only when the Proconsul of the same name was converted. This was the conclusion reached by Bede.
- (5) The title was meant to commemorate that victory. This was taught by Jerome.

A change of name upon entry into a new phase of life or ministry was familiar both to Jew and Gentile. Abram is changed to Abraham, Simon is changed to Peter, Roman Generals often assumed as a title the name of the country of their triumphs; thus Scipio took the name Africanus, and whether or not Saul possessed the Gentile name Paul from the first, the fact remains that Scripture does not use the name until Sergius Paulus, the proconsul at Paphos, is converted. There for the first time we read, “Saul, who also is called Paul” (Acts xiii. 9).

The adoption of a Gentile name was a common practice among the Jews. In the N.T. we have such Greek names as Philip and Alexander, and such Roman names as Crispus, Justus and Niger. Double names, too, were frequently used. We remember Belteshazzar-Daniel, Esther-Hadasa, and in the N.T. times, Herod-Agrippa and Simon-Peter.

For us, however, the most important point is, not whether Saul was also called Paul from birth, but that there is intentional association of the Apostle with his Roman convert of Paphos (significantly converted while the Jew was blinded), which links him,

originally a Hebrew of the Hebrews and a Pharisee of the Pharisees, with the Gentile, to whose salvation and glory he had been dedicated by the God of all grace.

#3. APOSTOLOS, The Sent One (Eph. i. 1). pp. 179, 180

In this opening sentence of Ephesians Paul refers to himself as an apostle (*apostolos*). The word is derived from the verb *apostello*, “I send”, as in Rom. x. 15: “How shall they preach except they be *sent*?” The title is used of “the twelve” (Matt. x. 2), and after the defection of Judas, the number was made up again by the inclusion of Matthias (Acts i. 26). Paul dissociates himself from “the twelve”, as may be seen from I Cor. xv. 7-9. He was an apostle of new order. “The twelve” were obviously not given when the Lord “ascended on high” (Eph. iv. 9, 10; Matt. x. 2), whereas the apostle of whom Paul was the first, are said to have been given from heaven (Eph. iv. 11).

The two epistles that contain the most emphatic statements by Paul himself as to his full right to the title of “apostle” are Galatians and II Corinthians. The former opens as follows:

“Paul, an apostle *not* of men, *neither* by man, *but* by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, Who raised Him from the dead” (Gal. i. 1).

After this, the two opening chapters are largely taken up with proving the independence of Paul’s apostleship, gospel and authority.

In II Corinthians, the question of Paul’s apostleship occupies a large part of chapters xi. and xii.

“For I reckon that I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles” (II Cor. xi. 5, R.V.).
“In nothing was I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I am nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds” (II Cor. xii. 11, 12).

The word *apostolos* is not much used in classical Greek. It is found in Herodotus as “an envoy”, and later it is used of the commander of a naval force. The fact that the word was almost unused in classical Greek made it the more suitable for the new order of envoys sent out by the Lord.

The word was known among the Jews, for Oecumenius says: “It is even yet a custom among the Jews to call those who carry about circular letters from their rulers, by the name of *apostles*.” The word is also used in John xiii. 16: “The servant is not greater than his lord, neither he who is sent (*apostolos*) greater than he who sent him.”

The word is used once in II Corinthians in its simple etymological sense. “They are the messengers of the churches” (II Cor. viii. 23), and once in Philipians, “Your messenger” (Phil. ii. 25).

The following is a synopsis of M’Lean’s statement as to the essential features characteristic of an apostle:

- (1) An apostle must have seen the Lord (John xv. 27). Paul is no exception—“Last of all He was seen of me also” (I Cor. xv. 8); “Am I not an apostle? Have not I seen the Lord?” (I Cor. ix. 1).
The “seeing of the Just One” was essential (Acts xxii. 14, 15).
- (2) An apostle must have been immediately called and chosen for the office by Christ Himself (Luke vi. 13; Gal. i. 1).
- (3) Infallible inspiration was also essentially necessary to that office (John xvi. 13; Gal. i. 11, 12; I Thess. ii. 13).
- (4) The apostolic commission was attested by “signs” (Heb. ii. 4; II Cor. xii. 12).
- (5) The apostles were not local ministers, but had “the care of all the churches” (II Cor. xi. 28), and power to settle all controversies (Acts xvi. 4), and to exercise discipline (I Cor. v. 3-6; II Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10).

If these things be true, it is obvious that the apostles could have had no “successors”. Their qualifications were supernatural and unique.

Such then was the office of *Paul the Apostle*, an earthen vessel indeed, but filled with heavenly treasure.

The Eternal God is thy Refuge.

(Being a series of studies designed to encourage the believer in times of stress).

#10. “We will make mention of the name of the Lord our God” (Psa. xx. 7). pp. 13, 14

When dealing with the great promise that the Lord will be the “defence” of His people, we quoted more than one passage in which this “defence” and “refuge” was associated with His “Name”. *The Companion Bible* draws attention to three occurrences of the “Name” in Psalm xx., and refers to them as follows:

“The DEFENDING Name” (verse 1).
“The DISPLAYED Name” (verse 5).
“The DELIVERING Name” (verse 7).

These references to the “Name” become more significant if viewed in the light of the custom associated with the Kinsman-Redeemer. A man in trouble called upon the “name” of his kinsman, and ranged himself under his banner for protection. It is this that the Psalmist is thinking of in these references. He first prays in verse 1:

“The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; the name of the God of Jacob defend thee.”

Then, in verse 5, he says:

“We will rejoice in Thy salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up our banners.”
“His banner over me”, said the Shulamite, “was love” (Song of Sol. ii. 4).

So here, “His banner over me”, the Psalmist might have said, “is my protection”.

And, in verse 7, David contrasts the vain help of man with the gracious deliverance of the Lord:

“Some trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God.”

The word *zakar*, “remember”, is also translated “to make mention”, as in Gen. xl. 14: “Make mention of me unto Pharaoh.” The same word occurs in Isa. xii.:

“In that day shall ye say, Praise the Lord, call upon His NAME, declare His doings among the people, *make mention* that His NAME is exalted” (Isa. xii. 4).

In Psalm ix., in connection with the Lord as a Refuge, we read:

“The Lord also will be a *refuge* for the oppressed, a *refuge* in times of trouble. And they that know Thy *Name* will put their trust in Thee: For Thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek Thee” (Psa. ix. 9, 10).

Again, at the close of the Psalm that opens with the words: “If it had not been the Lord Who was on our side” David says: “Our help is in the *Name* of the Lord, Who made heaven and earth” (Psa. cxxiv.).

Let us then remember that “Name which is above every name”, and rejoice to know that

The Eternal God is thy Refuge.

**#11. “Fear not. I am thy *Shield*” (Gen. xv. 1).
pp. 63, 64**

We have considered the several references in the Scriptures to God being a Refuge and a Defence, and we have learned that there is a secret place of the Most High in which we dwell, and a shadow under which we may “tarry for a night”. Associated with this “secret place” is also a Shield, as for example:

“Thou art My hiding place (*sether*, ‘secret place’) and my *shield*: I hope in Thy Word” (Psa. cxix. 114).

To Abram, after the battle with the kings was over, God said: “Fear not Abraham; I am thy *shield*” (Gen. xv. 1). To Israel, the prophet Moses said, in his last blessing: “Happy art thou O Israel; who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, *the shield* of thy help” (Deut. xxxiii. 29). David confessed:

“He is my *shield*” (II Sam. xxii. 8).

“As for God, His way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried: He is a buckler (*shield*) to all them that trust in Him” (II Sam. xxii. 31).

“Thou hast also given me the *shield* of thy salvation and thy gentleness hath made me great” (II Sam. xxii. 36).

In days when trouble increased, when many rose up against David, when many said that there was no help for him in God, when he was suffering the agony of Absalom’s treachery, he could still say: “But Thou, O Lord, art a *shield* for me: my glory, and the lifter up of mine head” (Psa. iii. 3). Again, on another occasion, when David felt that if the Lord should be silent to him he would “become like them that go down into the pit”, he said: “Blessed be the Lord, because He hath heard the voice of my supplications. The Lord is my strength and my *shield*: my heart trusteth in Him, and I am helped” (Psa. xxviii. 6, 7). The longing soul, separated from the fellowship and worship of God’s people and God’s house, cried: “Behold, O God our *shield* the Lord God is a sun and *shield*: the Lord will give grace and glory” (Psa. lxxxiv. 9, 11).

Here is a cluster of precious passages. Each is illuminative of one or more of the many phases of grace. “Shield and exceeding great reward”; “Shield and hiding place”; A shield provided by One whose ways are perfect, whose “condescension” (gentleness) indeed makes great, Who is salvation and Strength as well as Shield, Who protects when men oppose, deny or betray, and who gives both grace and glory.

David’s heart trusted, and the Psalmist added “I hope in Thy Word” (Psa. cxix. 114).

The days in which we live differ in some ways from O.T. times, but they are comparable to those of Habakkuk, when there was no evident intervention, when there was often no apparent answer to prayer, when “the just” indeed must “live by his faith” (Hab. i. 1-4; ii. 1-4). Even so, we still have His “Word”, our hearts can still “trust” in Him, and we rejoice, as no other people on earth can, in His “condescension” which has indeed made us “great”, for such a text is written large across the epistle to the Ephesians.

“O Israel, trust in the Lord: He is their help and their *shield*” (Psa. cxv. 9).

“O house of Aaron, trust in the Lord: He is their help and their *shield*” (Psa. cxv. 10).

“Ye that fear the Lord, trust in the Lord: He is their help and their *shield*” (Psa. cxv. 11).

“Above all, taking the *shield* of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked” (Eph. vi. 16).

“The Eternal God is thy Refuge.”

#12. “The hidden ones” (Psa. lxxxiii. 3). pp. 93, 94

“They have consulted against Thy hidden ones” (Psa. lxxxiii. 3).

“Your life is hid with Christ in God” (Col. iii. 3).

It is clear from these two passages that the title “hidden ones” is appropriate both for Israel and for the Church. To some the idea of “hiding” may suggest cowardice, but just as it is foolhardy to expose oneself to the danger of high explosives unless the demands of humanity justify the risk, so, when facing spiritual wickedness, it is wise and right to remember that the shield, the helmet, and the breastplate are as much a part of the commanded and provided panoply of God as is the Sword of the Spirit. The reader will also remember that in Heb. xi. there are two cases in which “faith” is identified with the act of “hiding”—the hiding of the infant Moses, and the hiding of the spies (Heb. xi. 23, 31; Ex. ii. 2; Josh. ii. 4).

“Hiding” does not necessarily indicate fear. In Psa. xxvii. David says:

“The Lord is my light and my salvation: WHOM SHALL I FEAR?

The Lord is the strength of my life: OF WHOM SHALL I BE AFRAID?” (Psa. xxvii. 1).

And yet, in the fifth verse of this same Psalm, he says:

“In the time of trouble He shall *hide* me in His pavilion; In the secret of His tabernacle shall He *hide* me” (Psa. xxvii. 5).

In Psalm xxxi., which is in some respects parallel with Psalm xxvii., we find David in great trouble. Nets have been spread for him, he was a reproach among his neighbours, and forgotten like a dead man out of mind. Slander and fear and adverse counsel were on every side. In such a predicament he says, in verse 5: “Into Thine hand I commit my spirit; Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth.” And in verse 15: “My times are in Thy hand.” Rejoicing in the goodness of the Lord which he had “laid up” (the same word as “hide”) for them that fear Him, the Psalmist passes on from the thought of the “hidden” *goodness*, to that of the “hidden” *ones*, and so he concludes:

“Thou shalt hide them in the secret of Thy presence from the pride of man: thou **shalt keep them secretly** (“hide”) in a pavilion from the strife of tongues” (Psa. xxxi. 19, 20).

Perhaps some may object that, while David with his great faith and experience could take such a stand, such cannot be expected of the general run of believers. As an answer, the reader should notice verse 22 in which the Psalmist cries: “I said in my haste, I am cut off from Thine eyes.” Yet the Lord heard him and preserved him.

In Psalm cxliii. we read “Deliver me, O Lord, from mine enemies; I flee unto Thee to hide me” (Psa. cxliii. 9). The Margin here reads: “*Heb.* hide me with Thee”, while Dr. W. Kay renders the passage:

“To Thee have I confided (my all)—with the footnote: Lit. Unto Thee have I hidden, i.e., with Thee have I deposited my cause; secretly and silently, suppressing all angry feeling against man.”

Keble’s rendering is similar: “I have hid all with Thee”, while Young’s literal translation reads: “Near Thee I am covered.” It is outside our present scope and purpose to enter into questions of translation. The reader will, however, be able to see something of the implications here even though a full understanding of the passage must await fuller examination.

We have already discussed the question of “fear” in relation to “hiding”. There is one further passage which might well be included under this heading, in Prov. xxii. 3, “A prudent man foreseeth evil, and hideth himself”. This same word, “hide”, is also found in other passages, as follows:

“*Hide* me under the shadow of Thy wings” (Psa. xvii. 8).
“In the secret of His tabernacle shall He *hide* me” (Psa. xxvii. 5).
“*Hide* me from the secret counsel of the wicked” (Psa. lxiv. 2).
“Seek ye the Lord, all ye meek of the earth it may be ye shall be *hid* in the day of the Lord’s anger” (Zeph. ii. 3).

To those who know the secret place of the Most High, whose life is “hid” with Christ in God, whose blessings are associated with a “Mystery” that had been “hid” since the ages, the words of Isa. xxvi. quoted below may well prove to have a message, without, of course, in any sense robbing the passage of its *literal* fulfillment:

“Come, My people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast” (Isa. xxvi. 20).

“Rock of Ages cleft for me,
Let me *hide* myself in Thee.”

“The Eternal God is thy Refuge.”

Fruits of Fundamental Studies.

#23. The intimate association between the senses and the processes of thought. Gen. ii. 7. pp. 14 - 19

If one desires to appear “intellectual”, or to impress others with one’s “spirituality”, there is sometimes a temptation to decry the body. This, however, has no scriptural warrant. The Apostle may bemoan the fact that in his flesh dwelt no good thing, and that he was conscious of a law of sin working in his members, but “the flesh” and “the law of sin” must not be confused with the body itself and its functions. The same epistle (Romans) enjoins the believer to “yield” his members to the service of the Lord, and to “present” his body as a living sacrifice.

In the last article we occupied all our space in endeavouring to give some idea of what is implied in the record of man’s creation from the dust of the ground. In the present article, we propose to look, not at the body itself, but at the body as an organ apart from which the processes of thought would never receive impetus to commence, and if started, would have no material with which to work. The body plays a far more important part in the development of the mind and in the functioning of the will than at first sight appears.

We distinguish mind from matter by its qualities. Matter may be measured, frozen, attracted by gravity, etc., while mind cannot. Nevertheless, though mind and matter are quite distinct, mind needs matter for the materials of its thought processes, and it needs the organized material of the body to set these processes going. Whatever properties and powers the mind may possess, they remain inert until set in motion, as it were, by the sensations experienced by the body through the medium of the senses. Let us, then, seek to understand a little about this ladder, which, while resting upon the solid basis of sensation, rises up until its top is in the clouds. We shall not, of course, attempt in an article of this length to follow the whole process and progress of thought. If we can see something of the first few steps, and establish the connection that must exist between the body with its senses and the thought processes and the will, we shall have accomplished all that is necessary for our present purpose.

The senses are five in number—touch, taste, smell, hearing and sight. The sense of taste is limited to the papillae on the surface of the tongue, and it is, of course, necessary that actual contact should be made with the object tasted. The sense of smell, is confined to the olfactory nerves which have their termination in the nostrils. While the necessity for contact is not so obvious here as in the case of taste, yet contact there must be, for if any substance which has a definite odour be sealed up in a glass case the sense of smell is unaffected. The sense of hearing is dependent upon a pair of organs so placed that the vibrations of the air shall not only register upon the drum and be conveyed by a marvelous mechanism to the brain, but a sense also of direction is included, so that the head is turned until not only is the sound heard, but the direction from which it comes is gauged. The sense of sight is dependent upon another pair of organs which register the

presence of light and its degree of intensity. Light is independent of the atmosphere, for we can see an object in a glass jar, from which all air has been extracted. The sense of touch has no special organ, the nerves that convey this sensation to the brain being distributed all over the surface of the body, with the exception of the hair, the nails, the enamel of the teeth, and the outer skin known as the cuticle.

It is through the sensations associated with these five senses that the inner man becomes acquainted with the facts of creation, and provided with the material upon which thought can be exercised. By the time we have begun to think much about the processes of thought, and the exercise of discernment and judgment, we have traveled so far from our earlier experiences that we are apt to forget the important place that these lowly organs of sense have had in the development of our mental faculties. To make this point clearer, let us go back in imagination to the days of our infancy.

In a very short time a baby begins to learn, either by painful or pleasant experience, that his fingers belong to himself, while the edge of his cot, the cup from which he feeds, and the person who looks after him are external to himself. He has learned, without being conscious of it, the first great lesson, the differentiation that the philosopher refers to as "The Self, and the Not Self". Beginning with this distinction, discernment springs more and more into operation, and by easy stages the infant mind begins to compare, to ponder, to discern differences, to arrive at judgments.

One of the basic subdivisions that the mind makes between the sensations is that of pleasure and pain. One sound will soothe, another irritate; one touch will cause intense pain, another give great pleasure, and with this realization comes the natural desire to seek that which causes pleasure, and avoid that which causes pain. Moral reasons may operate at a later stage to cause the individual to seek pain and avoid pleasure, but not at the beginning.

We have, therefore, a link between the sensations of pleasure and pain, and the emotions of *desire* and *aversion*. From these two emotions spring hope and fear. After a pleasant sensation has been experienced several times a pleasant expectation is set up, while the repetition of a painful sensation would produce the emotion of fear. Now suppose a series of sensations that had ended formerly in pleasure should fail on one occasion to give this pleasure, then a new emotion, a feeling of disappointment or sorrow, would come to birth. Conversely, if a series of sensations that had usually ended in pain should fail to produce this effect, the new emotion produced would be that of joy or surprise. There is no need to pursue this idea further, through the whole gamut of human emotions. We trust that the link between emotion and sensation is sufficiently clear.

Not only are the emotions directly associated with the sensations, but the higher intellectual powers are also dependent in the first instance on these same fundamental aids. Memory, actuated by the law of suggestion, is the power of the mind to recall or revive sensations. If the varying sensations that affect the mind left behind no more trace than does our reflection upon a mirror, memory would be an impossibility—and without memory we could not build. We should be for ever handling bricks and stones, with

neither design to guide us nor desire to achieve. Take, for example, the case of a child hearing a bell. This by itself will not mean very much unless there is something else associated with it. If, however, whenever this bell rings, the child is fed, or taken from his crib, then in time, by the aid of memory, he will begin to associate the two together. He may, of course, go further and draw the erroneous conclusion that the ringing of the bell and the appearance of the food are cause and effect. Such a mistake would be quite understandable in the case of a child, who is not yet able to rise to the higher processes of thought and argument. The basis, however, for such reasoning is being laid. The child begins to expect that after the bell will come the bottle, so that without his knowing it, these sensations are giving rise to some appreciation of the principle that “the mind expects like consequents to follow like antecedents” (*Carlyle*). The mind of the child that can distinguish between pleasure and pain, that can desire the one and fear the other, that can distinguish these differences, and remember them, such a mind already has the fundamentals of all reasoning.

Mere sensation, however, could never of itself convey to the mind the reality of the external world. Sensations might come and go without any realization of the cause. We must ask, therefore, how it is that the mind is able to acquire its knowledge of external objects. The child who, from occupation with its own fingers, discovers by the sense of touch, and the emotions of pleasure and pain, that there is a world external to itself, proceeds to investigate that world. Some things feel soft, others hard; some are hot, while others are cold. Moreover, by using his eyes in conjunction with his hands, he discovers that objects have form and colour, and that they are near and far. In the endeavour to reach some object which is present to sight and yet remote from touch, he moves towards it, and so begins to crawl, and finally walk. This recognition of an outside world we call “perception”, and with the coming of this perception comes also the consciousness of that which is within, namely personal identity. The consciousness of prolonged identity, the knowledge that I am the same person as I was in all my former history, is founded upon the consciousness that my body as an organism is the same as that which I possessed in the past. My sense of personal identity depends on memory, and memory is largely the recalling of sensations previously received.

We come next to the question of the will, and we can well imagine that some of our readers will make a mental protest, and say that there can be no real connection between “the body” and “the will”. Let us look into the matter more closely.

“By the will, we understand the powers of the mind to *choose* or *refuse*” (*Carlyle*).

While we recognize that the will is the power of the mind to choose, we must remember that it is not a mere preference, or desire which we cannot gratify. *It is a power of immediate effective choice.* Let us explain. We lay before the reader the following statement and attempt to justify it.

“Although there may be *desire* where there is no power, there cannot be *will*.”

We know that the sensations of pleasure and pain are entirely beyond the power of the will, and none can love or hate at its bidding. The mind, however, if it possesses a body,

with organs of sense and muscular powers, has something which it can *control*. The eye can be opened and closed at will. The tongue can speak or refrain at will. The muscles, to the extent of their powers, obey the command of the will with precision and without hesitation. My hand can just as readily write words of blasphemy on this sheet of paper, as it is now writing words that attempt to help towards the truth. This is the true dominion of the mind. It can move its own members, and, by moving itself, it can move others. It cannot, however, “will” the movement of other objects in the same way as it can “will” the movements of its own body:

“If the most despotic monarch were deprived of all power of voluntary movement, he would also be deprived of all exercise of the will. He might still fervently *desire* to have some object effected, but he could no longer, even in a figurative sense, will it he can make no sign, and he would soon cease to repeat his impotent attempts to exercise will” (*Carlyle*).

Behind the exercise of will is desire. The will has no power of itself for any mental operation. One cannot by the exercise of the will compel oneself either to believe or to reject evidence. The motive that moves the will is desire.

We must not attempt within our limited compass to pursue these interesting themes further. All that we have endeavour to do is to show the intimate association that exists between the processes of thought (the higher processes we have not touched upon here) and the bodily sensations. For the sake of clearness we set out again below the steps we have covered, leaving the reader to continue the ascent into the higher realms of thought.

Through the medium of the five senses we become aware of the existence of an external world, and of our own personality. Our earliest and most fundamental impressions are those of pleasure and pain, and we are so constituted that we desire that which pleases, and fear and avoid that which causes pain. From these experiences arise hope, disappointment, joy, sorrow, surprise, etc. None of these emotions depends upon the will. The power of the will is the mind’s power to accept or reject, to do or not to do. We cannot by an act of will create a sensation, or turn pain into pleasure. Memory, too—which is fundamentally the memory of things experienced through the senses—plays an important part, for only by the aid of the memory can we attempt to compare, contrast and classify. All this leads up to perception, or the cognition of the material world through sensation. There is, therefore, a real connection between the body formed out of the dust of the earth, and that something more that makes man a living soul. While man shares with the beasts of the field the possession of a body of flesh and blood, he is at the same time the only creature who was created in the image of God, and who possesses rationality and a capacity for worship. Of all these things, however, we must speak at length in subsequent articles.

Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth. (Second Series).

ISAIAH.

#6. Children of Sign and Wonder (vii. 1 - x. 34). pp. 19 - 26

We have now passed in review four out of the seven sections of the first great divisions of Isaiah's prophecy (Isa. i.-xii.), and we must next consider the remaining sections: 5, 6, and 7—Isa. vii.-xii.). Just as we found the first three sections linked together as a structural whole, so we shall find the last three also closely associated by corresponding parts. For the structure of Isa. i.-v., the reader is referred to Volume XXX, page 131. Our present quest is the analysis of chapters vii.-xii. The subject-matter here falls into three sections:

- (1) THE VIRGIN'S SON. IMMANUEL (Isa. vii. 1 - ix. 7).
- (2) THE REMNANT SHALL RETURN (Isa. ix. 8 - x. 34).
- (3) THE ROOT AND OFFSPRING OF DAVID (Isa. xi.-xii.).

For our present purpose, we must pass by a great deal of detail, but we believe the accompanying structures will be of service in drawing attention to the outstanding features of each section.

In the first of these sections (Isa. vii. 1 - ix. 7) we are struck by the recurrence of the children who are said to be given for "signs", and the importance of the typical meaning of their names.

SHEAR-JASHUB.—"The remnant shall return" (Isa. vii. 3).
IMMANUEL.—"God with us" (Isa. vii. 14).
MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ.—"Haste, spoil, speed, prey" (Isa. viii. 1-4).

In addition we have the words of the prophet concerning himself and his children:

"Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts which dwelleth in mount Zion" (Isa. viii. 18).

And then finally, in chapter ix., we have the glorious prophecy that sums up all these signs:

"For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace" (Isa. ix. 6).

Intertwined with these wonderful signs, we have references to the political atmosphere of the times, driving the people through unbelief into confederacies, and so bringing upon them the invasion of the Assyrian, which forms the centre of the book (Isa. xxxvi. - xxxix.).

Isaiah vii. 1 - ix. 7. Immanuel.

- A1 | vii. 1-9. |
 - a | 1, 2. Confederacy. Syria with Ephraim.
 - b | 3. SHEAR-JASHUB. The sign.
 - c | 4-9. Threat of Invasion.
- A2 | vii. 10 - viii. 8. |
 - b | vii. 10. IMMANUEL. The sign.
 - c | vii. 18-25. Threat of Invasion.
 - b | viii. 1-3. MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ. The sign.
 - c | viii. 4-8. Threat of Invasion.
- A3 | viii. 9 - ix. 7. |
 - a | viii. 9-12. Confederacy. Both houses of Israel.
 - c | viii. 13-17. Sanctuary from gin and snare.
 - b | viii. 18. THE CHILDREN given for signs.
 - a | viii. 19-22. Confederacy. Wizards. Dead
 - c | ix. 1-5. Deliverance from oppressor.
 - b | ix. 6, 7. CHILD. SON. Fulfilling all signs.

Isaiah's prophetic method is to take the actual facts of current history and with these facts as a basis, to look down the centuries to the more complete fulfillment both of the woes, and of the blessings. The reference to the war against Jerusalem by the Kings of Syria and Israel with which Isa. vii. opens, is a reference to a fact of history, recorded in II Kings xv. 37 - xvi. 5. No comment which we could make could take the place of this inspired record, and we therefore quote what is written in the Book of Kings so that the background of Isa. vii.-xii. may be appreciated:

“In those days the Lord began to send against Judah, Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah. And Jotham slept with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David his father: and Ahaz his son reigned in his stead. In the seventeenth year of Pekah the son of Remaliah, Ahaz the son of Jotham, king of Judah, began to reign. Twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to reign, and reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem, and did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord his God, like David his father. But he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, yea, and made his son to pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel. And he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree. Then Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem to war: and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him” (II Kings xv. 37 - xvi. 5).

The real menace of this attack is found in the words of Isa. vii. 6: “Let us set a king in the midst.” Immediately following this we read: “Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass” (Isa. vii. 7). “Within threescore and five years” Ephraim was to be “broken” (Isa. vii. 8).

No outside foe could hurt the house of Judah: the real enemy was in their own hearts: “If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established” (Isa. vii. 9).

The Companion Bible calls attention to the figure of *paronomasia* that is used here. The rhyming of the Hebrew words may perhaps be illustrated by some such translation as: “No *confiding* no *abiding*.”

It is in connection with this threat of invasion by Syria and Israel that the first of the “sign” children is introduced.

“Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-Jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller’s field” (Isa. vii. 3).

Shear-Jashub, as we have seen, means “The remnant shall return” and is so translated in Isa. x. 21. The name therefore contained the assurance that, even though the people were to be reduced by siege or invasion, God would remember His covenant with the house of David.

It would appear from Isa. vii. 10 that the Lord was testing the nature and sincerity of the faith of Ahaz, when He said:

“Ask thee a *sign* of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above” (Isa. vii. 11).

Ahaz had no excuse for refusing, except that he had already made up his mind to appeal to Assyria:

“So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son: come up, and save me out of the hand of the King of Syria, and out of the hand of the King of Israel, which rise up against me” (II Kings xvi. 7).

The refusal of Ahaz has the appearance of humility (“Neither will I tempt the Lord”) but it was, in fact, a cloak for his apostasy.

We come now to the first great prophetic type of the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Therefore the Lord Himself shall give you a *sign*; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” (Isa. vii. 14).

This sign had a twofold fulfillment—the first, in the lifetime of Ahaz himself, and the second, at the birth of Christ. The word for “virgin” here needs a word of explanation. The word used by Isaiah is *ha-almah*, which means a “damsel”, but not necessarily a “virgin” in the fullest sense of the word. The word used in Matt. i. 23, on the other hand, is *parthenos*, and means a “virgin” in the strictest sense.

The political bearing of the name Immanuel (“God with us”) is found in Isa. viii. 10:

“Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought: speak the word, and it shall not stand: FOR GOD IS WITH US.”

The “sign” of Isa. vii. 14 was indeed “in the depth” and “in the height”, as verse 11 puts it, for what could be deeper than the Saviour’s condescension when He laid aside

His glory to take upon Himself the form and fashion of a man, and become the virgin's son?

The bearing of this verse upon the great subject of the deity of Christ is too vast a theme to be touched upon in a paragraph, but the reader will find the subject dealt with in our published writings, to which reference should be made for fuller exposition. The curious reference to "butter and honey" constitute part of an infant's diet. Some translators render the connective "that" in verse 15 as "before" or "up to the time of". It would seem, however, that the A.V. is probably correct here.

"The received version is the most simple and agrees best with the real scope this child, unlike other infants, from the first dawn of reason, will know to refuse evil and to choose the good. The phrase, like the fact, is unique, and never used in Scripture of any other child. Three wonders would meet in Him Whose name is "Wonderful"—a miraculous birth, a Divine nature, and sinless choice of the good alone" (*Birks Commentary on Isaiah*).

The remaining verses of Isa. vii. (18-25) are at first sight rather difficult. They must be understood as indicating the change over a country when, owing to the depopulation consequent upon invasion, agriculture ceases, and the normal crops give place to jungle, and patches of scant pasturage. The necessity for arming with bows and arrows in a land which once produced crops and supported flocks and herds is indicative of the degeneration that had occurred. The desolation thus produced fulfilled the prophecy of Isa. vi. and extended to the very days of the Messiah. Before, however, we reach these times, we have a further reference to the days of Ahaz.

Isaiah is told by the Lord to take a great roll, or better, a great tablet, and write on it with the carving tool of man, "For Maher-shalal-hash-baz". The warning indicated by the meaning this strange name is clear: "Hasting to spoil, he speeds to the prey." This prophecy was attested by Uriah the priest and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, and within twenty-one months (i.e. nine months before his birth, and twelve months after) Damascus had fallen, in the third year of Ahaz. This period (II Kings xvi. 9) has been called "The Gordian Knot of Chronology". We cannot, however, go into this question in the present article.

The further threat of invasion (*see* structure) is followed once more by a reference to the children who were given as signs:

"Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs" (Isa. viii. 18).

A deeper and even more serious "confederacy" is now indicated. It was a sad departure for the children of Israel to seek an alliance with Syria, and for Judah to seek the help of Assyria, but the prophet now visualizes an apostasy that is in league with hell itself. The conflict of the ages is brought before us in the choice of refuge to which Israel descended in time of danger.

"And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of

the living should they seek unto the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, there shall be no morning unto them” (Isa. viii. 19, 20).

Light, however, dawns “in Galilee of the nations”, and in Isa. ix. 2 we read, “Upon them hath the light shined”—a promise that was fulfilled in Matt. iv. 14-16.

In Isa. ix. 3, Dr. Ginsburg suggests that one of the Hebrew word has been wrongly divided, and that, instead of being *lo*, “not”, it should form part of the preceding word and read *haggilo*. The translation would then be:

“Thou hast multiplied the exultation, Thou hast increased the joy; They joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest, As men exult as they divide the spoil.”

Deliverance instead of invasion is now the theme. The rejoicing is associated with “spoil” and with the thought of the “harvest”, and so refers to the last days of prophetic vision.

In verse 5, Young’s literal translation reads as follows:

“For every battle of a warrior is with rushing, and raiment rolled in blood, and it hath been for burning—fuel for fire” (Isa. ix. 5).

Here we have, not only the overthrow of Sennacherib, but an anticipation of the day ushered in by the Prince of Peace, as spoken of by the Psalmist:

“Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations He hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder: *He burneth the chariot in the fire*” (Psa. xlvi. 8, 9).

Then, in verses 6 and 7, comes the glorious prophecy of the true Immanuel, the One Who gathers up into Himself all the signs and prophecies that have gone before:

“For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this” (Isa. ix. 6, 7).

In Isa. x. 21 we read:

“The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the MIGHTY GOD.”

This is balanced in verse 20 by the statement:

“The remnant of Israel shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth.”

Who is this “mighty God”, the “Holy One of Israel”? He is Immanuel (“God with us”), the virgin’s Son, the Child Whose name is “wonderful”. There are those who would attempt to anatomize the glorious Person of the Son, but there is no justification in

Scripture for such a course. The N.T. affirms that “Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh”. So here in Isa. ix. How the “Child” or the “Son” can be at the same time “the mighty God” the prophet makes no attempt to explain. He does, however, preface the glorious title with the word “wonderful”, and worship rather than analysis would seem to be our true attitude.

We must beware of confusion when we read the title “The everlasting Father”. The word translated “everlasting” is the Hebrew *ad*, and the LXX translates the passage: *Pater tou mellontos aionios*, “Father of the age about to be”. These words describe the Lord’s office. The “age about to be”, the age that was beyond the purview of the O.T. prophet, was entirely in His care. The words of Luke i. 32, 33 are relevant here:

“And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end.”

The next section (Isa. ix. 8 - x. 34), is devoted to the Assyrian invasion, a dark cloud lightened by the promise, “The remnant shall return”. We will leave the examination of this section to the reader, and pass on, in our next article, to chapters xi. and xii.

ISAIAH.

#7. The Rest that shall be Glory (xi. and xii.). pp. 51 - 56

We now come to the closing sub-section of Isaiah’s great opening prophecy (Isa. i.-xii) which is found in chapters xi. and xii. In the earlier section (vii. 1 - ix. 7) the theme was the Virgin’s Son, Immanuel, and the Child Whose name is Wonderful. In chapters xi. and xii. the subject is this same glorious person, with a further explanation of His government, and its association with the house of David. The section naturally falls into two parts:

- (1) ISAIAH XI. THE ASSURANCE OF DELIVERANCE.
THE BRANCH AND ROOT OF JESSE.
- (2) ISAIAH XII. THE SONG OF SALVATION.
THE LORD JEHOVAH.

It will be seen that the structural outline of chapter xi., which is given below, revolves around the two titles of the Deliverer—“The Branch” and “The Root”, the intervening and following verses revealing the character and extent of His dominion.

Isaiah xi.

- A | 1. THE BRANCH OF JESSE.
B | 2-5. | a | 2, 3. Spirit. *Ruach*.
 b | 4. Judge the poor and meek.
 a | 5. Breath. *Ruach*.
 b | 5. Slay the wicked.
C | 6-8. | c | 6. Animal creation; loses enmity.
 d | 6. Little child shall lead them.
 c | 7. Animal creation; changes in constitution.
 d | 8. Sucking child and weaned child fearless.
D | 9. | e | They shall not hurt nor destroy.
 f | The Sea.
- A | 10. THE ROOT OF JESSE.
B | 10-12. | a | 10. Ensign. *Nes*.
 b | 11. Recover the remnant.
 a | 12. Ensign. *Nes*.
 b | 12. Gather the dispersed.
C | 13, 14. | c | 13. Enmity of Ephraim and Judah removed.
 d | 14. Submission of former enemies.
D | 15, 16. | e | 15. The Lord shall utterly destroy.
 f | 15, 16. The Sea.

The opening words of Isa. xi. seem to be set in contrast with the closing words of chapter x., in which the Assyrian is likened to a “bough” that is “lopped with terror”, the “thickets of the forest” that are “cut down with iron”, and “Lebanon” that “shall fall by a mighty one”. The word “rod” in Isa. xi. 1 (“the rod out of the stem of Jesse”) does not seem a very suitable translation in view of the fact that the same word is used of the Assyrian in Isa. x. 5 and 15. The two Hebrew originals are entirely different. In chapter x. it is *matteh*, while in chapter xi. it is *choter*, meaning a “twig” or “shoot”. No etymologist would, of course, teach that *choter* has any real connection with *chittah*, the Hebrew word for “wheat”; nevertheless the resemblance is marked in the original and is suggestive. The word *geza*, meaning “stem” or “stock”, which is used of Jesse, the father of David (Isa. xi. 1), is an apt word, as a reference to Job xiv. will show:

“For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease. Though the root (*sheresh*, the same word as in Isa. xi. 1) thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock (*geza*, the same word as ‘stem’ in Isa. xi. 1) die in the ground; yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant” (Job xiv. 7-9).

Coming back to Isa. xi., we find next the enduement of the Messiah set forth, and the spirit of the Lord is said to “rest” upon Him. The word “rest” is *nuach*, while “spirit” is *ruach*. The paronomasia here is intentional. Perhaps, also, there is a reference back to Isa. vii. 2 where “is confederate” is the translation of this same word *nuach*, the people being represented as “resting” on a false hope.

This spiritual enduement of the Messiah is sevenfold:

		(2) WISDOM.
		(3) UNDERSTANDING.
(1) THE SPIRIT		(4) COUNSEL.
OF THE		(5) MIGHT.
LORD.		(6) KNOWLEDGE.
		(7) FEAR.

In verse 3 we learn that this spiritual equipment is to make the coming Ruler “of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord”. The Margin tells us that the word translated “quick understanding” is the Hebrew for “scent” or “smell”. Actually it is the verbal form of *ruach*, meaning “spirit” (Isa. xi. 2) or “breath” (Isa. xi. 4). It is translated “to smell” eight times in the A.V., together with three further occurrences in the marginal notes. “He shall be of *quick scent* in the fear of the Lord” is a vivid figure, and indicates very strikingly the acuteness of the Messiah’s recognition of the Father’s will.

As one reads of the manner in which the Messiah will “judge the poor” and “reprove with equity for the meek of the earth” one is reminded of David’s great kingdom Psalm, where over and over again he speaks of the judgment of the poor and needy. It is interesting also to note that it is in this Psalm and in no other that David speaks of himself as “the Son of Jesse” (Psa. lxxii. 20).

“And He shall *smite* the earth with the *rod* of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked” (Isa. xi. 4).

Some codices of the Hebrew Bible read here *ariz*, meaning “oppressor”, instead of *erez*, “earth”. This reading is confirmed by a parallel reference in the N.T. and by comparison with Isa. x.:

“O My people that dwellest in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian: he shall *smite* thee with a *rod*, and shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt” (Isa. x. 24).

The N.T. parallel is found in II Thess. ii., where the antitype of the Assyrian is himself smitten in the day of the Lord’s coming:

“And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming” (II Thess. ii. 8).

The references in Isa. xi. 6 to the wolf and the lamb, the leopard and the kid, look forward to this same blessed day when the enmity brought in by sin shall be removed, and the groan of creation shall be hushed. Some have raised scientific objections to the literal interpretation of the following verse (Isa. xi. 7) on the grounds that the lion is a carnivorous animal, and therefore fashioned and constituted, both in tooth and maw, so as to be able to live on flesh. We do not deny this. If it were natural for a lion to eat straw like an ox, there would be no point in the prophecy. He Who can change the hearts of men and turn them from darkness to light, can as surely change the nature of the animal world so that all types of evil shall pass away.

“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).

These words are repeated in Isa. lxxv. 25, and the context of this second reference helps our understanding of the first. It should be observed that the promise in the first place is not universal, but is limited to “all My holy mountain”. So, in Isa. lxxv., the new creation is limited at first to Jerusalem (Isa. lxxv. 17, 18), and the nations that go up to Jerusalem to learn of the law of the Lord (Isa. ii. 3-5) see with their own eyes what full surrender to the Lord’s will means and to what it leads.

The words: “The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea” (Isa. xi. 9) are liable to be misunderstood. “The waters” here are those living waters that shall flow out from Jerusalem, “half of them to the former or eastern sea (that is ‘the Dead Sea’), and half of them toward the hinder sea” (Zech. xiv. 8). These living waters are described at length in Ezek. xlvi., and the reference to Engedi (Ezek. xlvi. 10) shows that the Dead Sea is intended. Wherever this water comes it brings “healing”, and so, as we look back to Isa. vi. 10, we realize that at last Israel shall perceive and understand, and be healed indeed. What a beautiful figure of blessing this verse reveals:

“The earth shall be full of life-giving knowledge of the Lord, as the living water shall flow down and completely cover the Dead Sea.”

The Branch and Root of Jesse is to be, in that day, “an ensign of the people” and “an ensign of the nations” (Isa. xi. 10, 12). Out of the twenty occurrences of *nes*, the Hebrew word translated “ensign”, ten are found in Isaiah. The first is in Isa. v. 26:

“And He will lift up an *ensign* to the nations from far, and will hiss unto them whose arrows are sharp” (Isa. v. 26, 28).

Here we have a “banner” or “ensign” lifted up for judgment. In Isa. xi., on the other hand, it is lifted up for blessing. The next reference, in Isa. xiii. 2, is again a message of judgment, this time judgment upon Babylon.

Passing over several intervening references, we come to Isa. xlix.:

“Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up Mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up My *standard* to the people; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders” (Isa. xlix. 22).

The last reference is in Isa. lxxii., where Israel’s blessed restoration is in full view:

“Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones, lift up a *standard* for the people thy salvation cometh A city not forsaken” (Isa. lxxii. 10-12).

The “Gentiles”, as well as “the outcasts of Israel”, are all, in that day, to be gathered to this Ensign. It is to this that the Apostle refers in Rom. xv. 12, where the hope of the church during the Acts is seen to be the realization of the prophecy of Isa. xi.

Ephraim in Isa. xi. 13 stands for the whole ten tribes of Israel, but we must not forget that Ephraim itself was also engaged in strife within the kingdom of Israel as well.

“Syria is confederate with Ephraim” (Isa. vii. 2).

“The head of Ephraim is Samaria” (Isa. vii. 9).

“The drunkards of Ephraim shall be trodden under feet” (Isa. xxviii. 3).

The reunion of the tribes is set forth in symbol in Ezek. xxxvii., and Ephraim is there used to represent the whole ten tribes (verse 16).

The tongue of the Egyptian sea that is to be utterly destroyed (Isa. xi. 15) refers to “that arm of the gulf of Suez which was parted in the Exodus” (*Birks*). This is to disappear when the movements that are to shake the earth take place. The “river” is the river Euphrates—the word used for the Nile is *Yeor* (Isa. vii. 18); *Nahar* refers to the Euphrates (Gen. xv. 18). In that day men shall go over dryshod into the land of promise, even as Israel did “in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt” (Isa. xi. 16).

We now come to the concluding section—Isa. xii., a chapter that might well be entitled “The Song of Salvation”. Anger is turned away and Israel is comforted. God is their salvation, and the Lord Jehovah their strength and song. The passage ends on the exultant note:

“Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion: for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee” (Isa. xii. 6).

with which we may compare the concluding words of Ezekiel:

“And the name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there” (Ezek. xlvi. 35).

So concludes the first glorious section of this wonderful prophecy. We have much land to be possessed before we can call Isaiah our own, but we trust the reader’s interest has been quickened, and that his hope and faith will be encouraged as we go on to learn more of the wonderful ways of God.

ISAIAH.

#8. Burdens and Blessings (xiii. - xxvii.). With Particular Reference to The Burden of Babylon (xiii., xiv.). pp. 81 - 86

The second large section of Isaiah's prophecy extends from chapter xiii. to xxvii. and is largely occupied with "burdens" concerning the nations that come into touch with Israel and their relation to the glorious kingdom that is to be set up at the advent of the King. The nations that are the subject of this series of prophecies are Babylon, Palestine, Moab, Damascus, the land beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, Egypt, The Desert of the Sea, Dumah, Arabia, The Valley of Vision (possibly Jerusalem) and finally Tyre.

It is not our intention to examine in detail these fifteen chapters, with their intricate references to history past and future, but to concentrate attention upon the "Burden of Babylon", for with the fall of Babylon the conflict ceases and the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

The structure of Isa. xiii. 1 - xiv. 30 is as follows:--

ISAIAH xiii. - xiv. 30. BABYLON AND PHILISTIA.

- A1 | xiii. 1-5. Babylon. Destroy the whole land.
- B1 | xiii. 6-18. | a | 6. The Day of the Lord. Destruction.
 - b | 7, 8. Faint, melt, pangs, sorrows.
 - a | 9-14. The Day of the Lord. Destroy.
 - b | 15-18. Dashed, vanished, no pity, not spare.
- C1 | xiii. 19. Babylon, as Sodom and Gomorrah.
- D1 | xiii. 20-22. Owls shall be there, satyrs, dragons.
- A2 | xiv. 1-3. Israel. Set in their land.
- B2 | xiv. 4-20. | a | 4-8. The oppressor ceased.
 - b | 9-11. Pomp brought down to the grave.
 - a | 12-15. Subduer of nations cut down.
 - b | 16-20. Cast out of thy grave.
- C2 | xiv. 21, 22. Babylon, name cut off.
- D2 | xiv. 23. Possession for the bittern.
- A3 | xiv. 24, 25. Assyrian. Broken in My land.
- B3 | xiv. 25. Yoke and burden removed.
- C3 | xiv. 26, 27. The purpose.
- D3 | xiv. 28-30. Serpents, cockatrice, fiery flying serpent.

Before Immanuel, the root of Jesse, is lifted up as an ensign for the blessing of the peoples, another ensign is lifted up to bring the peoples with their armies "to destroy the whole land" (Isa. xiii. 2-5).

The “sanctified ones” of verse 3 need not refer to saints, but to any set apart for a particular work. The immediate reference may have been to the Medes and Persians that conquered Babylon, but the fact that the prophecy immediately runs on to the day of the Lord, shows that the full significance of this passage is future. “The sanctified” and the “mighty ones” may refer to the angelic powers that will be marshaled against Babylon at the time of the end.

“The Day of the Lord is at hand” (Isa. xiii. 6).

The term “The day of the Lord” occurs first of all in chapter ii. 12 when the Lord alone shall be exalted (verses 11 and 17). There are twenty such occurrences, sixteen of them simply reading **Yom Jehovah**, “Day of Jehovah”, and four **Yom I’Jehovah**, “Day for Jehovah”. In the New Testament it occurs four times, making a total of twenty-four, all divided in fours or multiples of four. At some time or another we ought to set out these references, and so we will make sure that the reader is acquainted with them and their contexts by setting them out here and now.

“The Day of the Lord.”

(1) YOM JEHOVAH.—A DAY OF THE LORD.

“Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty” (Isa. xiii. 6).

“Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger stars sun moon shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove” (Isa. xiii. 9-13).

“Ye have not gone up into the gaps, neither made up the hedge for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord” (Ezek. xiii. 5).

“Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty it shall come” (Joel i. 15).

“For the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A day of darkness” (Joel ii. 1, 2).

“For the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?” (Joel ii. 11).

“The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come” (Joel ii. 31).

“For the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining heavens and the earth shall shake” (Joel iii. 14-16).

“Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion bear serpent Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness and not light” (Amos v. 18-20).

“For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen: as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy reward shall return upon thine own head” (Obadiah 15).

“Hold thy peace at the presence of the Lord God: for the day of the Lord is at hand: for the Lord hath prepared a sacrifice, He hath bid His guests” (Zeph. i. 7).

“The great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord: the mighty man shall cry there bitterly” (Zeph. i. 14).

“Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord” (mal. iv. 5).

(2) YOM L'JEHOVAH.—A DAY FOR, OR KNOWN TO, THE LORD.

“For the day of the Lord of Hosts shall be upon every one that is proud the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day” (Isa. ii. 12-17).

“For the day is near, even the day of the Lord is near, a cloudy day: it shall be the time of the heathen” (Ezek. xxx. 3).

“Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee” (Zech. xiv. 1).

“It shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not day, nor night” (Zech. xiv. 7).

(3) HE HEMERO KURIOU.—THE DAY OF (THE) LORD.

“For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night” (I Thess. v. 2).

“That ye be not soon shaken in mind as that the day of the Lord is at hand” (II Thess. ii. 2, R.V.).

“But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in the which the heavens shall pass away” (II Pet. iii. 10).

(4) HE KURIAKE HEMERA.—THE LORD'S DAY.

“I was in the spirit in the Lord's day” (Rev. i. 10).

To appreciate fully the meaning of that prophetic period entitled “The day of the Lord”, every one of these references must be duly considered together with their context, and when the whole is brought to bear upon the last prophecy concerning it, namely, the book of the Revelation, it will be seen that both the first occurrence (Isa. xiii. 6), and the last (Rev. i. 10), focus attention upon the character and the fall of Babylon. A very small remnant prevented the overthrow of Israel being like that of Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa. i. 9), but no remnant is found in Babylon.

“And Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah” (Isa. xiii. 19).

The plea of Abraham, that if only ten righteous were found in Sodom, it would be spared (Gen. xviii. 32) comes to mind, and also the “tenth” of Isa. vi. 13 which, as the remnant, saved Israel from utter destruction.

Before the “proverb” is taken up against the King of Babylon (Isa. xiv. 4), a small section is devoted to the restoration of Israel (Isa. xiv. 1-3). In the space of these three verses is compressed a great amount of prophetic truth.

“The Lord will have mercy on Jacob.”—In this simple statement we have the germ of Hosea i. and ii., where a child is named Lo-ruhamah—“not having obtained mercy”, which sign is finally cancelled in Hosea ii. 23: “I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy.” The dispensational section of Romans, namely, chapters ix.-xi. bases its teaching, concerning the remnant and the nations, upon this theme of “mercy” (Rom. ix. 15, 16, 18; xi. 30, 31, 32).

“And will yet choose Israel.”—The opening chapters of the prophet Zechariah expound this promise.

“Cry, yet, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; My cities through prosperity shall yet be spread abroad; and the Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem” (Zech. i. 17).

“And the Lord shall inherit Judah His portion in the holy land, and shall choose Jerusalem again” (Zech. ii. 12).

“The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?” (Zech. iii. 2).

So we may supplement every clause. Israel are to be set in their *own land*; this makes void all propositions to settle Israel in any land other than that given to Abraham. Strangers are to join with them in that day, yea, they shall even bring them to their place, and the house of Israel, so long the outcast among the nations, shall “possess them in the land of the Lord for servants”. Those who had been held captive by others shall in that day “rule over their oppressors”. In that day the Lord shall give Israel “rest”. The glimpse of the glorious future which Isaiah gives in these three verses, is comparable with the lifting of the veil in Isa. ii. 2-5 and iv. 2-6. It is as though the glorious purpose toward which the Lord moves cannot be entirely hidden even in a day of ruin and judgment.

From verse 4 to 23 of Isa. xiv. we have a “proverb” or a “parable” against the King of Babylon, but we must observe that it is not Isaiah himself who “takes up this parable”, but the restored Israel of verses 1-3. This is made evident by the initial word “that” of verse 4:

“And it shall come to pass in the day that the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve, *that* thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased!” (Isa. xiv. 3, 4).

This is comparable with the connection between Isa. xi. and xii. where we have the song which Israel will sing in that day. Like the lamentation which is taken up against the king of Tyre in Ezek. xxviii., we shall find in this parable a double reference. There will be a reference to the fall of the actual king of Babylon, who will also be a foreshadowing of the great oppressor and usurper, Satan himself:

“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High” (Isa. xiv. 12-14).

The expression, “the sides of the north”, is not so much explanation as revelation. Satan knew where God held His court, for Job i. 6, 7 tells us of his access. The word “sides” means “recesses” or “remote regions”. Seeing that Satan had aspired to a throne above the stars of God, the remote recesses of the north must refer to that region of the sky which is associated with the Pole Star. In solemn contrast with this blasphemous thought is the doom that is expressed in the very next verse: “Yet thou shalt be brought

down to Sheol, to the sides (remote recesses) of the pit” (Isa. xiv. 15). “How art thou fallen”, indeed, “O Lucifer, son of the morning!” The solemn “never more” of Isa. xiv. 20 finds an echo in Ezek. xxviii. 19, “never shalt thou be any more”; also in the doom of Babylon itself, where in Rev. xviii. 21-23 the words “no more at all” ring out like a knell.

Into the “burdens” of Palestine, Moab, Damascus, etc., that occupy the remainder of this section, we do not propose to enter. These scriptures are inspired and profitable, but our particular quest is to discover from all scripture the “Fundamentals of Dispensational Truth”. The remaining sections of Isaiah are such abundant material, we must pass on, and in our next article examine the third great section, namely, Isa. xxviii. - xxxv., “Woes and Glories”.

ISAIAH.

#9. Woes and Glories (xxviii. - xxxv.). Ephraim (xxviii.). pp. 117 - 121

Woe: the crown of pride and the covenant with death.

Glory: the crown of glory and the sure foundation.

We have now examined, with what care our time and space have permitted, the first two sections of the prophecy of Isaiah:

- (1) THE REMNANT SHALL RETURN (i. - xii.).
- (2) BURDENS AND BLESSINGS (xiii. - xxvii.).

We now come to the third great section:

- (3) WOES AND GLORIES (xxviii. - xxxv.).

In this section Israel is prominent, and the nations are represented mainly by the great oppressor Assyria. As we read the opening chapter (xxviii.) our first impression is a somewhat confused one. We read of a crown of pride, strong drink, overflowing waters, precept upon precept, stammering lips, a covenant with death and hell, a bed too short, the ploughing of land, and the cultivation of corn. What can it all mean? What connecting thread links these dissimilar themes into coherence?

If we forget for the moment the wealth of imagery, and take once more the larger view, we are immediately reminded that the pivot of the whole prophecy of Isaiah is the Assyrian invasion, which occupies the central section (Isa. xxxvi. - xxxix.). This section opens with a plain fact of history:

“Now it came to pass in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah that Sennacherib, King of Assyria, came up against all the defenced cities of Judah, and took them” (Isa. xxxvi. 1).

We also read that Rabshakeh, the Assyrian envoy, suggested that Hezekiah should “make an agreement” with the king of Assyria (Isa. xxxvi. 16). Now Isaiah’s prophecy, while it refers to the kingdom of Israel (Ephraim, Samaria, etc.) is specifically stated to be “concerning Judah and Jerusalem” (Isa. i. 1), and consequently it may very well be that the flowery language of Isa. xxviii. may represent certain specific facts of history expressed in prophetic form.

Ephraim (Isa. xxviii. 1) refers to the kingdom which had its seat in Samaria. In II Kings xviii. we read concerning Samaria:

“In the fourth year of King Hezekiah (i.e., ten years before the invasion of Sennacherib, see above) the king of Assyria came up against Samaria and besieged it, and at the end of three years they took it” (II Kings xviii. 9, 10).

This again is a plain fact of history, the only moral being the added statement of verse 12:

“Because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord their God, but transgressed His covenant, and all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded, and would not hear them nor do them.”

This comment underlies the prophecy of Isa. xxviii.:

“Yet they would not hear” (Isa. xxviii. 12).

“We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement” (Isa. xxviii. 15).

Beneath the imagery of Isa. xxviii. 1-4 we find presented the physical glory of the land of Samaria, the moral corruption of its people, and the advent of the king of Assyria.

“It would be difficult to find in all Palestine, a situation of equal strength, fertility and beauty combined” (*Dr. Robinson*).

Twice the prophet refers to the “glorious beauty” and the “fat valley” of Ephraim, but he also speaks of their crown of pride becoming a fading flower. Under the figure of the hasty or early summer fruit, he represents the taking of Samaria by the hand of the Assyrian (Isa. xxviii. 4). Drunkenness, wine, strong drink, bring their corresponding dullness, pride, recklessness and judgment. The people are said to have been “swallowed up of wine” (Isa. xxviii. 7), and in verse 4 we read that they shall be “swallowed up” (Isa. xxviii. 4 margin) by the avenging Assyrian. The reader will doubtless remember the gracious use of this strange figure in Isa. xxv. 7, 8, where “the vail” and “death” are swallowed up in victory.

The prophet uses the figure of a “crown” four times. Twice he speaks of the “crown of pride” (Isa. xxviii. 1, 3) and twice of the “crown of glory” (Isa. xxviii. 5 and lxii. 3). Reference to a “crown of glory” in a setting of judgment is characteristic of Isaiah

(ii. 1-4; iv. 2-6), where we frequently have glimpses of coming glory interposed between chapters of denunciation and woe.

We must now present the structure of this chapter, a structure that has cost us much time and thought. The material is so rich and the theme so interwoven with imagery, that we must be content to give the barest outline, leaving the interested reader to fill in the detail.

Isaiah xxviii. Ephraim: Woes and Glories.

- A | CROWNS (1-8). |
 - a | Crown of pride. Drunkards of Ephraim.
 - b | Overflowing flood.
 - a | Crown of pride. Drunkards of Ephraim.
 - b | Trodden under foot.
 - al | Crown of glory. Wine and strong drink.
- B | TEACHING (9-13). |
 - d | Whom shall He teach?
 - e | Precept upon precept.
 - f | Stammering lips in judgment.
 - d | To whom He said.
 - e | Precept upon precept.
 - f | Snared as a judgment.
- A | COVENANTS (14-19). |
 - a | Death and hell.
 - b | Overflowing, refuge of lies.
 - c | Line and plummet.
 - b | Overflowing, refuge of lies.
 - a | Death and hell.
 - bl | Overflowing, trodden down.
- B | TEACHING (20-29). |
 - d | Parable of the short bed.
 - e | Strange work, strange act.
 - f | The Lord of Hosts.
 - d | Parable of corn cultivation.
 - f | The Lord of Hosts.
 - e | Wonderful, excellent.

Leaving for the moment the section that foretells the destruction of Samaria, let us look at the section that reveals the cause of this great judgment. We are already prepared by the comment in II Kings xviii. 12 to find that the root cause is disobedience to the word of the Lord.

How are we to understand the references in Isa. xxviii. 9-13 to teaching? Are we to take the repeated statement “precept upon precept” as indicative of the approved method of instruction? or are these the words of “scornful men” and “mockers” (Isa. xxviii. 14, 22)? Bishop Lowth’s comment seems to supply the best interpretation that we know, and we give it in his own words:

“What, say they, doth he treat us as mere infants just weaned? Doth he teach us like little children, perpetually inculcating the same elementary lessons, the mere rudiments of knowledge; precept after precept, line after line? imitating at the same time, and ridiculing in verse 10, the concise prophetic manner. God by His prophet retorts upon them with great severity their own contemptuous mockery. Yes, saith He, it shall be, in fact, as you say: ye shall be taught by a strange tongue, and a stammering lip, in a strange country; ye shall be carried into captivity by a people whose language is unintelligible to you, and which ye shall be forced to learn like children” (*Bishop Lowth*).

“We must conceive the abrupt, intentionally short, reiterated and almost childish words of verse 10 as spoken in mimicry, with a mocking motion of the head, and in childish, stammering, taunting tone” (*Ewald*).

The Hebrew reads:

ZAV LAZAV, ZAV, LAZAV
KAV LA KAV, KAV LA KAV
ZE ER SHAM, ZE ER SHAM.

Or, as the *Companion Bible* puts it: “Law upon law, *Saw upon saw.”

(NOTE: * - “Saw”, allied with “saga”, a sententious saying, “a wise saw”).

The word “stammering” here does not refer to a defect in the power of speech, as “stuttering”, but rather to the scorn with which the Jew looked upon the “jabbering” of other tongues. *Laag* is translated “scorn”, “derision”, “mock”; and the Margin of Isa. xxxiii. 19 gives the rendering “ridiculous”.

It would take us too far afield to speak here of the spiritual gifts which were poured out upon the church during the Acts, but the fact that Paul cites this very passage in I Cor. xiv. 21, shows that the Gentiles received these gifts “to provoke Israel to jealousy”. This view we have always maintained in our exposition of the gifts in the church and will be found in the articles concerned. The only point we make here is that the thought of mockery and derision is incipient in the reference, and that judgment is imminent, both in Isa. xxxiii. and in I Cor. xii. - xiv.

Israel had refused the “rest and refreshing” which the Lord had offered:

“To whom He said, This is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest; and this is the refreshing: *yet they would not hear*” (Isa. xxviii. 12).

“How often”, said the Saviour, “would I have gathered your children *and ye would not*” (Matt. xxiii. 37).

The same charge is repeated in Isa. xxx. where, instead of the covenant with death and hell, we find the people “trusting in the shadow of Egypt”:

“That strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt! For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose: therefore have I cried concerning this, Their strength is to sit still In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength: *and ye would not*” (Isa. xxx. 2, 7, 15).

God's people had made for themselves, "a refuge of lies" (Isa. xxviii. 15), but it would be of no avail.

In contrast with the false security that Israel had achieved by entering into an agreement with heathen nations, we read in Isa. xxviii. 16:

"Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste."

This passage is quoted by Paul in Rom. ix. 33 when dealing with the parallel failure of Israel and the advent of the Messiah.

When Cromwell was encamped at Musselburgh in 1650, he sent a letter to the opposing party, in which the following passage occurs:

"I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken There may be, as well, a carnal confidence upon misunderstood and misapplied precepts, which may be called spiritual drunkenness. There may be a *covenant** made with death and hell I pray you read the twenty-eighth of Isaiah from the fifth to the fifteenth verse."

(NOTE: * - A pointed reference which the Covenanters would be quick to see.).

It is interesting to find that this chapter in Isaiah has played its part in our own national history; whether rightly or wrongly we do not here attempt to decide.

The remainder of the chapter is taken up with the parable of the bed too short for the sleeper, an allegory referring to the false security that any alliance with Sennacherib would achieve, and the parable of the husbandman, who does not plough for ever but follows the ploughing with sowing. There is a definite purpose in the process of ploughing, harrowing, threshing and grinding. Judgment with its accompanying misery is God's "strange act" (Isa. xxviii. 21), but He permits the judgment to fall, so that He may at length restore and bless.

"Is corn crushed (i.e. reduced to powder)? Nay, He will not for ever be threshing it, nor break it This also cometh from the Lord of hosts (i.e. the same may be expected of Him in His treatment of His people), Which is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working" (Isa. xxviii. 28, 29).

"For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth" (Amos ix. 9).

We have now considered briefly the alternation of woes and blessings so far as Samaria is concerned. In the next chapter the prophet's attention is directed to Jerusalem, and this we must consider in our next article.

ISAIAH.

#10. Woes and Glories (xxviii. - xxxv.). Jerusalem, and its trust in Egypt (xxix. - xxxi.). pp. 155 - 159

In the preceding chapter Isaiah has spoken of the sin and the punishment of Samaria. He now turns to the rulers and people of Jerusalem and Judah and denounces in them the self-same spirit that brought about the downfall of Samaria, the self-same instrument being used for their abasement, namely, the king of Assyria, though this time it was Sennacherib in the place of Shalmaneser. Chapters xxix., xxx. and xxxi. are devoted to Judah's woes (because of their alliance with Egypt, and because of their blindness to the Word), and Judah's future glories, for which the Lord waits to be gracious. There are six references to Egypt in these three sections.

Because of its introductory nature, chapter xxix., with its twofold woe, must first of all be considered. It explains the reasons that led both to lack of trust in the Lord and putting trust in Egypt, which, however, is not named in it.

“Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt! add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices. Yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be heaviness and sorrow: and it shall be unto Me as Ariel” (Isa. xxix. 1, 2).

With such cryptic terms Isaiah opens his mouth against Judah. What does he mean?

The name Ariel has two distinct meanings dependent upon whether the word *ari* is taken to mean “a lion”, as it does in II Sam. xxiii. 20, or “an altar”, as it does in Ezek. xliii. 15, 16. The reader unacquainted with the Hebrew may appreciate a word of explanation concerning this ambiguity.

Ari, if derived from *arah*, “to pluck or to tear”, denotes a “lion”, but if *ari* be derived from *arah* (from *charah*), “to burn”, it denotes a “hearth” or “altar”. There is, however, the possibility that the word in Ezek. xliii. 15, 16 is *Har-el*, “the Mount of God”, for this is the spelling of the first occurrence of “altar” in these verses. However, the matter is too involved for more than a note here, and the array of names, including such scholars as Vitringa and Gesenius on the one hand and Grotius and Delitzsch on the other, is such that we must perforce accept the difficulty and do the best we can. As the name is repeated by Isaiah, it must be recognized that there is always the possibility that he played upon the double meaning of the word. If so, his message would read: “Woe to the lion of God, To the altar-place of God.” The words: “Add ye year to year; let them kill the sacrifices”, are spoken ironically and have the sense: “Go on, year after year, let the feasts go round.” But the Lord had already repudiated such sacrifices and feasts:

“To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? Bring no more vain oblations, incense is an abomination unto Me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with” (Isa. i. 11-13).

As faith declines, ceremonial increases: “Should I weep in the fifth month, separating myself as I have done these so many years?” asked the ritualist in the days of Zechariah. But what did it matter how, when and what they did, for, said the Lord: “When ye fasted and mourned in the fifth and seventh month, even those seventy years, did ye at all fast, unto Me, *even to Me?*” (Zech. vii. 3-5). And so, “Woe to Ariel”, the altar-hearth of God!

Verses 5-8 graphically portray the coming of Sennacherib, his dream of conquest and his utter defeat. The Assyrians might be likened, for their multitude, to small dust, yet they should become like chaff that passes away suddenly (Isa. xxix. 5). Those nations that fight against Zion shall be as a dream, or night vision, when “he awaketh”, a figure that very aptly describes the difference between Sennacherib’s boast and his expectation, and what he actually received at the hand of the Lord.

From verse 9 it is evident that the people did not understand Isaiah’s prophecies. They were like those who heard Ezekiel, who said:

“Ah, Lord God! they say of me, Doth he not speak parables?” (Ezek. xx. 49).

“They are drunken; but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink. For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep” (Isa. xxix. 9, 10).

Here was judicial blindness, the book had become “sealed” (verse 11), the reason and the consequences being given in verses 13, 14:

“Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near Me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour Me, but have removed their heart from Me, and their fear of Me is taught by the precepts of men, therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvelous work among this people, even a marvelous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid” (Isa. xxix. 13, 14).

Such is the “Woe”.

The future “Glory” is found in verses 18-24. “In that day”, as in Isa. xxix. 18, “the deaf shall hear the words of the book”, “the blind shall see”, and they “that erred in spirit shall come to understanding”, and “they that murmured shall learn doctrine”.

Chapter xxx. opens with a specific charge against these “rebellious children”: “They set out to go down into Egypt; and they have not asked at My mouth” (Isa. xxx. 2). To Egypt! once “an iron furnace” to this people and now, as Rabshakeh even taunted Israel, “a broken reed” (II Kings xviii. 21). Judah thought “to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt”, but this could only end in their “shame” and “confusion” (Isa. xxx. 2, 3): “For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose, therefore have I cried concerning this, Their strength is to sit still” (Isa. xxx. 7).

In the mistaken idea that it is an exhortation to trust the Lord, the words, “Their strength is to sit still”, have been often misapplied. The word “strength” here is Rahab, a name given to Egypt (Psa. lxxxvii. 4). “I have named her, Rahab, sitting still.” That is

poor help in time of need; “a bruised reed” indeed. In contrast with the false and fickle “stillness” is the true exhortation of verse 15: “In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength” (Isa. xxx. 15). Then comes the dreadful refusal, “And ye would not”, followed by their reaping and sowing:

“But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee; and, We will ride upon the swift; therefore shall they that pursue you be swift” (Isa. xxx. 16).

Thus is pronounced yet another “woe” against this people. But the “Glory” follows immediately.

“And therefore will the Lord wait, that He may be gracious unto you, and therefore will He be exalted, that He may have mercy upon you: for the Lord is a God of judgment: blessed are all they that wait for Him” (Isa. xxx. 18).

“Therefore will the Lord wait blessed are all they that *wait*.” “Though it tarry, *wait*”, said the Lord to Habakkuk—and to us all. Go not down to Egypt—*wait*. Put no trust in ungodly alliances—*wait*. This is not the wisdom of the world: “For since the beginning of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside Thee, what He hath prepared for him that *waiteth* for Him” (Isa. lxvi. 4).

From the context of Isa. xxx. 18, we are once more “in that day”, for verses 21-26 reveal millennial conditions, and verses 27-33, with its “Tophet” and “breath of the Lord like a stream of brimstone”, pointedly refer to the events of Rev. xix. 20.

From the vision of the future, Isaiah once more returns to the unholy alliance with Egypt, saying:

“Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are strong, but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord” (Isa. xxxi. 1).

The vanity of this trust in Egypt is further enlarged upon in verse 3: “Now the Egyptians are men and not God; and their horses are flesh and not spirit.”

With this prophecy of failure, the series of woes end, and the remainder of the chapter reveals “the glories” that shall come “in that day”. First, the Lord reveals that “He will come down to fight for Mount Zion, and for the hills thereof” (Isa. xxxi. 4). From the figure of an undaunted lion when a crowd of shepherds come against it, the prophet turns to the figure of a bird protecting its young: “As birds flying, so will the Lord of Hosts defend Jerusalem; defending also He will deliver it; and passing over He will preserve it” (Isa. xxxi. 5). The word translated “birds” (Heb. *Tsippor*) refers to birds of the smaller kind, as the translation “sparrow” indicates (Psa. cii. 7). The word “flying” is in the feminine and may indicate the “mother bird”, even as the word translated “flying” contains the thought of “hovering”. But the most interesting word here is the one which is translated “passing over”, for it is *pasach*, which is first found in Exod. xii. 13 in the words, “I will pass over you”. The fact that the word can be translated “halt” and “leap”

in I Kings xviii. 21 and 26, and “lame” in II Sam. iv. 4, together with the figure, in Isa. xxxi. 5, of the outstretched, protecting, wing, shows that in the great Passover itself, the thought is that the Lord *stayed* to preserve against the destroying angel rather than that he “passed over” and left them.

The final section begins with a call to repentance, which is characteristic of all God’s dealings in grace with Israel: “Turn ye unto Him from Whom the children of Israel have so deeply revolted” (Isa. xxxi. 6). Similarly, Moses and the Prophets emphasize the necessity for “turning”

“If thou *turn*” (Deut. iv. 30);
“*Turn* thou unto Me” (Jer. iii. 7);
“Repent and *turn*” (Ezek. xiv. 6; xviii. 30);
“That we might *turn*” (Dan. ix. 13);
“Take with you words and *turn* to the Lord” (Hos. xiv. 2);
“*Turn* ye unto Me and I will turn unto you” (Zech. i. 3);
“Rend your heart and *turn* unto the Lord” (Joel ii. 12);

“Repent” cried John the Baptist, followed by the Lord Himself and, later, by the apostles.

This “turning to God” will be “from idols” (I Thess. i. 9, 10), for “in that day every man shall cast away his idols” (Isa. xxxi. 7). Just as Isa. xxx. ended with Tophet, so chapter xxx. ends with the destruction of the Assyrian and with Jerusalem described as the Lord’s “fire” and “furnace”. *Vitringa* comments on verse 9 as follows:

“The Assyrian king shall be struck with so great a panic at the slaughter of his army, that in his flight he shall pass by his strongholds on the borders of his empire, not daring to trust himself to them.”

ISAIAH.

#11. Woes and Glories (xxviii. - xxxv.).

Glories when the King reigns.

Woe to the vile and the careless (xxxii.).

pp. 185 - 190

Isaiah, after his alternation of “woe and glory”, pauses at chapter xxxii., while he envisages that glorious reign which, at intervals, has shed light, in prospect, upon the dark picture of his people’s sin. Twice, already, the prophet has followed the mention of the Assyrian by a glorious reference to Christ.

- A | The greaves and war cloaks of the warrior become fuel for burning.
- B | “Unto us a child is born, etc.” (Isa. ix. 5, 6).
- A | The thickets of the Assyrian forest are cut down.
- B | “There shall come forth a rod of Jesse” (Isa. x. 34 - xi. 1).

He does so again in the opening of the section now before us.

- A | The Assyrian has fled in fear.
- B | “Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness” (Isa. xxxi. 9 - xxxii. 1).

The structure of the chapter may be set out as follows:--

Isaiah xxxii.

- A | 1, 2. RIGHTEOUSNESS. | Hiding Place. Covert. Shadow.
- B | 3-11. CHARACTER. | Eyes, ears, heart, stammerer.
Vile, liberal, churl.
Careless women.
- C | 12-14. LAMENTATION. Land a desolation.
- D | 15, 16. Until Then.
- A | 17, 18. RIGHTEOUSNESS. | Peace. Quietness.
Assurance. Peaceable habitation.
Sure dwellings. Quiet resting places.
- C | 20. BLESSING. Land cultivated.

Years before Isaiah uttered his prophecy of the King, David had expressed his longing for such a reign of righteousness, peace and prosperity. This is recorded in Psalm lxxii., wherein “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended”. When the great antitypical Assyrian shall be destroyed, the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and the reign of righteousness and peace will begin.

We are already aware that this King is Immanuel, “God with us” (Isa. vii. 14), and that He is the Child born, the Son given, and at the same time the mighty God (Isa. ix. 6, 7), also that this mighty One is to reign upon the throne of David. We realize therefore that the prophet uses the words “A man” in chapter xxxii. with intention.

“A man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land” (Isa. xxxii. 2).

“A *hiding place*.”—The first occurrences of *chaba*, the verb that gives us “hiding place”, are in Gen. iii. 8 and 10, where our first parents hide themselves for shame because of their sin. This word “hiding place” indicates peculiar distinction, because it is the only occurrence of the word in the O.T. Men may make a refuge of lies, they may invent a covering for themselves, but all will be swept away and be of no avail. This King, this Man, is the one and only true Hiding Place since Adam’s futile attempt. He shall be a “covert”, Heb. *sathar*. The word includes an element of secrecy, and *sethar*, the substantive, is many times translated “secret” and “secretly”:

“In the time of trouble He shall hide me in His pavilion, in the *secret* of His tabernacle shall He hide me” (Ps. xxvii. 5).

“Surely in the floods of great waters they shall not come nigh unto him. Thou art my *hiding place*; Thou shalt preserve me from trouble; Thou shalt encompass me about with songs of deliverance” (Psa. xxxii. 6, 7).

“Thou hast been a shelter for me I will trust in the *covert* of Thy wings” (Psa. lxi. 3, 4).

Isaiah has used the word twice before in chapter xvi. 4 where he speaks of “a covert” from the face of the spoiler, and in xxviii. 17, where the “refuge of lies” is referred to and it is said that “the waters shall overflow the hiding place”.

Moreover, a two-fold provision that would be fully appreciated by those who dwelt in a thirsty land is found in this “man”.

“As rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary (or thirsty) land” (Isa. xxxii. 2).

The figure of a shadow is one that is used very freely in the Old Testament.

“Hide me under the shadow of Thy wings” (Psa. xvii. 8).

“How excellent is Thy loving kindness, O God! therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of Thy wings” (Psa. xxxvi. 7).

Isaiah himself contrasts the “shadow” provided by the Lord (Isa. iv. 6; xxv. 4), with the “refuge of lies” to which Israel turned when they put their trust “in the shadow of Egypt” (Isa. xxxii. 2, 3).

The “weary” land, is a land where weariness arises out of drought and thirst. In Psalm lxiii. 1 and cxliii. 6 it is translated “a thirsty land” and in Prov. xxv. 25 it is used of a “thirsty” soul.

These are lovely and blessed forecasts of the reign of Christ. In Isa. xxxii. 17 and 18, as the structure reveals, these blessings are again to the fore, and we draw attention to two important reciprocal principles underlying them.

- (1) In both Isa. xxxii. 1, 2, and in the sequel verses 17 and 18, peace is the effect and work of righteousness, and
- (2) Then the *abstract* terms “righteousness, quietness and assurance” are realized in the *concrete* enjoyment of “peaceable habitation, sure dwellings and quiet resting places”.

Quite apart from the importance of understanding the teaching of Isaiah, the true and scriptural meaning of “peace” and its essential relationship to “righteousness”, lies at the very foundation of our faith and is practically the key which unlocks the doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans.

Shalom, “peace”, is derived from *shallam*, which has the meaning of “completeness”. This completeness colours the varied ways in which *shallam* is used in the O.T. For example,

“The days of thy mourning shall be *ended*” (Isa. lx. 20).

“Thus all the work was *finished*” (II Chron. v. 1).

It is especially important to perceive this “completing” in such usage as,

“He shall *surely* pay ox for ox” (Exod. xxi. 36).
“He should make *full* restitution” (Exod. xxii. 3).

So also in the translations “reward”, “recompense”, “requite”, “repay”, “make amends” and “restore”; what is uppermost is the idea of making a complete return as a righteous basis of peace.

Shalem, the adjective, is mostly translated “perfect”, which enforces the idea resident in the root word. “Peace” therefore is not merely the cessation of hostilities, it is the result of **perfect or complete satisfaction**. It is therefore obvious that in their dealings with one another the world can never appropriately use the word “peace” in its full meaning. At the best there will be but a poor compromise. Again we say nations at war may cease fighting, but unless the root cause of the hostility has been completely and righteously dealt with, the ensuing “peace” will be but a patched-up interval of comparative calm between periods of open hostility. The Epistle to the Romans connects “peace” with “righteousness”. “Therefore being *justified* by faith, we have *peace* with God” (Rom. v. 1). And Hebrews speaks of the “*peaceable* fruit of *righteousness*” (Heb. xii. 11). So also Isaiah.

“The work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever” (Isa. xxxii. 17).

The difference between “work” (*maaseh*) and “effect” (*abobah*) is the difference between a thing done, or made, and service rendered. So righteousness makes peace as an accomplished fact, for its result is tranquility.

We have been in correspondence with a believer, who, while positively expressing his belief in Christ and consciousness of the sealing of the Holy Spirit until the day of redemption, is nevertheless seeking assurance and confirmation. He has come as far as Isa. xxxii. 17, but has not stepped out into verse 18 where those who are justified and at peace “ *dwell in a peaceable habitation, sure dwellings, and quiet resting places*”. Perhaps the difference between the experiences of verses 17 and 18 is the difference between “faith” and “trust”, a difference that eludes us when we seek to be logical, but which is nevertheless obvious as we become acquainted with the vagaries of the human heart. The difference is well illustrated by a story about Blondin, the tight-rope walker. This acrobat asked a spectator of his feats whether he *believed* that he could carry him across the tight-rope on his back. The man replied in the affirmative. “Will you then let me do it?” continued Blondin. “No”, replied the man, thus evincing that while he “believed”, he did not “trust”.

Returning to the earlier verses of Isa. xxxii., we observe that in the structure we have grouped verses 3-11 under the heading, “Character”. It had been the prophet’s grief that Israel’s “eyes”, “ears” and “heart” were blind, dull and hard, and that this had brought about their inability to understand, and consequently their failure (Isa. vi. 9, 10). Under the reign of the righteous King, eyes shall see, ears shall hearken, hearts shall understand, and instead of being addressed in judgment by men of stammering lips (Isa. xxviii. 11); those of once stammering lips shall speak plainly. Let us not miss the prophet’s intention

here. Every faculty mentioned is seen to have reached perfection. Eyes “shall not be dim”, or “be dazzled”. Ears shall not only “hear” but shall “hearken”, meaning an obedient hearing in place of that “hearing” which “heard” but did not understand. Hearts, once hard and hasty, shall “understand knowledge”, and stammering lips shall speak “elegantly” (margin).

In contrast with this blessed growth under the reign of peace, is placed the character of the vile and the churl, who shall then be seen in their true colours. The words “The vile person will speak villainy” make one think of the pronouncement of Rev. xxii. 11. “He that is unjust, let him be unjust still.” The solemn possibilities as to the nature of sin and the limits of repentance, that Isa. xxxii. 6 and Rev. xxii. 11 indicate, are great.

“Thorns and briars”, emblems of the primeval curse, come up upon the land where villainy and carelessness go hand in hand, and Isaiah adds that the

“palaces shall be forsaken; the multitudes of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens *for ever until* the spirit be poured upon us from on high” (Isa. xxxii. 13-15).

“*For ever until.*”—The association of these two expressions is impossible if the orthodox interpretation of “for ever” be the truth, for every exponent of the eternity of punishment stresses its everlasting and unchanging character. *Olam*, the Hebrew word translated “ever”, is derived from *alam*, to hide or to conceal, therefore something secret (Psalm xc. 8); (II Kings iv. 27), and *olam* refers to a period of time, the beginning, end, or character of which, is “hidden” from the observer. It is used of time past (Gen. vi. 4); or time future, and in many occurrences it is evident that such future time is limited (Deut. xv. 17). The word “until” is the translation of the Hebrew *cd*, as it occurs in the phrase “for ever”; consequently we could translate the passage “The towers shall be for dens until the age until the spirit be poured”, which gives good sense and does no violence to word or grammar. If the judgment here described is to be eternal, then there can be no subsequent “until”. But there is a subsequent “until”, and we are therefore compelled to conclude, either

- (1) The orthodox translation “for ever” is an error and should be abandoned, or
- (2) Isaiah made a mistake, and there will not be, because there cannot be, any subsequent blessing, because the eternal nature of punishment precludes the idea.

Most of our friends who hold the orthodox view, are happily neither consistent nor logical. They appear to be able to believe both the eternity of punishment, and the inspiration of Isaiah. Perhaps it is a case of where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise, but such blissful ignorance is hardly the qualification that one looks for in critic or teacher.

This blessed restoration, when “the wilderness shall be a fruitful field”, is the result of Israel’s true Pentecost. To this blessed day the prophet Joel devotes practically the whole of his prophecy. Just as Isaiah speaks of the wilderness being turned into a fruitful field, when the spirit shall be poured out from on high, so Joel uses another great figure of restoration.

“That which the palmerworm hath left hath the locust eaten; and that which the locust hath left hath the cankerworm eaten; and that which the cankerworm hath left hath the caterpillar eaten” (Joel i. 4).

Then comes the call,

“Rend your hearts, and not your garments” (Joel ii. 13).

“And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar, and the palmerworm” (Joel ii. 25).

“And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh” (Joel ii. 28).

Isaiah, as Joel, looks to the fulfillment of Pentecost for the realization of his vision of restoration. This evidently was in the minds of the apostles when they enquired as to the restoration of the kingdom of Israel (Acts i. 6), just as it was also the basis of Peter’s call to repentance, with the assurance that if there was a true response the times of refreshing and restitution would follow (Acts iii. 19-21).

We should exceed the scope of our present studies were we here to enter into the question of the true meaning of Pentecost, but the question has been studied in the series “The Acts of the Apostles” in Volume XXV.

The Gospel of JOHN.

#12. Fullness and true grace, in contrast with type and shadow (i. 15 - 17). pp. 57 - 62

Once again the Apostle reverts to the testimony of John the Baptist. His first witness, as recorded in this Gospel, is to Christ, “the true Light”, with the object that “all men through Him might believe” (John i. 6-8).

John the Apostle and John the Baptist have but one testimony, the Baptist’s witness becoming imperceptibly interwoven with the testimony of the Apostle, neither breaking its thread nor spoiling its harmony.

“John bare witness of Him, and cried, saying, This was He of Whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for He was before me” (John i. 15).

The Baptist is but confirming the marvelous testimony of the Apostle given in John i. 1 and 14. Christ as “the Word” was before John. Christ as “the Word made flesh” was after him. This testimony of the Baptist is expanded in John iii. 27 and 31 and will be given fuller consideration when that passage is reached. It is inserted to supplement the Apostle’s statement here, so that in the mouth of two witnesses every word may be established. Accordingly we proceed to verses 16-18.

In verse 14 the Apostle had spoken of Christ as “full of grace and truth”. He now refers to that “fullness” (John i. 16) as the source and that “grace and truth” (John i. 17) which believers have received. In verse 14, the Apostle had spoken for the first time of Christ as “the only begotten of the Father”. He now carries the title back, in verse 18, to counterbalance, in time, what the Word was “in the beginning”. Verses 16-18, therefore, are an expansion and exposition both of what accrues to man and what pertains to God from the incarnation.

“And of His fullness have all we received, and grace for grace” (John i. 16).

We cannot hope to understand this passage merely by concentrating upon the meaning of the word “fullness”, but must ascertain what is associated with that fullness and in what manner the statement carries forward the Apostle’s theme. This will necessitate consideration of the expression “grace for grace”, and inasmuch as the fullness of the Lord is first of all associated with “grace and truth” and that “grace and truth” is placed over against the law given to Moses in verse 17, it will be necessary to include and consider these references before we can appreciate in any measure the intention in verse 16. We observe therefore a marked contrast indicated between “the law” that was given by “Moses” and the “grace and truth” that “came by Jesus Christ”.

Here, together with verse 18, we have two contrasted lines of teaching,

Moses.	Jesus Christ.
Law.	Grace and Truth.
Given by (<i>edothē</i>).	Came into being by (<i>egeneto</i>).
God.	Father.
Not seen.	Declared.
Back parts (Exod. xxxiii. 23).	Bosom.
Servants (Heb. iii. 5, 6).	Son.

For the moment our attention is directed to the expression “grace and truth”. Now, whatever that term may mean, it is obvious that it belongs to one, and to one only, of these two categories. It does belong to that headed by “Jesus Christ”; it does not belong to that headed by Moses. Is it however true that there was no “grace” in the law?

“How came Israel to have it and not the Babylonians, Egyptians, Philistines, Assyrians, etc.? Yes, it was all grace: as God asks and tells them so earnestly and so often, in Deut. iv. 32-40 and other places. And was there no ‘truth’ in the law? Yes, surely every word was truth. But in John i. 17 the contrast is between one thing that was given by Moses, and a different thing that came by Jesus Christ”

(*Dr. Bullinger’s “Figures of Speech”*).

The use of the figure of speech called Hendiadys, *Hen-dia-dys*, the “one by means of two” figure, is the explanation of the apparent difficulty. The two words “grace and truth” really represent but one thing and are employed solely to emphasize the word “truth”. The one thing intended is the term “*true* grace”, with emphasis on the word “true”. We have now contrasted with one another “law” and “true grace”. But we must discover what “true” grace is. There can be no such thing as “false” grace, and the words “true grace” here must therefore stand in contrast with some other conception. To elucidate the point let us consider the usage of the word *alethinōs*, “true”.

“That was the *true* light” (John was not that light) (John i. 9).

“*True* worshippers shall worship the Father, in spirit and in truth” (In contrast to the worship either in Samaria or Jerusalem) (John iv. 23).

“My Father giveth you the *true* bread” (In contrast with the type given by Moses) (John vi. 32).

“I am the *true* Vine” (of which the O.T. references were types) (John xv. 1).

It will be seen that John has frequently used this word with the meaning “anti-typical, or real”. There is one reference which actually places the word “true” over against “type” and it is Heb. ix. 24:

“For Christ is not entered into the holy places, made with hands, which are the figures (anti-types) of the true, but into heaven itself.”

We can now return to John i. 17 and bring the expressions “law” and “grace and truth” under a common denominator, for both may be called “grace”, but in the law the grace was “typical”, and the offerings “shadows”, while in the gospel grace was “real”, and the work of Christ the fulfillment of the shadows and types of the law.

We have already indicated the difference between the law that was “given” by Moses, and real grace that “came” by Jesus Christ. In the structures of the prologue (*see* Volume XXIX, page 174) this is found in correspondence with the statement in verse 3 that “all things were made by Him”. Here, Christ is seen as Creator in both realms.

We can now go back to John i. 16, and understand the expression “grace for grace”. The word translated “for” is *anti*, which means “over against”; “grace over against grace” means, in the light of verse 17, “the grace of gospel realities in place of the grace of types and shadows”. This “real grace”, we learn, is “out of His fullness”.

“For of His fullness have all we received, and (or even) grace over against grace, for the law by Moses was given, but true grace came into being by Jesus Christ” (John i. 16, 17).

The “fullness” which is the source of this rich supply is that which we have already noted in verse 14, and arises only from the fact that “the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us”. We have already noted in our studies in the epistle to the Colossians, that the “fullness”, *pleroma*, links the testimony of John to that of Paul and, that apart from the one passage in John i. 16, the word *pleroma* is used, in reference to Christ, exclusively by Paul. In Volume XXIII, page 171, we gave an analysis of the distribution of the word, but as the subject is of such importance we do not hesitate to repeat the outline here for the benefit of new readers.

The Fullness.

- A | John i. 1-18. | HIS TITLE.—In the beginning. The Word.
HIS OFFICE.—Maker of all things.
His title in the flesh. The only begotten Son.
God declared to be invisible.
- B | Gal. iv. 1-10. | The elements of the world.
Ye observe days, months, times and years.
Made of a woman. Made under the law.
Sonship (*Adoption*).
- C | Ephesians. Christ and His Church |
 - a | i. 10. Goal. Head up things in heaven and earth.
 - b | i. 23. Foreshadowing Head. Fullness of Him.
 - a | iii. 19. Goal. Filled unto all the fullness of God.
 - b | iv. 13. Measure. Fullness of Christ.
- A | Col. i. 12-22. | HIS TITLE.—Before all things. The Image.
HIS OFFICE.—Creator of all things.
His title in the two spheres.
Firstborn of all creation. Firstborn from the dead.
God declared to be invisible.
- B | Col. ii. 9-23. | The rudiments of the world.
Holydays, new moons and sabbaths.
Bodily. Completeness.

The expression in Gal. iv. 4, “the fullness of the time” refers to the glorious complement, the generation which should bring in the glorious readjustment by the birth, death and resurrection of the One Who was then born.

“We beheld His *glory* *full* of grace and truth and of His *fullness* have all we received, even the grace of the gospel for the grace of type and shadow (the *pleroma*)” (John i. 14-16).

The reader will observe that there, where “the fullness of the time” is mentioned, we have the repudiation of the elements of the world, “days, months, times and years”, as religious observances, and there also we have the parallel with John i. 14, the Word made flesh, for we read that in the fullness of the time, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman.

If we further pursue our investigation we shall observe the same features in the corresponding section, Col. ii. 9-23. When John wrote his Gospel, all ceremonial observance was finished. The epistle to the Hebrews had been sent to those who were involved in the transition; the epistle to the Colossians had demonstrated once and for all the completeness of the believer in Christ, and even John, though he ministered a message of “life” to the “world” and had no commission to speak of the mystery and its blessings, could not and would not put upon the “other sheep” the bondage of ceremonial, now removed by grace. This is made clear in John iv. 20-24, but we must leave consideration of its message until we reach that chapter.

In all testimony, especially where change, opposition, and contention are involved, there is danger of leaving a wrong impression by over or under stating the truth or by omitting some feature, so well known and so fully believed, as to appear to be in no need of vindication. We want, therefore, to avoid the slightest appearance of evil, and evil it would be if but one reader suspected that we belittled the inspiration and moral glory of the law given by Moses. We will therefore quote the thirteen references in the Gospel of John to Moses, and thus complete the presentation of the truth.

Moses in John’s Gospel.

“For the law was given by Moses, but true grace came by Jesus Christ” (i. 17).

“We have found Him, of Whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write” (i. 45).

“And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up” (iii. 14).

“There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me” (v. 45, 46).

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but My Father giveth you the True Bread from heaven” (vi. 32).

“Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why do ye go about to kill Me?” (vii. 19).

“Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it was of Moses, but of the fathers) and ye, on the sabbath day, circumcise a man. If a man on the sabbath day, receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken (or without breaking the law of Moses); are ye angry at Me because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day?” (vii. 22, 23).

“Moses in the law commanded us that she should be stoned; but what sayest Thou?”
(viii. 5).

“Then they reviled Him, and said, Thou art his disciple, but we are Moses’ disciples. We know that God spake unto Moses; as for this fellow, we know not from whence he is” (ix. 28, 29).

Let the reader trace the story of these references. First we have the distinction “law” and “grace”, and then the finding of the Messiah, the Subject of prophecy. The very gospel message of John iii. 16 finds its foreshadowing in the act of Moses, even as the True Bread was typified by the Manna. So far, the references, with one exception, have been an expansion of John i. 17. The exception was the warning of John v. 45, 46.

The remaining references indicate the growing opposition of the blind disciples of Moses which culminates in chapter ix. At the close of this chapter we find much that makes us think of John i. 5. The darkness comprehended it not, or did not grasp, the Light.

“And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see: and that they which see may be made blind. And some of the Pharisees which were with Him heard these words, and said unto Him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see: therefore your sin remaineth” (John ix. 39-41).

In this chapter He Who was the Word made flesh is called by His enemies “a sinner”, “a fellow”, a “man not of God”, but by the man born blind He is first of all called: “a man that is called Jesus”, then “a Prophet” and, at last “The Son of God” and “Lord”.

Moses therefore is given his rightful place in John’s Gospel. Like John the Baptist, he was but a voice, a lamp, a lifted finger. It is Christ Who is the Word, the Light, and the Lamb of God.

We have now stepped through this most wonderful prologue, with the exception of verse 18, to which we must devote a separate article. We shall then be ready to listen to the testimony given by John of those things which, if believed, give “life”, and by “abiding” in them lead to a fellowship and a glory not found in the message to the circumcision.

#13. The Invisible and the Only Begotten.
The Summary of the Prologue (i. 18).
pp. 86 - 90

We have now arrived at the stupendous conclusion to this great prologue: From the revelation of “The Word” in the beginning, we have descended to creation, to manifestation and to incarnation. The Word was made flesh. Then we commence the ascent to “the glory that He had before”, but the coming of the Word in the flesh was for the purpose of redemption.

“No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, Which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him” (John i. 18).

The “Word” of verse 1 becomes here “the only begotten Son”, while “God” becomes “the Father”. When we speak of the Holy Spirit, we do not mentally conjure up some particular shape or form, but when believers speak of the “Father” they are apt to forget the words of John iv.:

“The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth” (John iv. 23, 24).

There can be no mistaking the meaning of this passage. “The Father” is placed in correspondence with “God”, Who is spirit. Again, in John v. we read:

“And the Father Himself, Which hath sent Me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape” (John v. 37).

And again in John vi.: “Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is of God, He hath seen the Father” (John vi. 46). Similarly, in I Tim. i. 17 God is declared to be “The King eternal, incorruptible, *invisible*”, while in chapter vi. of the same epistle we read: “Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, Whom no man hath seen or can see” (I Tim. vi. 16). Such is the consistent testimony of Scripture. It is of the very essence of material things that they can be either seen, or heard, or felt. The world of matter is intimately linked with the bodily senses, but it is of the very essence of spirit that the human eye, and ear, and hand cannot apprehend it: “Handle me and see, for spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have” (Luke xxiv. 39). While the reader will readily acquiesce in all that has been advanced from the Scriptures, there will probably be, nevertheless, in the back of the mind, a number of Old Testament passages that seem at first sight to contradict this testimony. For example, in Gen. xxxv. we read:

“God *appeared* unto Jacob and God went up from him, in the place where He talked with him I am God Almighty and Jacob called the name of the *place* where God spake with him, Bethel” (Gen. xxxv. 9-15).

Here, Jacob obviously had very personal dealings with “The Lord God Almighty”. Moreover, on an earlier occasion, in Gen. xxxii., where Jacob had traveled from Bethel to Jabbok, we read:

“There wrestled a Man with him until the breaking of the day And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved” (Gen. xxxii. 24, 30).

Again, in Exodus, we read:

“Then went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and they saw the God of Israel they beheld God, and did eat and drink” (Exod. xxiv. 9-11).

“The Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend” (Exod. xxxiii. 11).

We have already dealt with the place that the incarnation holds in the Divine scheme, and have drawn attention to the fact that John i. 14 does not say, “The Word became *man*”, but that “The Word became flesh”. The New Testament declares that Jesus Christ was a “man”, but it does not say that He became such at the incarnation. Phil. ii. declares that He was found in fashion as a man, and Rom. viii. that He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, but Gen. xxxii. had already indicated that the God of Jacob was a “man” long before the lowly birth at Bethlehem. All this we have already considered when dealing with John i. 14, but it is so important that we repeat some of our conclusions here. The invisible God expressed Himself before time began. He Who created the world and all things, first of all humbled Himself by taking visible shape. He became the Image of the invisible God, the Firstborn of every creature, the Beginning of the creation of God. He, the visible God, was the One after Whose image and likeness Adam was created, and He it was Who walked in Eden in the cool of the day. He, the visible God, was the God of Israel seen by Moses and the Seventy. And so, when John i. 18 declares that “no man hath seen God *at any time*”, and the Old Testament declares that certain men did see God, there is no contradiction. John i. 18 refers to God Who is Spirit, whereas the Old Testament speaks of the One Who, for the purposes of creation and mediation, became the Image of the invisible God, and in the fullness of time, for the putting away of sin, became flesh, and the Only Begotten of the Father.

The second clause of John i. 18 reads in the Authorized Version as follows: “The only begotten Son, Which is in the bosom of the Father.” The Revised Version margin reads: “Many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten.*” This reading is found in the Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi, and the Codex Regius. It is also found in 33 of the cursive manuscripts, the Peshito versions, the Memphitic and Aetheopian, and a host of the Fathers. Arius, though opposed to the doctrine of the deity of Christ, upheld this reading, and it was incorporated in the creed of Antioch. Lachmann, Tregelles, & Westcott and Hort also accept it as the true version. The words “only begotten Son” are the words we should expect, and it hardly seems possible that so strange a reading as “God only begotten” should have been inserted in place of the more usual “The only begotten Son”. In this marvelous prologue we have some wonderful revelations of movements in the Godhead, all directed towards manifestation and

realization—"The Word", "The Light", "The Glory", "The Fullness", "The Word was God", "The Word was made flesh", and now "God only begotten". He "was" in the beginning; he "tabernacled" among us; He "is" in the bosom of the Father. This last statement uses the words *ho on*: "The One Who is." These words speak of the Lord's ascension, as in John iii.:

"No man hath ascended up into heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man Which is (*ho on*) in heaven" (John iii. 13).

The Saviour, as the Son of man, has gone back "where He was before" (John vi. 62), and it is as the "Only Begotten" Who is in the bosom of "The Father" that John i. 18 now speaks of Him. Before the incarnation, before the Word was made flesh, the Lord is not spoken of as "the Only Begotten", neither is He called "The Son of man". He has gone back now to the glory, but He has gone back with the evidences of redemption accomplished, and so can reveal the invisible God as Father.

There is only one other reference to the word "bosom" in John's Gospel, and that is in xiii. 23: "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples whom Jesus loved." The word indicates not only a place of warm affection, but also a place in which confidences are received, as we see from Peter's suggestion that John should ask the Lord in confidence as to who was the betrayer. In John xiii. 23 we have the word *en* ("in the bosom"); in verse 25 it is *epi* ("on the breast"); while in John i. 18 it is *eis* ("unto"). The latter indicates something more intimate and resembles the word "with" (*pros*) in John i. 1.

We find this same emphasis upon the new relationship of the ascended Lord in Heb. i. 3-5. In verse 3 He is spoken of as "The brightness of His glory" and "The express image of His person" (titles comparable with "The Word" of John i. 1). He is also credited in Heb. i. 10 with the work of creation just as in John i. 3. The parallel is again evident in Heb. ii. 14, which is comparable with John i. 14, and in Heb. i. 3-5, parallel with John i. 18, we read:

"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. For unto which of the angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee?"

The Lord returns as "The only Begotten Son", having "obtained" a more excellent name than angels. To say such a thing of the Lord as "God" would be absurd. No one needs to be told that He who is "God" (John i. 1; Heb. i. 8) has a more excellent name than angels. In what sense, then, could "The Word" Who "was God" "obtain" this name? The answer is that He who was so high, stooped to man's estate and was made a little lower than the angels for our sake and for our redemption. As the Man Who had thus triumphed He could be spoken of as having "obtained" by inheritance a more excellent name, this name being "The Only Begotten Son of God".

As "The Word", the Lord's office was to make known the will and the glory of the invisible God. Sin, however, had come into the world; and so the Word "was made

flesh”. He became “the Light of the world” and the believer was able to see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. He told His disciples that “he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father”, and so the Apostle, looking up to the right hand of the Father, could say: “He hath declared Him.”

The word “declare” here is *exegeomai* (giving our word “exegesis”), and means literally “to lead out”. The word occurs six times in the New Testament, including the passage in Luke xxiv.:

“And they *told* what things were done in the way, and how He was known of them in the breaking of bread” (Luke xxiv. 35).

The other occurrences are in Acts x. 8; xv. 12 & 14; and xxi. 19.

It is not surprising, seeing that in this prologue John has taken up the language of philosophy, to find that this word “declare” was a technical term much used in connection with speaking by oracle, and interpreting things regarded as being Divine. Christ is the true Interpreter of God to man. He came from heaven, not to demonstrate His own Deity, but to show us what the invisible God was like. Those who have rightly “seen” Christ, have “seen” the Father. We know what the love of God is, because we have seen it manifested in Christ. We know His patience, His peace, His power, His mind, His will—we know Him, for the “Only Begotten Son” has given Him a complete exposition. He is our Interpreter, our Mediator, our Daysman. He has “shown” us the Father “and it sufficeth us”.

The prologue has now accomplished its purpose. The Gospel itself now await us, and from first to last we shall discover that in it the Son of God is manifesting, revealing, interpreting the Father to His children. It must now be our delightful task to endeavour to open up these treasures and exhibit them for the blessing and comfort of the believer, and to the glory of the Lord.

#14. The Witnesses.
The Witness of John the Baptist (i. 19 - 34).
pp. 122 - 128

“I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God” (John i. 34).

It will be observed that the structure of this Gospel, which has already been indicated in Volume XXIX, pp. 126, 127, that the whole book apart from the prologue, is covered by the word “Witnesses”. Omitting all details, the structure is as follows:

B | a | i. 19-34. The Witness of John the Baptist.
 b | i. 35-51. Simon, son of Jona: “Follow Me.”
C | ii. 1 - xxi. 14. The Witness of the Eight Signs.
B | b | xxi. 15-23. Simon Peter, Son of Jonas: “Follow Me.”
 a | xxi. 24, 25. The Witness of John the Apostle.

Even in the prologue itself, the witness of John the Baptist is introduced twice, and in such a way as to form a definite part of the structure:

E | i. 6-8. JOHN. Witness (*marturian*).
E | i. 15. JOHN. Witness (*marturia*).

Of all the writers in the New Testament John is the one who uses the idea of “bearing witness” most frequently. From the start to finish his Gospel is based upon testimony borne. This fact is confirmed by the following figures giving the occurrences of

Martureo.—In the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) 3 occurrences.
 In John’s Gospel 33 occurrences, and in his other writings 14 occurrences.
Marturia.—In the Synoptic Gospels 4 occurrences.
 In John’s Gospel 14 occurrences, and in his other writings 16 occurrences.

This tabulation demonstrates very clearly the supreme place that John gives to the question of “testimony”. In addition, another fact emerges. The Synoptic Gospels use these two words *seven* times, and John himself *seventy-seven* times. The numbers indicate completeness and perfection. For the purposes with which the Gospels were written, their respective witnesses were complete. John’s purpose seems to have demanded much more in the way of witness than was the case with Matthew, Mark and Luke. Those addressed by the Synoptic writers would have had a fuller acquaintance with the prophecies of the O.T. than would those for whom John wrote, and the genealogies given by Matthew and Luke would in themselves have gone a long way towards providing convincing evidence. John, writing to the world, depends more on the records borne by John the Baptist and himself and others, than on the appeal to O.T. prophecy. There are only eight or nine references to the fulfillment of prophecy in John’s Gospel, as against the forty-seven references to *martureo* and *marturia*.

An examination of the fourteen references to *marturia* in John's Gospel divides the witness into three groups—the opening testimony of John the Baptist, the closing testimony of John the Apostle, and the threefold testimony of the Lord Himself:

Marturia (“Witness”) in John's Gospel.

- A | i. 7; i. 19. The two-fold witness of John the Baptist.
- B | The threefold witness of the Lord Jesus Christ. |
 - a1 | iii. 11. Not receive.
 - b1 | iii. 32. No man received. *Man.*
 - c1 | iii. 33. He that received. *True.*
 - a2 | v. 31. Not true?
 - c2 | v. 32. My witness is true. *True.*
 - b2 | v. 34. I receive not witness from man. *Man.*
 - d | v. 36. Greater than John. The works.
 - a3 | viii. 13. Not true.
 - c3 | viii. 14. My record is true. *True.*
 - b3 | viii. 17. Testimony of two men. *Man.*
- A | xix. 35; xix. 24. The twofold witness of John the Apostle.

It is very clear from the above analysis of John's fourteen references that this “record” or “witness” plays a great part in his presentation of the truth.

We must now turn our attention to the opening testimony in the structure—namely, that given by John the Baptist. This testimony, which is given in fairly full detail, settles a number of vital points with regards to the One Whose Person and Work fill the Gospel with their glory, and Who is set forth as “The Way, the Truth, and the Life”. John the Baptist's testimony settled the following crucial facts:

- (1) Jesus Christ was the long promised and expected Lord, Whose word of restoration and comfort opens the second portion of Isaiah's prophecy (Isa. xl., John i. 23).
- (2) Jesus Christ was the Lamb of God, the great Antitype of all the sacrificial lambs offered under the dispensation of type and shadow (John i. 29, 36).
- (3) Jesus Christ was the Messiah, “Which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost” (John i. 31-33).
- (4) Jesus Christ was the Son of God (John i. 34).

Upon closer examination we find that John the Baptist's witness is twofold. The first part is his answer to the Sanhedrin, the most powerful ruling body among the Jews; the second part is given unasked, and represents his own spontaneous conviction upon seeing the evidence promised to him in connection with the baptizing of the Saviour. The structure is as follows:

The Witness of the John the Baptist (John i. 19 - 34).

- A | 19-28. The record of John, when asked by Jews. |
 - a1 | 19. Question.—“Who art thou?”
 - b1 | 20-21. Answer.—Not the Christ, Elijah or that Prophet.
 - a2 | 22. Question.—“Who art thou?”
 - b2 | 23. Answer.—I am a Voice.
 - a3 | 24, 25. Question.—“Why baptizest thou?”
 - b3 | 26, 27. Answer.—He it is.
- A | 29-34. The record of John when he saw the sign the next day. |
 - c | 29, 30. Behold the Lamb of God.
 - d | 31. I knew Him not.
 - e | 31. John’s baptism.
 - f | 31. Water.
 - c | 32. I saw the Spirit.
 - d | 33. I knew Him not.
 - e | 33. Christ’s baptism.
 - f | 33. The Holy Ghost.
 - c1 | 34. The Son of God.

We must now acquaint ourselves a little more fully with the facts brought out by this witness, and their bearing upon the purpose of John’s Gospel.

Unless the reader has already made a study of the testimony of John the Baptist, it is very unlikely, if he were asked how many times he is mentioned by name in the Gospels and the Acts, that his answer would be anywhere near the correct number. John the Baptist is actually mentioned no less than 90 times in the N.T., whereas John, the writer of the Gospel, is mentioned only 35 times by name, including the references in the Revelation.

Luke, in the first chapter of his Gospel, gives the detailed story of John the Baptist’s birth, and in chapter iii. he speaks of his unworthiness when compared with the One Who was to follow:

“And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not; John answered them, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with water: but One mightier than I cometh, the latchet of Whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire” (Luke iii. 15, 16).

The Lord’s own testimony to His forerunner we find in Matt. xi.:

“A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send My messenger before Thy face, which shall prepare Thy way before Thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist” (Matt. xi. 9-11).

The events immediately associated with the birth of John the Baptist obviously indicated the arrival of some one of no small importance, and it is not surprising that

those who heard of them said, “What manner of child shall this be?” We must also remember the testimony of the Acts to the fact that the ministry of John the Baptist had had an effect outside the land of Palestine, for we find that Apollos of Alexandria, and the twelve disciples at Ephesus had come under its influence (Acts xviii. 25; xix. 1-4), the greater must be the King he represents. If the forerunner therefore be so great, how great must He be, Whose shoe-latchet John felt Himself not worthy to unloose!

John opens his testimony in verse 19 by recording the questions put to John the Baptist and his answers to them. The priests and Levites sent from Jerusalem simply asked the question, “Who art thou?” They did not actually say, “Art thou the Christ?” but, knowing that this question was uppermost in men’s minds (see Luke iii. 15), John anticipates the enquiry by confessing—“denying not, but confessing”—“I am not the Christ”. Let us pause a moment here. John says that those who asked the question were “Jews”. Matthew refers to his own people as “Jews” only once (Matt. xxviii. 15), his other four references being the statements of others. Mark speaks of the Jews only once out of six occurrences, when he describes, apparently for the sake of the Gentile reader, the Jewish custom of washing (Mark vii. 3). And Luke, who has the Gentile reader in mind, has only two references out of a total of five (Luke vii. 3; xxiii. 51). John, on the other hand, uses the word “Jew” 68 times, an indication that by the time he wrote his Gospel, his own people had ceased to be a nation, and could only be referred to by the name commonly used among the Gentiles. In contrast with John’s 68 references to the “Jews” we must place his four references to “Israel” (John i. 31, 49; iii. 10; xii. 13), and Matthew’s twelve references. These are significant numbers, especially as we view them in the light of Israel’s position before and after Acts xxviii.

The Sanhedrin were well within their province when they sent to ask John the Baptist who he was, for they were responsible for the religious life of the people. Seeing that John so emphatically denied that he was the Christ, his questioners ask, “Art thou Elias?” There is an insistent testimony in the Rabbinical writings to the expectation that Elijah would appear just before the advent of the Messiah, an expectation justified by the prophecy of Malachi (Mal. iv. 5). John answers this second enquiry with the words, “I am not”. The deputation then puts one more question, “Art thou that prophet?” This is a reference to the promise fulfilled in Christ Himself. John answers with the one word, “No”. A mere negative, however, would not be a satisfactory answer to take back to the Sanhedrin, and the Jews therefore put their question in another form: “Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself?” To many, alas, such a question would open the door to pride, but John remains true. He begins by saying, “I am a voice”—not even “I am *the* voice” for there is no article—and then he goes on to explain that he is the forerunner promised by Isaiah, and that the One Whose coming he announced was none other than the *Lord*.

This, however, raised further problems in the minds of the Jews. The teaching of the Rabbis was that the world would be restored at the coming of the Messiah, and Kimchi speaks of the Rabbinical tradition that Elijah would so purify the people at his coming that even the illegitimate child would be restored to the congregation. If then

John the Baptist, with his baptism and his new order of things, was neither the Messiah, nor Elijah, nor “that prophet”, by what authority did he baptize? We learn from the account that those who asked the question were “of the Pharisees”, a sect which was most scrupulous regarding ceremonial. Hitherto baptism had been employed when Gentile proselytes were admitted into the commonwealth of Israel, but now John is baptizing Jews as well, and they naturally ask for an explanation. John is only too ready to give the answer. He tells them that his baptism is but an introductory ceremony. Someone infinitely superior to himself was already among them, for Whose advent it was John’s office to prepare.

Following this catechism of John, comes his own spontaneous testimony in verses 29-34. Here we come at once to the heart of the Gospel. At one step we leave the arguments of the Pharisees and their scruples concerning baptism, for the clear and evangelical testimony of verse 29:

“Behold the Lamb of God Which taketh away the sin of the world” (John i. 29).

Here, in one brief, clear-cut sentence is crystallized the supreme purpose of the prologue. It was for this purpose that the Word was made flesh.

“In the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight” (Col. i. 22).

“That through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, even the devil, and deliver” (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

This same purpose, expressed in varied language, is the testimony of prophet, evangelist and apostle alike.

Throughout the sacrificial system of the law of Moses, the offering of a lamb is of constant recurrence. No Jew could forget that at the beginning of every year (Ex. xii. 1) there was the offering of the Passover lamb, and at the beginning and end of each day the sacrifice of a lamb upon the altar. There would be one passage, however, that would be uppermost in their minds when they heard the cry, “Behold the Lamb of God”—the well-known passage in Isa. liii.:

“He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter” (verse 7).

“He shall bear their iniquities” (verse 11).

“He bare the sin of many” (verse 12).

It was John’s testimony that he was the forerunner of the Lord of Isa. xl., and the Lamb of Isa. liii.

The phrase, “That taketh away the sin of the world” is not recorded by the other evangelists. Matthew, for example, says, “He shall save *His people* from their sins”. John, however, rejoices to put on record this early testimony. It also is interesting to note, in passing, that the next occurrence of the word, *kosmos*, “world”, is in John iii. 16.

The title “The Lamb” (*Amnos*) used by John in i. 29 is not found in the other three Gospels. A similar word *Arnion* (“little lamb”) is used in the Revelation, where it occurs as a title of Christ no less than 28 times (4*7). It is never used in the epistles of Paul.

John now reverts to the purpose of his baptizing, and explains that it was appointed, among other things, as a means of identifying the Messiah. Comparing the recorded in Matt. iii. with that of John i. we gather that John had a personal knowledge of the Lord and knew about His birth and His exemplary life. What he did not know, however, until the sign was given was that “Jesus is the Christ”. That sign he saw, and so John the Baptist becomes the first of a long line of witnesses, leading up to the closing testimony of chapter xx.: “*Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*” (John xx. 31).

The significance of the words, “The Spirit descending and remaining on Him”, is explained more fully in John iii. 34. As Alford says:

“We receive Him only *as we can*, only as far as our receptivity extends *by measure*; but He, into the very fullness and infinite capacity of His Divine Being.”

We must now pass on to the second testimony preserved by John, this time a collective witness, given by Andrew, Simon, Philip and Nathaniel. This testimony, however, must be considered as a whole in our next article.

#15. The Witnesses.

The Witness of John, Andrew, Philip and Nathaniel (i. 35-51). pp. 169 - 175

“We have found Him—Messiah, Song of God, King of Israel.”

We have, in John i. 19-51 a testimony given on four consecutive days.

1st day.—The testimony of John to those sent to him from the Sanhedrin.—The Lord, the Coming One, Who was preferred before him (John i. 19-28).

2nd day.—The testimony of John to all who attended.—His baptizing at Bethabara. The Lamb of God. The Son of God. He who baptizeth with holy spirit (John i. 29-34).

3rd day.—The testimony of John and Andrew.—The Lamb of God. The Messiah (John i. 35-42).

4th day.—The testimony of Philip and Nathaniel.—Him of Whom Moses wrote. The Son of God, the Son of man. The King of Israel (John i. 43-51).

We have considered the testimony of John the Baptist on the first and second days: we have now to hear the testimony given by others on the two following days. First let us discover the structure, so that the salient features may be made manifest.

The Testimony of John, Andrew, Philip and Nathaniel (John i. 35-51).

- A | 35. The next day. John and the two disciples. They followed Him.
B1 | 36-39. JOHN'S TESTIMONY. |
 a | 36. The Lamb of God.
 b | 38. Rabbi.
 c | 39. Come and see.
B2 | 40-42. ANDREW'S TESTIMONY. |
 d | 41. Findeth Simon.
 e | 41. We have found the Messiah.
A | 43. The next day. Jesus and Philip. Follow Me.
B2 | 43-46. PHILIP'S TESTIMONY. |
 d | 45. Findeth Nathaniel.
 e | 45. We have found Him.
B1 | 46-51. NATHANIEL'S TESTIMONY. |
 c | 46. Come and see.
 b | 49. Rabbi.
 a | 49-51. Son of God. Son of Man. King of Israel.

The keen speaker or preacher, desirous of giving out the best that the Lord has given him, is often sensitive about repeating himself. We speak feelingly on this matter for we have several times hesitated to go over the ground already traversed, yet, for the sake of some new-comer, we have risked incurring the censure of mere repetition, only to find afterwards that the help directed towards the one was welcome to not a few. Paul has given his testimony to this same thing in Phil. iii. 1, and John the Baptist exemplifies it in the following passage:--

“The next day after John stood, and two of his disciples, and looking upon Jesus as He walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God. And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus” (John i. 35-37).

We do not know whether or not these two disciples had been present the previous day, but if they had the repetition of the testimony seems to have been blessed to them, and if they had not they now had the opportunity of heeding it. John knew that he must decrease, and the movement of his two disciples was for him the beginning of the end. But what a glorious end, to preach away one's disciples so that they become followers of Christ. It seems that our Saviour, seeing them following Him, encouraged them by the enquiry, “What seek ye?” It is salutary that we should be met with this question at the beginning of our discipleship. What are we seeking? What is our quest? What are our motives? Their reply was simple, almost naïve, “Rabbi, where dwellest Thou?” It will be observed that the Apostle here feels called upon parenthetically to interpret for his reader the title of “Rabbi”. This, of itself, indicates the writer's anticipation of his Gospel having a Gentile audience, and a Gentile audience far removed from Jewish influence. Any synagogue-goer would know the meaning of “Rabbi” and even those Gentiles to whom Paul spoke in the synagogue at Antioch would have no need of John's interpretation. When, however, we observe that in this Gospel interpretation of Hebrew or Aramaic terms is customary, it becomes evident that the audience John envisaged

could not have been Jews. Not only is “Rabbi” interpreted, but so also is “Cephas” (i. 42); “Messias” (i. 41); “Siloam” (ix. 7) and “Rabboni” (xx. 16).

Possibly the question “Where dwellest Thou?” covered deeper feelings, but, whatever their degree, the Lord is not One who quenches smoking flax, and He replied by the invitation, “Come and see”. No description is given of the humble abode of the Son of God, but one cannot refrain from thinking of the wonder of those few hours spent beneath that roof with such a teacher. From that abode these two disciples went forth with the conviction that they had found the Messiah. “One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother” (John i. 40). Who was the other, unnamed, disciple? John never names himself in this Gospel: in the ordinary way he would almost certainly have given the names of both disciples. So also we read later in the epistle:--

“And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple; that disciple was known unto the high priest” (John xviii. 15).

“When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He saith unto His mother, Woman behold thy son. Then saith He to the disciple, Behold thy mother. And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home” (John xix. 26, 27).

Again, in John xx. 2, 3, 4, 8 and xxi. 7, 20, 23, 24, we have references to “that disciple”. The last reference, however, leaves no room for doubt: “This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things” (John xxi. 24).

The statement in verse 41, “He first findeth his own brother Simon”, seems to demand the sequel, “and John then found his own brother James”. However, it is to Andrew’s testimony that attention must now be given.

“We have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted the Christ” (John i. 41).

The express object of John’s Gospel is that we may believe that “Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through His name” (John xx. 31). Andrew’s testimony, therefore, is timely, and if we need to be informed on the point, we may learn from the parenthesis that “the Christ” is the Greek interpretation of the Hebrew “Messiah”. We may then discover that the “Messiah” is “the Anointed”, *Mashiach* (Psa. ii. 2), and that this anointing applies to the Prophet (I Kings xix. 16), the Priest (Exod. xxix. 7), and the King (II Sam. ii. 4). The choice of every theme in John’s Gospel, the production of every witness, and the omission of much that is found in other Gospels is made with the view of demonstrating this glorious fact. Andrew’s testimony therefore is directly to the point. Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God. The Lord confirms the faith of the disciples in His Messiahship, by the re-naming of Simon. The name Cephas means “a stone”, and re-naming proved to be prophetic (Matt. xvi. 18).

We must now turn to Philip’s testimony. We do not know how Philip became acquainted with the Lord; whether he also had heard John the Baptist; or whether his was a personal call, but we are informed that Philip was of the same city as Andrew and Peter, a circumstance of itself likely to form a bond between them. However that may be,

the Lord would go into Galilee, and He wanted disciples, and Philip was called. Before leaving for Galilee, Philip emulates Andrew's example, and finds Nathaniel, saying:

“We have found Him of Whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph” (John i. 45).

Instead of using the title of “the Messiah” Philip refers to the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy that pointed Him out. It is unjustifiable to magnify the added words, “the son of Joseph” into a text from which to discuss the validity of the virgin birth. The Gospel of Matthew, which clearly sets Joseph gives the genealogy of the Saviour through “Joseph, the husband of Mary”, and Luke who gives very explicit information about the virgin birth of Christ, says in Luke iii. 23: “And Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, being as was supposed, the son of Joseph.” Mary, herself, who certainly knew the facts concerning the birth of Christ, did not hesitate to say to Him, “Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing” (Luke ii. 48). Philip's remark therefore cannot rightly be made into a theological term. He said what all said, “the son of Joseph”, for such He was “in law”.

The testimony of Nathaniel gathers up what has been distributed among the witnesses, and brings the opening set of testimony to a climax. Like Thomas, Nathaniel was not easily convinced. He seized on the reference to “Nazareth”, saying, “Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?” (John i. 46). This was the attitude of mind which prompted the rejoinder of the officers of the chief priest: “Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet” (John vii. 52). The fact that John records the opinion of Nathaniel regarding Nazareth, and the opinion of the leaders of the Jews regarding Galilee [and we must remember that Christ was called, “The prophet of Nazareth of Galilee” (Matt. xxi. 11)], suggests that he was here meeting an objection.

Some who knew the prophecy concerning Bethlehem may not have known how it could be reconciled with the reference to Nazareth. Here it is faced, though not explained. Possibly the emphasis on Bethlehem fits the kingdom purpose of Matthew, and the emphasis on “Galilee of the nations” and despised Nazareth, fits the world-wide purpose of John's Gospel. Apparently Philip did not debate the matter with Nathaniel, but used the argument that had proved irresistible with Andrew and John, “Come and see”. As Nathaniel approached the Lord, the Saviour said: “Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile” (John i. 47). Had there been a trace of guile in Nathaniel's character he would have affected a little modesty and disclaimed such an unqualified description of his character as flattering, but, genuinely guileless, he accepts the description as true, nevertheless asks in astonishment how the Lord could thus know his character. The answer revealed that he stood before a Prophet: “Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee” (John i. 48).

It was not unusual for some such place of seclusion to be sought for prayer, and the fact that the Lord had knowledge not only of Nathaniel's character, but of his private devotions, brought him to his great confession: “Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel” (John i. 49).

There is something in Nathaniel's sudden conversion that reminds one of Thomas, and the very reply of the Lord to Nathaniel has something reminiscent in it of the scene in that room when the disciples were assembled described in John xx. 26-29.

“Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig-tree believest thou? Thou shalt see greater things than these. And He said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man” (John i. 50, 51).

“Verily” is the translation of the word *Amen*, a word brought over from the Hebrew into the Greek. John is the only one that records these double Amens of the Lord, of which there are no less than twenty-five occurrences, and we feel that we cannot omit presenting to the reader the complete list so that, should time permit, he may be able to weigh them over in the balance of the sanctuary.

The Double Verities (Amens) of John's Gospel.

- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Open heaven. Angels ascending and descending (i. 51).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Without new birth, cannot see kingdom (iii. 3).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Unless born of water and spirit, no entrance (iii. 5).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. We speak that we do know (iii. 11).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. The Son can do nothing of Himself (v. 19).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. He that heareth hath life (v. 24).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. The dead shall hear and live (v. 25).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Ye seek Me because ye did eat (vi. 26).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Moses gave you not that bread from heaven (vi. 32).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life (vi. 47).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Except ye eat drink no life (vi. 53).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Whosoever commits sin is its servant (viii. 34).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. If keep My saying, never see death (viii. 51).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Before Abraham was, I am (viii. 58).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Thieves climb up some other way (x. 1).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. I am the door of the sheep (x. 7).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Except wheat die abideth alone (xii. 24).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Servant is not greater than his lord (xiii. 16).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. He that receiveth whom I send, receiveth Me (xiii. 20).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. One of you shall betray Me (xiii. 21).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. The cock shall not crow, before denial (xiii. 38).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. The believer shall do greater works (xiv. 12).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Ye shall weep but it will turn to joy (xvi. 20).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. Whatever you ask in My Name, The Father will give (xvi. 23).
- Verily, verily, I say unto you. When young guidest self when old another guide thee (xxi. 18).

Unless one can bring to the task unlimited time and patience, and has available unlimited space, analysis of this formidable list is doomed to failure. That these sentences, so solemnly introduced, are of the greatest weight, we have no doubt, and we shall better appreciate their contribution to the great testimony of the whole, if we note their place and association as the story of this Gospel unfolds. We therefore keep the list before us for future reference. There is no reason, of course, why the reader should not make his own analysis. He will soon discover that these statements of our Lord have to

do with life and death, the kingdom and service, or the Lord's Own relationship with the Father and the believer. For example, he may observe that the fourteenth reference is the great "I am" passage (viii. 58). So far as the present series is concerned, however, we have enough in hand to cope with the first of these double Amens, the study of which will more than occupy our available space.

When attempting to show the way in which John refers to Christ as the Word, and the Word made flesh, we said, speaking of the philosophical use of *logos* and the failure of human wisdom,

"As we realize the immensity of the gulf that yawned between the far-off Platonist God, and the things of time and sense, we may perhaps better understand why the Lord used the figure of Jacob's ladder as representing Himself in John i. 51" (Vol. xix., p.98).

At the top, as it were, of Nathaniel's opening confession stands "The Son of God". At the bottom stands the Lord's own assumption, "The Son of man". Jacob, before he became "an Israelite indeed" (for he had manifested considerable guile), was vouchsafed the vision of Bethel.

"He dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And behold the Lord stood above it" (Gen. xxviii. 12, 13).

The Rabbis have allowed their fancy full rein in connection with Jacob's ladder, and while it would be waste of space to give five quotations from their speculations, their prevalence would make the Lord's allusion to Jacob's ladder quite reasonable in Nathaniel's ears. The bringing of heaven and earth together, the placing of the Son of God at the one extreme and the Son of man at the other, is perhaps the most important feature of the imagery.

With the testimony of Nathaniel the opening witness to the person and work of Christ comes to a close. We now approach the great central portion of the Gospel, chapters ii. 1 - xxi. 14, and the witness we shall there hear will be not only that of men, but of miracle; not only the testimony of fallible flesh and blood, but of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. To this great theme we must now address ourselves, and we hope that in doing so many hours of delightful fellowship will be ours in tracing the testimony of the eight signs up to their evangelical conclusion, "Life in His name" (John xx. 31).

“In all their affliction, He was afflicted.”

[THIS SHORT SERIES IS INTENDED TO LEAD THE BELIEVER TO SEE THAT THE “FELLOWSHIP OF HIS SUFFERINGS” IMPLIES THAT GOD HIMSELF SHARES, IN A VERY REAL SENSE, THE SUFFERING THAT IS THE INEVITABLE CONSEQUENCE OF THE FALL OF MAN, AND THUS TO RECEIVE STRENGTH TO ENDURE AND TO TRIUMPH.]

#1. pp. 190 - 192

If the God we worship be the God of the theologian and the philosophers, a Being Who is absolute and unconditioned, then much could be advanced to prove that suffering or feeling of any sort cannot be a divine experience. This subject, under the title “Is God passible?” (capable of feeling or suffering), has caused much heartburning in theological centres. If the God we worship finds the express image of His Person in His beloved Son, if the God we love be “The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”, if the God of grace calls Himself “The God of Jacob”, then no proof is needed to persuade His believing children that He does sympathize, feel, and indeed share, the groan of a creation subjected to vanity. Any attempt adequately to deal with so vast a theme would demand that the whole of the Scriptures be laid under tribute. Such an enquiry is quite beyond the intention of these short articles. Our immediate object is to minister to those who are suffering in mind, body or estate, and we feel that the aspect of truth we here wish to present is one well calculated to reach this end.

When brought face to face with suffering, especially on the scale that now confronts the world, a very great number of believers are beset with questions. They fear to attribute any feeling to the great I AM, yet find it difficult to believe that He can be any way “moved” by human distress. Unless “love” in the Godhead is something not only greater but essentially different from any and every exhibition of human love, then the great truth that “God is love”, contains a full answer to the problem, and it seems to us that all doubts in the matter must therefore vanish as mist before the sun. This, however, is too sweeping a manner in which to deal with sensitive consciences. We must accordingly descend to details; we must present our proofs; we must show our reasons; above all, we must endeavour to show the teaching of the Scriptures on this great subject.

The text which we have chosen for our title, expresses the point we wish to make in this series, viz., “In all their affliction, He was afflicted” (Isa. lxiii. 9). To break off at this point and raise the question of correct readings, Hebrew MSS and similar subjects may appear to be an uncalled for academic intrusion. But as there will always be the possibility of an objector raising the matter, we must in this introductory article consider the validity of our text.

The R.V. of Isa. lxiii. 9 reads, as a marginal alternative:

“Another reading is, In all their adversity, He was no Adversary.”

The Companion Bible has the following note:

“Hebrew text reads: ‘In all their adversity (He was) no adversary’. But some codices, with two early printed editions, read as text of A.V.”

Bird’s translation and note are:

“In all their affliction, His was the conflict.”

“**Note.**—The received version, based on the *keri* (that which is “read”, as an alternative to that which was “written” *kethib*), seems here in substance the best, and yields a most emphatic sense.”

This passage looks at the problem of affliction, not so much from the human as from the divine standpoint. No problem is raised by the words “all their affliction”, for man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward. No, the wonder of the text is in the remainder of the passage, namely, that in it all, He, too, was afflicted. Isaiah is referring to Israel’s early history, and his words bring to mind a passage in Exodus. While it is not a *verbal* parallel, because a different Hebrew word is used, yet to limit the description of human sorrow to the dimension of one word would not be true criticism but prejudice.

“And the Lord said, I have surely *seen* the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have *heard* their cry by reason of their taskmasters; *for I know their sorrows*” (Exod. iii. 7).

This “knowledge” (Heb. *yada*) is most intimate in its character (Gen. iv. 1); it is the result of experience (Exod. vi. 7; vii. 5); and its personal and experimental nature is most blessedly set forth in the work of the Saviour. He was

“A man of sorrows, and *acquainted* (Heb. *yada*) with grief” (Isa. liii. 3).

“By His *knowledge* (Heb. *daath*, substantive of *yada*) shall My righteous Servant justify many, *for he shall bear* their iniquities” (Isa. liii. 11).

When Jehovah said “I know their sorrows”, He expressed a knowledge deeper than that of mere observation. It was the knowledge of personal acquaintance. Isaiah makes the Saviour’s “knowledge” synonymous with “bearing iniquity”.

To the words of our text, Isaiah adds: “And the Angel of His Presence saved them.” This “Angel of the Presence” speaks precious things of fellowship, of a God near at hand and not afar off, of One Who, though the Almighty Creator, was yet One Who could “grieve” over the waywardness and misery of His creatures.

Let us take comfort from the thought, that if our hearts are distressed at the folly and the wickedness that surround us, we see but a fraction of the sorrow of a groaning creation that is “known”, experimentally known in its entirety, by the Lord of Glory. We hope to return to this theme again and again, until the wonder and the blessedness of it irradiates our tears with, as it were, its rainbow hues.

The Legacy of Peace

#1. The Meaning of Shalom.

pp. 42 - 44

The inner portion of the Gospel according to John (chapters xiii. - xviii.) has always been exceedingly precious to all Christians, quite irrespective of their dispensational position. In these chapters we have our Lord's last words to His disciples before He went forth to betrayal and death; and among them what we may describe as His "legacy of peace":

"Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you" (John xiv. 27).

Bloomfield states that both the words used here—"leave" (*aphiemi*) and "give" (*didomi*)—are "usually conjoined in the wording of a will". This, therefore, we may regard as our Lord's bequest to His disciples before He left this world to go to the Father. The subject of peace is always a "word in season", and without it no other blessing can be enjoyed.

There is not much agreement among lexicographers and etymologists as to the derivation of the Greek word *eirene*, but this is unimportant as we have already learned that the true significance of any doctrinal term is best discovered from the Hebrew Scriptures, for the meaning of most doctrinal terms was fixed centuries before the N.T. was written. We therefore turn to the O.T. to learn what we can of this legacy of peace bequeathed by the Lord to His own.

Shalom, the Hebrew word "peace", is derived from *shalam*, "to make whole, complete, perfect". There is a depth of meaning in the Hebrew word that is not expressed in the English translation. The modern meaning of the word "peace" is largely concerned with "tranquility" or "quietness", without paying much attention to whether or not the grounds of this tranquility are sound and just. Consequently much that passes for "peace" is unworthy of the name, and vanishes when most needed, because it has no solid basis. To gain some idea of the Scriptural meaning of the word, let us look at the way *shalam* is used, so that we may be able to appreciate more fully the Lord's legacy of love.

In Exod. xxi. and xxii., we have a number of judgments which Moses sets before the people in connection with the settling of disputes. In chapter xxi. we have the case of a man who opens a pit, and fails to cover it, and so causes the loss of an ox or an ass. The judgment is that "the owner of the pit shall make it good (*shalam*)" (Exod. xxi. 34). Another case is that of an ox, hurt so badly by another man's ox that it dies. If it was known that the ox was dangerous and the owner had neglected to keep it in, the judgment is that "he shall surely pay (*shalam*) ox for ox" (Exod. xxi. 36). So also in Exod. xxii. 1, "He shall *restore*"; xxii. 3, "He shall make *full restitution*"; and, further on in the chapter: "restore", "pay", "make good" (Exod. xxii. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15).

The basic meaning of “peace” is unmistakable. Peace is impossible without “making amends”. “The work of righteousness shall be peace.” This matter is so vital that we trust the reader will not begrudge the time spent in making this essential feature even clearer. Let us consider one or two other passages.

In Lev. v. 16 we read: “He shall *make amends* for the harm that he hath done.” Here again the word is *shalam*. We also find it translated “requite” in Judges i. 7, “finish” in I Kings ix. 25, “recompense” in Isa. lxxv. 6, and “perfect” in Isa. xlii. 19. As an adjective *shalem* is translated “full” (Gen. xv. 16), “whole” (Deut. xxvii. 6), and “just” (Prov. xi. 1).

Turning back to John xvi., we find that the Saviour adds to His bequest the words: “Not as the world giveth, give I unto you” (John xvi. 27). It was the custom of the world to include the word “peace” in its salutations. Heathen kings used this form of salutation, as we find in Ezra and Daniel (Ezra iv. 17; v. 7; Dan. iv. 1; vi. 25), but it was not in their power to establish true peace either among men, or with God. True peace is the result of satisfactory settlement, and when used in connection with God and man necessitates the sacrificial work of Christ. This we must look into later, but before closing the present article, which is mainly concerned with the true meaning of “peace”, let us see what words are used to indicate its opposite, so that we may obtain as full a view of the word as possible.

In the first place, “peace” is naturally contrasted with “war”:

“I am for *peace*; but when I speak, they are for war” (Psa. cxx. 7).
“I came not to send *peace*, but a sword” (Matt. x. 34).

It is also contrasted with evil, and compared with good:

“Depart from evil and do good: seek *peace* and pursue it” (Psa. xxxiv. 14).
“Thoughts of *peace*, and not of evil” (Jer. xxix. 11).

“Peace” is also placed in contrast with “anxiety”:

“Be anxious for nothing and the *peace* of God shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus” (Phil. iv. 6, 7).

Moreover, “peace” enables the believer to endure without being offended (Matt. xi. 2-6):

“Great *peace* have they which love Thy law, and nothing shall offend them” (Psa. cxix. 165).

In our next article we must consider more definitely the grounds of our peace. We know enough already, however, to be able to praise God for a peace that is something more than quietness, resulting from a finished work, and a settlement that satisfies all the demands of righteousness.

#2. The enmity that necessitates peace.

pp. 72 - 76

Wherever there is found the necessity for peace, there must also be some phase of enmity. We have learned something of the basic meaning of “peace” by examining the Hebrew word *shalom*. Let us now add to our understanding and appreciation of this wonderful legacy, by considering some of the references to enmity that are to be found in Scripture.

The Hebrew word for “enemy” is *oyeb*, which becomes *ebah*, “enmity”, and gives the name *Job*, “hated”. The story of *Job* is the story of peace triumphing over enmity, a peace that “restores” and “makes amends” as the sequel so plainly shows. The Greek words for “enemy”, *echthros*, and “enmity”, *echthra* are of uncertain derivation. The root word is probably a compound of *echo*, “to have”, and *thrano*, “to shatter, bruise, enfeeble”. It will be seen how fully the word *shalom* answers all the awful implications of its opposite, whether expressed by the Hebrew *ebah*, by the story of *Job*, or by the thought of destruction that appears to be resident in the Greek word.

It will be necessary to have some check upon our search for references to “enmity”, “enemies”, “war”, “sword”, “strife” and the like, for these would be too numerous to deal with, without some selection. Let us look, therefore, at “enmity” as it comes into relation with “peace”, and especially as it comes into touch with the “God of peace”.

“The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly” (Rom. xvi. 20).

Without the illumination already received, the idea of associating the God of *peace* with “bruising” would sound incongruous. We have learned, however, that peace does not mean simply quietness; it means settlement, completeness, perfectness, and the God of peace will most surely wage war with all that is contrary to His glorious goal.

The enmity of Rom. xvi. 20 reminds us of the “enmity” that we find in Gen. iii. 15:

“I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

The essential meaning of “peace” prepares us for the revelation of Scripture, that in the procuring of peace there must be a “bruising”:

“He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him” (Isa. liii. 5).

The Lord could not, however, be holden of death, and so Isa. liii. continues:

“When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand” (Isa. liii. 10).

This leads us to the second reference to the “God of peace”:

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect” (Heb. xiii. 20, 21).

Not only must the “God of peace” meet the enmity of the Serpent; He must also overcome death and the grave (for death is an “enemy”: I Cor. xv. 26). The “God of peace” must carry the work of its blessed conclusion and “make perfect in every good work to do His will” those who, by reason of the alienation and enmity of sin, knew not the way of peace nor the paths of righteousness. Nothing short of resurrection glory, with its complete satisfaction, can satisfy the God of peace, and so, to the testimony of Rom. xvi. and Heb. xiii. must be added that of I Thess. v.:

“The God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Thess. v. 23 R.V.).

We have quoted the R.V. here because of its translation “be preserved entire”. The A.V., however, by its double use of “wholly” and “whole” keeps closer to the actual wording. The first word “wholly” is a translation of *holoteles*, from *holos*, “all” and *teleo*, “to complete”. What a wonderful expansion of the word *shalom*, with its underlying thought of perfectness and completion. The second word, translated “whole” in the A.V. and “entire” in the R.V. is *holokleros*, from *holos*, “all”, and *kleros*, a “part” or “share”. This word is used by Josephus to describe the “perfectness” of the sacrificial victim and in Acts iii. 16 with reference to the lame man’s “perfect soundness”. It is also used in James i. 4 of that spiritual integrity that “wants nothing”.

In I Thess. v. 23, the order of the words is important—“spirit, and soul and body”. This order was inverted at the fall of man. The spirit lusted after wisdom, the soul lusted after that which was pleasant to the eyes, the body sought satisfaction. The yielding to the temptation placed the spirit in a position subordinate to the soul, and the soul to the body. The law of sin is “in the members”, and still wars against the law of the mind. Man is not viewed as complete and entire until spirit, soul and body shall have attended the full perfectness of resurrection standing in Christ. Such a doctrine is, of course, a complete denial of spiritism, which discounts the body and has no room for a physical resurrection, and is also a rebuke to those who set aside the soul as something undesirable and evil. The soul is as necessary as the body, though both may be instruments of evil if allowed to usurp the place of the spirit. The Lord Himself spoke of loving “the Lord thy God with all thy soul”, and it would be a foolish criticism of the Creator’s wisdom to set aside one third of the perfect man. It is true that the exercises of the soul in such things as poetry and music are not “spiritual”, neither is the eating of one’s breakfast; yet both are normal and both can be done to the glory of the Lord. I Thess. v. 23 reveals the God of peace triumphantly undoing the evil and discord introduced into the constitution of man by the enmity of Eden. The title is a fitting one, when once the true meaning and goal of “peace” is perceived.

There is a further reference to this title of the Lord in Phil. iv.

“Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise; think on these things. Those things which ye have both learned and received and heard and seen in me, do, and the *God of peace* shall be with you” (Phil. iv. 8, 9).

The clause “if there be any virtue” is misleading. The passage should be translated “*whatever* virtue there is” (See Rom. xiii. 9 and I Cor. iii. 14: “*Whatsoever* other commandment there be”, and “*Whosoever’s* work shall remain”). Also, the word “think” in this passage is *logizomai*, which is rendered “count” in Phil. iii. 13 and “reckon”, “count”, and “impute” in Rom. iv. 3-6. Do not let evil and unlovely things occupy your attention, the Apostle seems to say, but rather let that which is virtuous count with you—and if such a general injunction is difficult to grasp, remember my own conduct as an example. Wherever it was possible, the Apostle bestowed praise (See, for example, his introduction to I Corinthians). Wherever he could, he exercised that power of love “that believeth all things”. He was not quick to mark offence, he did not possess an eagle eye for faults, and he inculcated the grace that “esteemeth others better than self”. Fellowship with the God of peace will result from such an attitude of mind, and is precious beyond words.

It should be kept in mind that this passage in Phil. iv. is the working out of the exhortation and example of Phil. ii. 4-11, where the “mind that was in Christ Jesus” is the opposite of that mind which was in the Serpent in Gen. iii. The One Who thought it not a thing to be grasped at to be on equality with God, but humbled himself, is contrasted with the one who aspired to be like God, who tempted man with the same temptation, and now seeks to exalt himself to his final undoing.

Another phase of enmity that is countered by the presence of the God of peace is found in Rom. xv. 33: “Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.” To appreciate the teaching of this section we must read from verse 8, and to assist the reader in the understanding of its essential features we give below an abbreviated structure:

Romans xv. 8 - 33.

The Acceptableness of the Gentiles.

- A | 8, 9. Christ, a minister of the circumcision.
Gentiles might glorify God.
- B | 13, 14. THE GOD OF HOPE.
- A | 15-32. Paul, a minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles.
Offering of the Gentiles.
 - (a) acceptable to God (16).
 - (b) acceptable to Jewish believers (31).
- B | 33. THE GOD OF PEACE.

Through the grace of God, the Gentiles were now “acceptable to God, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost” (Rom. xv. 16), but the Apostle is in great doubt as to the attitude of

the leaders of the church at Jerusalem. He asks for prayer, that “the service which he had for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints”. Only when their full acceptance in the Lord was mutually recognized would the “enmity” that so evidently existed as a middle-wall between Jewish and Gentile believers be removed. How fitting, then, that the God of peace should form the closing theme. The true sequence of Rom. xv. is given in Eph. ii. 11-19, where this enmity and division between Jew and Gentile is likened to the middle-wall of partition, which has been destroyed and taken away, “the both” being made one, so making peace. It hardly seems right to speak of so great a theme with such brevity, but it must be remembered that our space is limited and our object here is not so much to give detailed exposition as to show the various phases of “enmity” that have given place and shall give place to this many-faceted “peace”.

We must refer to one more passage before we conclude this article—in Col. i. The enmity and alienation here are obvious, and once again are clearly associated with “peace”.

“And having made peace by the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself and you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled” (Col. i. 20, 21).

We have made no mention of the relation between “peace” and “enemies” in Rom. v. 1-11, nor to the enmity of the carnal mind which is placed in contrast with “life and peace” in Rom. viii. If we have demonstrated something of the nature of the “enmity” and thereby indicated something of the character and fullness of “peace”, we have accomplished our immediate purpose.

Perhaps a summary will be useful, as there has been a considerable amount of detail to be kept in mind.

- (1) The God of peace will deal with the enmity introduced in Gen. iii.
- (2) The God of peace has dealt with the enmity of sin and death, both in the person of the Lord, and in all His redeemed children.
- (3) The God of peace will accomplish perfect restoration, when man is raised “entire”, spirit and soul and body.
- (4) The Lord, as the God of peace, in association with the God of hope, is concerned with the breaking down of all enmity among the redeemed themselves, likening such enmity to a middle-wall of partition, the canceling of which is linked with the “both” being made “one”, so making “peace”.
- (5) Those who have fellowship with the God of peace, must have “the mind that was in Christ Jesus”, a direct repudiation of the mind of the usurper who aspired to be “as God”.

To all who have been reconciled by the death of Christ, and who “seek peace and ensue it”, comes the blessing of II Thess. iii. 16, and what more can we ask till traveling days are done?

“Now the Lord of peace Himself give you peace always by all means, The Lord be with you all.”

#3. “Peace, and at such a time.”
In the world---tribulation; in Me---peace.
pp. 103 - 106

In the Book of Ezra there are several letters by various people, and it is in these letters that we meet the somewhat curious expression that we have used in the title of the present article—“at such a time”.

“And at such a time” (Ezra iv. 10, 11).

“Peace and at such a time” (Ezra iv. 17).

“Unto Ezra perfect peace, and at such a time” (Ezra vii. 12).

The Chaldee participle which is translated “at such a time” is possibly used much in the same way as a business letter refers to the date when it is written. It is almost impossible to say what was the origin of the expression. The translators of the LXX version ignore it, while the R.V. renders it in each case: “and so forth.” We are, however, very remotely concerned with the expression itself, and have simply adopted it because of its suggestiveness in English. “Peace, and *at such a time*”!

We may be pardoned, we trust, for taking this phrase out of its context in order to provide the believer with words that express so fully the wonder of the gift of peace. We have peace *now*—“at such a time”—with enmity, strife and perplexity all around, and a presage of possible disaster in the hearts of the stoutest. We shall have peace *then*—“at such a time”—when the day of judgment opens, and sinners shall be judged by Him Who sits on the throne. We shall have peace *then*—“at such a time”—when He shall make all things new. Peace in the glory, peace in view of judgment, peace in the midst of strife—“Peace, *and at such a time*”. Let us look at these blessed facts a little more closely.

PEACE. AND AT SUCH A TIME—NOW, IN THIS WORLD.

“Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid” (John xiv. 27).

“These things I have spoken unto you, that in Me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world” (John xvi. 33).

The whole context of these words of cheer is one of fear and trouble on the one hand, and comfort and peace on the other. Nothing can make up for a full reading of the chapters concerned, but the following abbreviated structure of John xiv. may be suggestive:

John xiv. 1 - 31.

- A | 1. LET NOT YOUR HEART BE TROUBLED.—Ye believe.
B | 2-7. | I would have told you.
I go. I come again.
C | 8-14. The manifestation of the Father.
D | 15-20. | The other Comforter. Truth.
The world cannot receive.
C | 21-24. The manifestation of the Lord.
D | 25-27. | The other Comforter. Peace.
Not as the world giveth.
A | 27-28. LET NOT YOUR HEART BE TROUBLED.—Ye heard.
B | 28-31. | I go. I come again.
Now I have told you.

It is evident that the Lord is here ministering comfort to His own, who are to be left behind in the world. He tells them that if He goes away He will come again, and that during His absence the Holy Spirit will act as another Comforter. It is with this promise that His gift and legacy of peace is closely associated.

The source of the disciples' anxiety is most evidently the opposition of the world, which looms largely in these chapters. After referring to the world in a negative way in John xiv. 17, 19, 22 and 27, the record continues in verse 30: "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me." After a blessed interlude, referring once more to the believer's intimate nearness to the Lord, chapter xv. takes up the subject of the "world" again, and this time speaks of its hatred:

"If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you he that hateth Me, hateth My Father also They hated Me without a cause" (John xv. 18, 19, 23, 25).

Summing up the opposition of the world on the one hand, and the comfort and strength ready for the believer's every time of need, on the other, the Saviour says, in verse 33:

"These things I have spoken unto you, that in Me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 33).

"In the world" and "in Me"—these two phrases represent the two spheres of the present life.

The victory is already ours, and the peace that follows victory is also ours. The prince of this world has been judged, and we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. Truly we, and all of like precious faith, can say, "Peace—*and at such a time!*"

Let us now go back again to xiv. 27 and observe the threefold description of this peace that comforts and conquers.

- (1) Peace I leave with you:
- (2) My peace I give unto you:
- (3) Not as the world giveth, give I unto you.

It was customary in New Testament times at meeting or at parting, to wish one's friends "peace", and we find that the Apostles often included it in the salutations and concluding words of their epistles. There are only three epistles, out of the twenty-one in the New Testament, where this form of salutation does not occur at the beginning. Our Lord also uses the same greeting, but with deeper and fuller significance. He follows the greeting of "peace" which He "leaves" with them as His legacy, by giving it another and greater commendation—He calls it "My peace". In this section of the gospel the Lord speaks of other things that were His. In John xiv. 11 and xvi. 13 we read of "My joy"; in xv. 9 "My love"; in xvii. 24 "My glory"; and in xiv. 15 "My commandments". It was the special work of the Comforter to "receive of Mine, and to show it unto you" (John xvi. 14). Who can hope to fathom the depths of peace enjoyed by the Son of God, even while suffering and persecution were His daily lot? A glimpse, perhaps, is given in Matt. xi., when His rejection begins to become manifest, and He looks up to the Father and says: "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight" (Matt. xi. 26).

Just as the Lord was at perfect peace, though hated by the world around Him, so the believer, being in the will of God ("My commandments"), may know the steady assurance of the Divine approval ("My peace"), and exult in the consciousness of this living union ("My joy"), and all this in spite of external conditions, which, if unmatched by grace, would inspire fear and overwhelm with tribulation and hatred.

In our first article we looked at some of the contrastive words that are used with peace. One of these was the word "offend":

"Great peace have they which love Thy law, and nothing shall offend them"
(Psa. cxix. 165).

This blessedness, the blessedness of an unoffended spirit, is found in the peace that the Lord gives, for in John xvi. we read:

"These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service" (John xvi. 1, 2).

If the world hate and persecute, the believer who is taught of God "marvels not" (I John iii. 13), but it does tend to shake one's confidence and disturb one's peace, when fellow-believers follow the same methods, and apparently feel that they "do God service" thereby. It is a strength to realize that the Saviour Himself walked that path, and that when He said, "My peace I give unto you", it was a peace which He Himself enjoyed when surrounded by a hostile world. While He was with the disciples He could shield them Himself; now that He is at the right hand of God, he helps them through the ministry of the "other Comforter".

Then further, the Lord says: “Not as the world giveth, give I unto you.” We live in a day when we hear on every hand the words “peace, peace” when there is no peace. However earnest the men of the world may be, however much the nations may reach agreement, true peace is beyond their grasp, and is not in their power to give. The world cannot make a settlement for its sin, and apart from that, peace is impossible. But what the world could not and cannot do, the Lord Himself has accomplished, and it is for this reason that He can give in a way that is “not as the world giveth”.

“Jesus stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had so said, *He showed unto them* His hands and His side” (John xx. 19, 20).

It will perhaps be wise for us to pause here for the time being. These few articles do not by any means exhaust even the references to peace in the New Testament, quite apart from dealing with the many aspects that peace presents. We may perhaps return to the subject later, but rather than hold back what might be “a word in season” we pass on the message contained in these three articles to our readers, hoping that the comfort and strength which this peace can supply may be theirs abundantly.

The Mystery Manifested.

#1. Musterion: a secret that necessitates manifestation.

pp. 65 - 67

The burden of our ministry for the past thirty years has been an echo, however faint, of the words of the Lord's prisoner: "to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery" (Eph. iii. 9, R.V.). The very fullness of the subject itself demands repeated examination and restatement, while the passage of time and the addition of new readers, make it imperative that this central feature of our testimony shall be kept to the fore. Knowing the joy of meeting afresh "things old" and being sure that patient and prayerful study will always result in the discovery of "things new" in this rich mine of truth, those of our readers who are acquainted with the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the dispensation of the mystery will be among the first to welcome such a series.

Our first enquiry will be into the meaning and relation of the two words "mystery" and "manifest".

"Mystery" is the Anglicized form of the Greek *musterion*, and consequently is rather a transliteration than a translation. It has been in our language so long that in the course of centuries it has developed meanings and connections of its own. If therefore we would understand the scriptural usage and meaning of the word we must go behind all these derived meanings. For example, *musterion* is derived from *muo*, to close, to shut, e.g., the lips, the eyes, and so preserve a secret. In the days of the Apostles and for long before the Christian era, the mysteries, *ta musteria*, referred to secret politics and religious doctrines, with their "initiations", and spoke of those who had advanced in knowledge and those who were "perfect"; they were accompanied by obscene rites and are among the things that it is not meet should be named among us. These were Satanic travesties, for as surely as there is in the Word "the mystery of *godliness*" so surely do we learn that there is also "the mystery of *iniquity*". It is not for us to probe the depths of Satan, but to confine our investigations to higher and purer lines of enquiry.

We will first turn our attention to the occurrences of the word *musterion* in biblical Greek, i.e., Greek translation of the O.T. and Greek apocryphal writings before Christ.

It is only in the book of Daniel that the LXX uses the word. There it occurs several times, being translated in the A.V. by "secret". Other translators of the O.T. into Greek, namely, Theodotion and Symmachus, use the word but four times.

"Hast thou known *the secret* of God" (Job xv. 8).

"*The secret* of the Lord is with them that fear Him" (Psalm. xxv. 14).

"A talebearer revealeth *secrets*" (Prov. xx. 19).

"My leanness" Margin. "Heb. "My *secret*" (Isa. xxiv. 16).

These occurrences confirm the LXX translation of the word in Daniel, and indicate the primary idea of a mystery, or secret, but not necessarily anything mysterious in the modern sense of the word.

The word is of frequent use in the Apocrypha. *Ecclesiasticus* uses it of the secrets of private life in such statements as “Whoso discovereth *secrets* loseth his credit” (xxvii. 16). *Wisdom* uses it in connection with heathen sacrifices and rites: “They slew their children in sacrifices, or used *secret* ceremonies.” But the most frequent use of *musterion* is in relation to secrets of state, such as the plans and purposes of a king: “It is good to keep close the *secret* of a king” (*Tobit* xii. 7). Here we have a statement that approximates to the words of Matt. xiii., “The *mysteries* of the Kingdom of Heaven”, for the marginal note in the English translation of *Tobit* says, “*The secrets of the Kingdom*” as in the Hebrew.

In *Judith* we read that there was a rumour in the house of the King of Assyria that he would “avenge himself on all the earth”. He called together all his officers and nobles “and communicated with them his *secret* counsel (*to musterion tes boules*, ii. 1, 2). This passage is helpful in appreciating the expression in Eph. i. 9, “the *mystery* of His will” (*to musterion tou thelematos*), where however the purpose is not one of vengeance on all the earth, but of a dispensation of grace beyond dreams. The precision of this statement of Eph. i. 9 will be better appreciated when it is examined in its context. At the moment we are confining our attention to the usage of the word itself.

In *II Maccabees* the word is used of the betrayal of the secret plans of the Jews to their enemy, who because of their persecutions resorted to stratagems.

“Rhodocus, who was in the Jews’ host, disclosed the *secrets* to the enemies” (xiii. 21).

Before the N.T. was written therefore, the word “mystery” had a definite meaning among the readers of the Greek O.T. and Apocrypha. That meaning was “a secret”, generally “a secret purpose”, and at times “a secret purpose because of an enemy”. This meaning must be kept in mind when we find the word in the Gospels, the Epistles, or the Apocalypse. Now the essence of a secret is that it is known only to one person, and therefore unknowable to any other by any process of reasoning. It must therefore ever remain a secret unless revealed by the possessor of the secret.

This leads us to the other word in our title “The *Mystery Manifested*”. Before the Apostle could make manifest the secret counsel of the Most High, it must be made known to him, by *revelation*. The O.T. Scriptures do not contain “the secret”, for Eph. iii. 9 tells us that it was “hid in God”, while Col. i. 26 says that the mystery was “hid from ages and generations”. Not only do the O.T. Scriptures not contain this “secret”, but it is not found in the Gospels, nor even in the early epistles of Paul. The passages in Eph. iii. and Col. i. already quoted assure us that this mystery was “revealed” to Paul only when he had become the “prisoner of Jesus Christ”, and through him it was “made manifest” to His saints. It follows therefore that the mystery and its manifestation will constitute the essence of Paul’s prison ministry, and consequently we hope in this series to be of help to all who seek to know “what is the dispensation of the mystery”.

#2. A group of epistles that manifest the mystery. pp. 97 - 99

The reader who is looking for help in the understanding of the mystery is directed to a series of articles entitled "The Mystery. Its meaning, message and ministry", which appeared in Volume XVIII. We do not propose retraversing the ground there covered, although naturally some of the features of that series will come before us for further consideration. In the present series the subject is the *manifestation* of the mystery, rather than the mystery itself, and it is assumed that the reader is already acquainted with:--

- (1) The twofold character of the Acts (see Vol. XVIII, p. 33).
- (2) Paul's twofold ministry, especially his prison ministry (Vol. XVIII, p. 49).
- (3) Acts xxviii. as the dispensational boundary (Vol. XVIII, p. 72).

The prison epistles themselves are the one great means of manifesting the mystery to us to-day. We are independent of the opinions and interpretations of men, for in these prison epistles we find all that has been revealed on the subject and, consequently, just so far as we comprehend their teaching, so far, and no further, shall we comprehend the mystery itself.

We must not assume that all readers are sure which of Paul's epistles may be denominated "prison epistles". For their sakes, therefore, we give below the names of these epistles, together with the internal evidence they contain that they are of prison origin.

There are five epistles written from prison after the setting aside of Israel, and we have but to read them to discover the fact for ourselves.

EPHESIANS IS A PRISON EPISTLE.

"For this cause I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles" (iii. 1).

"I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you" (iv. 1).

"The mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds" (vi. 19, 20).

PHILIPPIANS IS A PRISON EPISTLE.

"Both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel" (i. 7).

"My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace" (i. 13).

"Many of the brethren . . . waxing confident by my bonds" (i. 14).

"Supposing to add affliction to my bonds" (i. 16).

"All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household" (iv. 22).

COLOSSIANS IS A PRISON EPISTLE.

"The mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds" (iv. 3).

"Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you" (iv. 10).

"Remember my bonds" (iv. 18).

II TIMOTHY IS A PRISON EPISTLE.

“Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner” (i. 8).

“Wherein I suffer trouble even unto bonds” (ii. 9).

“At my first answer no man stood with me” (iv. 16).

PHILEMON IS A PRISON EPISTLE.

“Paul a prisoner of Jesus Christ” (1).

“Now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ” (9).

“Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds” (10).

“He might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel” (13).

“There saluteth thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus” (23).

The epistle of Philemon is of a somewhat private nature. Philemon was host to the church at Colosse, and the epistle throws some light on the character of home life at that period. It is a lovely letter, full of christian grace, but for the purpose of this series, which is the seeking out of the special truth committed to Paul the Lord's prisoner, it will not be included in the present exposition. We shall find all that we require in the four remaining epistles, and indeed far more than we can cover in the space at our disposal.

These four epistles have been placed by different editors in every possible order. For ourselves we feel that there is insufficient evidence upon which to decide the sequence, but—and this is far more important to us—they have a most definite interrelation that it is of the utmost importance to observe; for a true realization of the scope of each epistle as a whole is essential to correct interpretation of the passages that make up its parts.

These four prison epistles present the truth for the present dispensation in its twofold form:--

- (1) STANDING.—Accepted in the Beloved. Complete in Him. Ephesians and Colossians.
- (2) STATE.—A prize and a crown in view. Philippians and II Timothy.

They are therefore not all devoted to doctrine and privilege, but, equally, to practice and walk. The correspondence observable between the two groups is of such importance that we included a summary of the parallels in structure form on page 92 of the June number, in order to make the survey as complete as possible.

Here, then, in these four epistles, is the medium used by God for the manifestation of the mystery. Their testimony is unique in that it is found nowhere else in Scripture. As the foregoing presentation shows, their testimony is complete. That testimony is inspired, for it was given by revelation, and contains truth that, apart from enlightenment, was inaccessible to the mind even of the most pious. In these epistles we shall find ten references to the word “mystery”, six being found in Ephesians and four in Colossians. When Paul was released from prison at Rome, and before he wrote II Timothy, he used his freedom, not so much for further teaching, but in preparing those who should succeed him in the work of the ministry, and in endeavouring to bring about some order in the churches already established. The outcome of this ministry was the writing of the first epistle to Timothy and the epistle to Titus. There are some who believe that these epistles were written during the Acts period. The interested reader is referred to Volume XIV, page 79, and Volume XV, pages 14, 30 and 59, for notes on the point.

In the first epistle to Timothy, we have two more references to a “mystery”, bringing the total number of references up to twelve. The following list gives the occurrences, together with an indication of the particular aspect of mystery in view in each reference.

The six references in Ephesians.

- “The mystery of His will” (i. 9).
- “The mystery” (iii. 3).
- “The mystery of Christ” (iii. 4).
- “The dispensation of the mystery” (iii. 9, R.V.)
- “The great mystery” (v. 32).
- “The mystery of the gospel” (vi. 19).

The six references in Colossians.

- “The mystery” (i. 26).
- “The mystery among the Gentiles” (i. 27).
- “The mystery of God” (ii. 2).
- “The mystery of Christ” (iv. 3).

The six references in I Timothy.

- “The mystery of the faith” (iii. 9).
- “The mystery of godliness” (iii. 16).

We must now give our attention to these references and their contexts so that we may learn how these mysteries, and their various aspects, have been manifested for our learning.

**#3. The Mystery of His Will.
The Manifestation.
pp. 133 - 135**

The first mystery to be maintained in Ephesians is “the mystery of His will”. We have seen in the opening article of this series that these words suggest some secret purpose hidden by God Himself because of the opposition of an enemy.

Most of our readers know that Eph. i. 3-14 may be regarded as the threefold charter of the Church of the One Body. It is divided into three parts by the phrases “to the praise of the glory of His grace” or “to the praise of His glory” (Eph. i. 6, 12, 14) as follows:

- (1) THE WILL OF THE FATHER (Eph. i. 3-6).
- (2) THE WORK OF THE SON (Eph. i. 7-12).
- (3) THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT (Eph. i. 13, 14).

It will be seen that while the “will” of the Father is the theme of the opening section, it is “the secret purpose of His will” that we find in the second section, which is concerned

with redemption. In the revelation of the purpose that is “according to the good pleasure of His will”, we find no mention of sin or death (Eph. i. 3-6). In this first section we find “blessing”, “choice”, “predestination”, and “acceptance”, but no suggestion that in this choice and predestination sin would find a place. The blessings are all “spiritual”; the choice is “in Christ”; the predestination is that we should be “holy and without blame before Him”; the acceptance is “in the Beloved”. The accomplishment of this purpose did not involve sin and death, which form no part of the “good pleasure of His will”. The second section, however, brings before us “the *mystery* of His will”, which is “according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself”, and concludes with another reference to that predestination which is “according to the purpose of Him Who is energizing the all things (*ta panta*) according to the counsel of His Own will” (Eph. i. 11). In this second section sin is prominent, and redemption is revealed as the one and only way of escape from it.

What is the Lord’s intention in discriminating here between “His will” and “the secret of His will”? This is so important that the reader must allow us to restate what has already been brought forward for the sake of new readers.

Nothing can be plainer in Scripture than that it was the will of God that Israel should be a kingdom of priests. Moreover, nothing can be plainer than that when Israel sinned they failed of their high destiny. Sin is transgression, disobedience, a missing of the mark. If, therefore, it had been God’s will that Israel should fail, their failure would have been in obedience to His will, and could not have been called sin. Their actions under these conditions could not have been regarded as blameworthy or meriting punishment. When Israel “came short of the glory of God”, the wisdom of God was made manifest by the fact that, although Israel had failed, God had not failed. In such a prophecy as that of Daniel, we get a glimpse of the “*secret* of His will”, which provided against the contingency of Israel’s fall.

All through the Acts of the Apostles, the Lord’s attitude to Israel was that expressed in Rom. x. 21:

“To Israel He saith, All day long have I stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.”

If God had definitely “willed” the non-repentance of Israel. His stretched-out hands would but have mocked their fated blindness, and their predestined refusal could not have been called by a God of truth, disobedience or gainsaying. Rom. ix. and x. do not leave us without light upon the reason for Israel’s failure:--

“Because they sought it (i.e. righteousness) not by faith, but as it were by the works of law. For they stumbled at that stumbling stone for they, being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God Have they not heard? Yes, verily did not Israel know?”

It is quite impossible to read Rom. x. and still believe that Israel’s failure arose from any decree on the part of God. It arose from their own ignorance and unbelief. The

question of the sovereignty of God, the freedom of a moral agent, the place of contingency in a world where moral agents work, the meaning and bearing of “foreknowledge” with regard to “election” are all involved in this consideration of the “secret of His will”. These deep and far-reaching themes require, however, very careful handling, and we cannot hope to include their consideration in the present series.

Returning to the case in point—Israel were not driven by any necessity to refuse the Saviour, or to spurn the Lord’s stretched-out hands. By so doing they were not accomplishing His will. At the same time we must not leave out of our reckoning the fact of “the mystery, or secret purpose of His will”, which came into operation when Israel passed into their present blind and “lo-ammi” condition. The present dispensation of the Mystery, made known to and through the apostle Paul as the prisoner of the Lord, had never been the subject of O.T. prophecy or of N.T. teaching up to the time of its revelation at the close of Acts xxviii.

We come back now to Eph. i. 3-14, and observe that no one was under any necessity to sin, by reason of any will or purpose of God. When man did sin, however, as in the case of Adam in the garden, God revealed to his wondering faith that He had provided a Redeemer. The redemption of the fallen heirs of glory, and the heading up of all things (*ta panta*, “the all things”) in heaven and earth in Christ was the secret purpose of His will. He knew that no creature would be able to stand, He knew that the Serpent would assuredly attack and deceive, and so, instead of allowing irrevocable ruin to overtake His plans, He, the only wise God, chose not to reveal all His will at once. And so, taking the wise in his own craftiness, He carries His purpose on.

To sum up, we may say that the manifestation of the mystery of His will means redemption by the blood of Christ, in the days of His flesh, and the reconciliation of “the all things” under His headship in the glorious future.

#4. The Mystery, manifested through a special ministry. pp. 176 - 178

The second reference to the mystery in Ephesians is found in Eph. iii. 3, “How that by revelation He made known unto me the mystery”.

Before we go a step further, let us realize the fact that in this chapter Paul speaks of two related, yet distinct, mysteries. The one he calls “the mystery”, the other “the mystery of Christ”. The one given to him by revelation and was made known through him to all others who ever received it, but the mystery of Christ was not the exclusive knowledge of any one of God’s servants. It had been known, in part, by the sons of men in earlier days, and was shared by Paul, in a superlative degree, with other apostles and prophets, but it was not to be confused with the mystery itself. Accordingly we keep these two subjects separate in this series, although, when we have concluded our

examination of Eph. iii. 1-13, the final revelation of the mystery of Christ as known by Paul will be seen as essential to the revelation of the mystery proper.

If the mystery was a secret hidden by God, there are at least two things necessary before that secret can be known and believed. It must be “revealed”, and it must be “manifested”. These two aspects of the subject we find by comparing what the Apostle wrote in Eph. iii., with what he wrote in Col. i.

“If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: How that by *revelation* He made known unto me the mystery” (Eph. iii. 2, 3).

“Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made *manifest* to His saints” (Col. i. 25, 26).

“By revelation He made known to *me*”; “Now is made manifest to *His saints*”. The mystery has been revealed to no one, but Paul, the chosen vessel. Through his subsequent ministry it has been manifested to the saints. In this series our subject is “The Mystery Manifested” and it is evident from what we have seen in Eph. iii. and Col. i. that “The mystery” was manifested through a special ministry, that of Paul. However, this statement left without comment would be misleading, for Paul’s ministry commenced with his testimony at Damascus (Acts ix. 19, 20). Paul himself was never under any illusion regarding the character of his ministry, for, from the very commencement, it was made known to him that the Lord, Who had appeared unto him at the first, would appear unto him again, giving him a further commission. This Paul stated in Acts xxvi. 16. He did not know in Acts ix. that this subsequent ministry was to be intimately associated with “bonds and afflictions”, although it was stated at the time that he was a chosen vessel not only to bear the name of the Lord, but also to suffer for His name’s sake. Prison begins to be associated with this new ministry in Acts xx. 22, 23 and xxi. 10-14, and it is as the prisoner of Jesus Christ that Paul received and made known the mystery. This is stated in Eph. iii. and Col. i. The R.V. of Eph. iii. 1 reads, “The prisoner of Christ Jesus”, where the A.V. reads “Jesus Christ”. The change is suggestive, for with the exception of Acts iii. 20, where the R.V. reads, “The Christ even Jesus”, this title is exclusive to the ministry of Paul, the references in I Pet. v. 10 and 14 reading “Christ” in the R.V. The difference between the two titles is this,

Jesus Christ.—In the Gospels it means, Jesus the Messiah. In the Epistles it means Jesus Who humbled Himself, but is now exalted and glorified as Christ.

Christ Jesus.—This is the converse of Jesus Christ, and denotes the new exalted One, Who once humbled Himself (Comp. Bible, Appendix 98, xi., xii.).

The mystery is essentially connected with the *exalted* Christ. It is *that* phase of the mystery of Christ that is the distinctive note of Eph. i. 21-23. Paul was not only the prisoner *of* Christ Jesus, but *for* you Gentiles. We must remember both statements, for both are important. Up to the close of the Acts, Paul could say, “*For* the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain” (Acts xxviii. 20), whereas in Eph. vi. 20 he calls himself “an ambassador in a chain” (R.V. margin), and now, no longer for the hope of Israel, but for

the grace of God to the Gentiles. The mystery, therefore, is manifested through the ministry of Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus.

This ministry was not a call to work that lasted but for a while and then was changed or laid aside. It was the Apostle's charge until he had finished his course and sealed his testimony with his blood. Consequently he follows up his statement concerning his prison ministry with, "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward" (Eph. iii. 2). As we have seen in other studies, the word "dispensation" refers not to a period of time, as does the word "age", but rather to a "stewardship"; some part of God's great purpose; some trust for which the Apostle was responsible. He calls it the dispensation *of* the grace of God, *to* you-ward, which is parallel with the opening words of Eph. iii.

The third statement which concludes the argument opened by the Apostle is, "how that by revelation He made known unto me the mystery". The mystery, therefore, has been manifested, through the Apostle Paul, *as* the prisoner of Christ Jesus, *to* whom the dispensation of the grace of God to the Gentiles had been given, and *to* whom the mystery was made known *by* revelation. The use of the word "revelation" in the Scriptures precludes all idea of attainment by search, by study, or by intuition. None could have discovered this secret. God alone could make it known. This is revelation in its simplest and truest meaning.

In verses 7, 8, and 9, the Apostle enlarges upon this ministry through which the mystery has been manifested, and there is in the passage a delightful blending of conscious unworthiness and confident assurance:

"Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of His power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that *I* should preach among the Gentiles, the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all as to what is the dispensation (R.V.) of that secret which hath been hidden from the ages in that God Who created all things" (Eph. iii. 7-9).

The manifestation of the mystery is not confined to Gentiles, for the Apostle goes on to tell of a vast unseen company to whom, also, this marvelous secret is being unfolded:

"To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. iii. 10).

The mystery has much to do both with "heavenly places" and with "principalities and powers" (Eph. i. 3, 20, 21), and it is therefore reasonable that these mighty beings, with whom the church of the One Body is blessed, and over whom Christ is Head (Col. i. 10), should have the mystery manifested to them, so that they too may take their place in the purpose of the ages intelligently and thankfully. Whereas the church learned the mystery through the ministry of Paul, the principalities and powers learn it through the church. The mystery, moreover, is called in this place, "the manifold wisdom of God", and "wisdom", or the title "the only wise God" is used in connection with the dispensational dealings of God with man. Here therefore we have another aspect of the subject under consideration.

The mystery has been manifested to the church through the ministry of Paul the prisoner of Christ Jesus, and by the church it has been made known to principalities and powers who, together with this church, own Jesus Christ as Head.

Occasional Meditations.

#6. Psalm li. pp. 11, 12

The heading of this Psalm gives a true introduction to its “feeling”: “A Psalm of David” (the name, David, means “the Beloved One”) “when Nathan the prophet” (whose name means “a Gift”) “came unto him”. In type, we have here a beloved child of God, convicted of sin by the Given One, Christ, and the spirit and gift of repentance. His only plea is for mercy. Mercy speaks of pure grace and this alone is the sinner’s plea (*see* Luke xviii. 13).

There is a wonderful suggestion of the twofold nature of sin in the words “blot out” and “wash me” in verses 1 and 2 of the Psalm. Sin is in God’s book and needs blotting out: it is criminal. Sin is also in the sinner and needs cleansing: It is filth and corruption. In verse 3 the nature of true repentance is seen; sin looms large, and hysterical emotion finds little room. Verse 4 makes clear that sin, though against our neighbour, is nevertheless *against God*. It is, in His sight, therefore, abominable. Verse 5 shows that original guilt not only does not excuse but heightens the hopeless condition of a sinner, or a saint, in himself, for though outward sin be diminished yet the root is there, and is seen and felt by the spiritual eye. In verse 7 the word “purge” may be rendered “make a sin offering”. The hyssop suggests the Passover and the broken bones of verse 8 speak plainly of David’s realization of his own unfitness to be, or to make, the offering (*see* Exod. xii. 46, Psal. xxxiv. 19, 20). This explains the sixteenth verse of the Psalm. The Lord *did* desire sacrifice for He had commanded it, yet He did not desire it from man, but from Christ, as Heb. x. 1-10 shows. Verses 9-12 witness to the fact that although a saved sinner can never finally be lost, yet any practice of sin prevents access into the presence of God, deprives the offender of the enjoyment of fellowship, and leaves him in doubt of the future. Verse 13 agrees with the clear teaching of the N.T. that effective instruction cannot take place until one has oneself been put right with regard to sin. The Lord has not promised to use an unclean vessel, even though that vessel be made of gold or silver.

So far as the Old Covenant is concerned, David here prays an impossible prayer. There was no sacrifice for the sin of murder! Would then David seek to move God to excuse his sin? No, for he says that if the Lord delivers him he will sing of *His righteousness*, which necessitates the legal removal of the penalty. David had faith, as had all who were saved before Christ, to see beyond the offering of bulls and goats to the One Who was to come, the Lamb of God Himself. The saved sinner does not sing aloud of his *own* righteousness, for, as verse 15 shows, his mouth is shut, as in the case of the man in the parable, who had not on a wedding garment. Let us learn the result of this great deliverance; it is praise. The sacrifices of verse 17 are accepted *because* of the sacrifice of Christ. Verses 18 and 19 speak literally of Jerusalem and of literal sacrifices for they look on to the time of the millennial reign of Christ.

We have in this Psalm: (1) David's own confession; (2) The confession of the saved remnant of Israel when back in their land; when they look upon Him Whom they pierced, for they too have been guilty, like David, of murder and adultery; and (3) The confession of a believer, for Matt. v., vi. and vii. show that murder and adultery can be of the heart.

Let us, realizing our sins against the Lord, and the wondrous efficacy of the blood of Christ, seek forgiveness and cleansing that we may serve God acceptably.

To the unsaved we would say that in this Psalm, a murderer speaks, a murderer is forgiven, and a murderer praises. Whether or not your sins appear as awful as this sin, they are not too great for God to forgive. But they are enough, if unforgiven, to condemn you for ever.

#7. The Passover.---Exodus xii. 1-20 and 29-33. pp. 95, 96

Divine inspiration has sealed the blessed promise that to every saved sinner Christ is the Passover Sacrifice, and the argument in I Cor. v. 8 is that those who are saved are to seek to be free from the leaven of sin and worldliness. Egypt is a picture of the world, and the Lord's people, though locally in it, are spiritually redeemed out of it, see Gal. i. 4. In Exod. xii. 2 we have an important but often forgotten truth, which is that redemption brings the redeemed into a new sphere—it is the beginning of months. Regeneration and resurrection life are vitally linked with redemption.

In verses 3-5 divine progress in personal appreciation is indicated; *a* lamb; *the* lamb; *your* lamb. The lamb is to be *without blemish*. Such is the constant claim of the Lord, and sinners are thereby cut from all hope in self.

The whole assembly shall kill it (verse 6). Israel here are viewed as one company, the many houses being but miniatures of the nation. So also the many lambs are here looked at as the One Antitype.

It.—In actuality, but one Passover Lamb has God ever appointed and accepted, a Lamb without blemish or spot and of His Own providing, none other than the Lord Jesus Christ.

The original rendering of the last three words of verse 6, “between the two evenings”, is suggestive. It not only means between the time called by the Hebrew reckoning between the first and second evenings, but also may mean between the evening of one day and before the evening of the next. This ambiguity is designed, for by its means Christ could partake of the Passover with His disciples one day, the next be offered as the true Passover Lamb, and yet be offered on the actual 14th Nisan, as here.

The blood outside meant safety within, and, sheltered by the blood, their food was provided by the self-same lamb whose blood protected from wrath.

Unleavened bread (a type of the absence of sin, and of the righteousness of Christ), was to be eaten with the Passover. Individually and collectively the people of God are to put away sin; they are to regard, or see, it not, else they dishonour the blood of atonement. In the first Lord's Supper, and every scriptural Lord's Supper since, there has been shown forth the unleavened life and death of Christ, by the partaking of the unleavened wine, and unleavened bread, and by the seeking to detect or judge sin as soon as it appeared.

Thus (verse 11).—That is as pilgrims who were about to quit Egypt and press on to the promised land.

The blood *to you* *I see* (verse 13).—What should we be? Where should we be, eternally, apart from the precious blood of Christ? The word “passover” signifies to halt, hover over (see I Kings xvii. 21; Isa. xxxi. 5; Deut. xxxii. 11). Where the Lord sees the blood He spreads His protecting wing. No house would have been safe had a “good resolution”, a “good character”, or even a piece of unleavened bread, been substituted for the blood.

Not a house (verse 30).—Take this to its furthest extreme, including the houses of Israel, and it would still be true, for although atonement saved the firstborn of Israel, yet atonement was by *death*, and, in Egypt, the difference that night was a lamb *or* a man.

The next thing is the leaving of Egypt. Unleavened bread and the Exodus from Egypt alike teach the needed lesson that salvation must lead to separation:

“Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, according as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover hath been sacrificed on behalf of us; therefore, let *us* keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but in unleaven of sincerity and truth. I wrote unto you *not to* mingle with fornicators for ye owe it to come out of the world. But now I have written to you *not to* mingle, if any one being *named* a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one, *neither to eat*” (I Cor. v. 6-11).

Christian! the blood of the Passover Lamb teaches all this: if it does not fit with your experience there is need for repentance.

Unsaved reader! God keeps His Word. Pharaoh long rejected God, but His judgments are certain of fulfillment, and the penalty of sin *must fall*—either on *you* or on *the* Passover Lamb.

**#8. The Ark of the Tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 10-22).
pp. 147, 148**

Israel, delivered from Egypt by the blood of the Passover, separated by the waters of the Red Sea, and alone with God in the desert, are to be taught the nature of God's holiness, man's sin, and God's salvation. Already they have failed, the tables of stone having been broken. The ark therefore is made, wherein the law, unbroken, may be placed. The Lord does not come a second time to Israel with the law, for one sin places a man irrevocably outside the possibility of probation or the making of his own righteousness. Inasmuch as redemption from Egypt had to be by blood, so approach to God, and acceptance with Him had to be by blood also.

The first article of furniture to be made for the Tabernacle was the ark, which was formed of wood and gold—a picture of the humanity and deity of Christ. In it was placed the Tables of Stone (16), and it is noteworthy that when Christ came into the world He said “Thy law is within my heart” (Ps. xl. 8; Heb. x. 5-9). The law demanded perfect obedience, and if this claim was disregarded salvation could not be effected without setting aside the law of God which was perfect, holy, just and good. Hence the ark and the law within comes first.

Upon this ark, typical of the spotless life and perfect obedience of the Lord Jesus, upon this ark, with its unbroken tables of the law, is placed the *mercy seat* (17). This mercy seat was sprinkled with blood, and there God met with Moses and Aaron on behalf of His people. Herein is set forth the one great work of Christ in life and death, viz., the making of a mercy seat (or “propitiation”, as the word is rendered in the New Testament) for the sins of His people,—where the penitent sinner could go and cry “God *be merciful* (i.e. be propitious) to me the sinner”. But further wonders arise out of this. Not only are sinners saved, justified and blessed here, but already they are united to the risen Saviour, and will be finally glorified with Him. No marvel that John was led to cry “Behold, what *manner of love* the Father hath bestowed upon us, that *we* should be called the sons of God”.

Two cherubim were made (18, 19), made out of *the mercy seat*, as chapter xxxvii. 7, 8 more clearly shows.

As the cherubim looked toward the mercy seat, they looked to one another (20), and as Christians look to Him Who is dwelling above the blood sprinkled mercy seat, unity will be promoted. The divisions of to-day are but proofs that the person and work of Christ are disregarded.

“There I will *meet* thee, and I will *commune* with thee” (22). Fellowship with the Lord and with His people is found in the holiest of all, because of the blood of *the* atonement, and by virtue of the divine unity made by grace between the Saviour and His

people. Oh that we may know this communion more. Numb. vii. 89 should be pondered and prayed over:

“And When Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation to speak with Him, then he heard the voice of One speaking unto him from off the mercy seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubims: and He spake unto him.”

Grace is such that those far off have been and still will be made nigh through that precious blood. The mercy seat, Christ Jesus, is God’s only appointed way of salvation from sin, and approach to Him, for

“Without shedding of blood, there does not become a sending away of sin” Heb. ix. 22).

The Powers That Be.

*(Being a series of studies in Roman history,
and Roman laws and customs,
in so far as they throw light upon the N.T. narrative).*

#17. “Civis Romanus sum.” Paul and Roman Citizenship. pp. 33 - 35

The Jew regarded the world as made up of “the circumcision” and “the uncircumcision”—his own favoured nation, and the rest of the world as “Gentile dogs”. The Greek, on the other hand, divided the world up into “Greeks” and ‘Barbarians’ (Rom. i. 14), while the Roman viewed it as being composed of Freeman and Slaves. A “Freeman” in the Roman sense might either be *Civis* (A Roman citizen), or *Peregrinus* (a foreigner, though free). A “Freeman” could either be *born free* or could *become free*.

In contrast with the position of the “Freeman” the slave was devoid of all rights of liberty, citizenship and position in a family. *Nullum habet caput*. Up to A.D.61, a slave could be ordered to fight in the arena with gladiators or wild beasts, and until the time of Claudius, his master could punish him with death at will. There was one well-known case of Vedius Pollio, in the reign of Augustus, who cast his slave into the ponds to feed his lampreys. The only penalty Pollio suffered was the loss of his fish ponds.

A slave who committed murder was punished with great severity, and we read that 400 slaves were executed to avenge the murder of Pedanius Secundus. Torture by whip or fetters was also inflicted for the slightest offences, and most of the large Roman houses contained an *ergastulum*, or private prison, where the slaves worked in chains.

A slave could become free by the process of “manumission”. The actual form of this enactment has come down to us from Delphi and reads as follows:

Date. Apollo, the Pythian *bought* from Sositus of Amphibia, for freedom, a female slave, whose name is Nicaea, by race a Roman, *with a price* of three and a half minae of silver. Former seller according to law: Eumnastus of Amphissa. The price he hath received. The purchase, however, Nicaea hath committed unto Apollo, for freedom.

The reader will not fail to see the parallel here with the Apostle’s words, “Bought with a price”, and the literal rendering of Gal. v. 1: “For freedom did Christ set us free.”

In numerous records of manumission the enfranchised person is said to be allowed henceforth to “do the things that he will”—an obvious parallel with Gal. v. 17. Moreover, many manumission orders contain the clause that the freed person shall never “be made a slave again”—a phrase which finds an echo in such passages as Gal. v. 1 and I Cor. vii. 23.

The “Freeman” (*liber*) might be born free (*ingenuus*), or he might be made free (*libertinus*). In the first case (*ingenuus*) he could either be a citizen (*civis*) or a *latinus*—i.e. one occupying a position intermediate between that of the true-born Roman (*civis*) and the *peregrinus* (or foreigner).

The privileges of the full citizen were as follows:

POLITICAL RIGHTS.

- (1) The right of voting in the *comitia* (*Jus Suffragii*).
- (2) Eligibility for all public offices and magistrates (*Jus Honorum*).
- (3) The *Jus Provocationis*, or right of appeal.

CIVIL RIGHTS.

- (i.) *Conubium*, the power to contract a legal marriage, with power of life and death over the family.
- (ii.) *Commercium*, the right to acquire, hold or transfer property, and to make contracts.

The Apostle himself was a full Roman citizen (*ingenuus*, or “free born”), for his father had been a citizen before him. We do not know how Paul’s father had acquired this coveted privilege, but it was so ordered, in the wisdom of God, in order that His messenger to the Roman world should be fully equipped. He was a Tarsian, “a citizen of no mean city”; he was also a Roman, a Jew, and a Pharisee.

“How often”, says Cicero, “has this exclamation *Civis Romanus sum* (“I am a Roman citizen”) brought aid and safety even among barbarians in the remotest parts of the earth” (*Cic. Verr. v. 57*). The reader will remember how scared the Philippians were when they discovered that Paul and Silas were Roman citizens (Acts xvi. 37-39). They had probably heard of the punishment in A.D.44 of the inhabitants of Rhodes, whom Claudius had deprived of their freedom for putting a Roman citizen to death.

We shall hope to deal later with the Roman’s right of appeal to Cæsar when we resume the subject of the Apostle’s trial. Meanwhile let us rejoice in our own heavenly “citizenship”, beside which the highest Roman privileges fade into insignificance.

#18. Paul before Felix. pp. 67 - 71

The letter that accompanied Paul when he went to Felix was as follows:

“Claudius Lysias, unto the most excellent governor Felix, greeting. This man was seized of the Jews, and was about to be slain, when I came upon them with the soldiers and rescued him, having learned that he was a Roman. And, desiring to know the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him down unto their council; whom I found to be accused about questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or bonds. And when it was shown to me that there would be a plot against this man, I sent him forth to thee, forthwith, charging his accusers also to speak against him before thee” (Acts xxiii. 26-30).

In view of the fact that Lysias Claudius had purchased his freedom “with a great sum” (Acts xxii. 28), his double name suggests that he was originally a Greek (Lysias) and that he had been set free by one of the house of Claudius, whose name he had assumed when he entered upon his Roman citizenship. The letter would naturally be written in Latin. Luke gives the Greek translation of it and tells us that it was “after this type” (Acts xxiii. 25). A letter of this kind, accompanying the accused, was known as the *elogium*, and it was customary to give it careful attention at the beginning of the case.

It was incumbent upon a Roman judge to try a prisoner, who had been sent with an *elogium*, if possible, within three days. In this case, however, Felix had to send to Jerusalem and demand the presence of Paul’s accusers, and this delayed his trial till the fifth day. Being a Roman citizen, Paul received a fuller hearing and greater consideration than did his Lord when He stood before Pilate.

Felix follows the normal order of procedure and, having received the *elogium*, enters upon the *interrogatio*, which resolves itself into settling the question of the province to which Paul belonged. When Felix understood that Paul is from Cilicia, he says:

“I will hear thee, when thine accusers are also come. And he commanded him to be kept in Herod’s judgment hall” (Acts xxiii. 34, 35).

From the descriptions we have of trial carried out in Rome, we can reconstruct with a fair measure of probable accuracy the general arrangement of the court. Felix himself would be seated proudly on his *sella curulis*—a chair, usually inlaid with ivory, and shaped rather like a camp-stool with curved legs, and would be surrounded by the clerks and lectors—the latter being officers who attended upon the Roman magistrate, and carried before him the bundle of rods and the axe that symbolized his authority. Before Felix would stand Paul the accused, and the high Priest Annas and other members of the Sanhedrin.

Pleading before a Roman like Felix was no light task, and as the Jews ardently desired to make sure of their victim, they hired the services of an orator named Tertullus. Paul, however, elected to defend himself.

Tertullus was evidently a practiced speaker, and “Luke has faithfully preserved an outline of his voluble plausibility” (*Farrar*). He opens his speech with a flattering allusion to Felix’s administration. If we had had nothing but the language of Tertullus to guide us, we should have imagined that Felix was held in the highest admiration by the Jews. In verses 2 and 3 we read:

“Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence, we accept it always, and in all places, most noble Felix, with all thankfulness” (Acts xxiv. 2, 3).

As a matter of fact, however, we know that Felix was particularly detested by the Jews. It is true that he had put down one form of brigandage, but he had actually encouraged and profited by another.

Luke tells us in verse 1 that Tertullus “informed against Paul”, and this, of course, was the work that he was employed to do. The opening of the case was known as the *nominis* or *criminis delatio*, the information formally laid before the *quaesitor*. It would have been contrary to human nature if Felix, the man who had been born a slave, had not felt highly pleased at being reminded of his “providence”, a word used of emperors and frequently inscribed on their coins.

Tertullus now proceeds to the indictment, or *accusatio*, which he subdivides into three parts:

- (1) Paul was a public pest, and lived by exciting factions among the Jews all over the world. He was, in short, a public enemy.
- (2) He was a ringleader of a sect called the “Nazarenes”.
- (3) He had attempted to profane the Temple.

According to Tertullus, therefore, the Apostle was guilty of three offences—treason, heresy, and sacrilege. Treason was a most deadly offence against Roman law; heresy was an offence against the Jewish law; and sacrilege was an offence against both.

Tertullus speaks of Paul as “a pestilent fellow”. The original here is *loinios*, a “plague”. Certain it is that, wherever Paul went, “his appearance seemed the signal for dissension, from the day when he escaped over the wall at Damascus, to the day of his apprehension in the Temple. He had been driven out of Antioch, stoned at Lystra, imprisoned at Philippi, accused of treason at Thessalonica, expelled from the synagogue at Corinth, haled before the proconsul Gallio. The cause of a serious riot at Ephesus; and the moment he arrived at Jerusalem, the disturbances had broken out afresh” (*Septimus Buss*). Tertullus was evidently instructed to avoid the name “Christian” for this would have been too much like agreeing that “Jesus” was the “Christ”. He therefore speaks of “the sect of the Nazarenes”.

Judaism was a *religio licita*, recognized by the state, and Tertullus suggests that Lysias had been responsible for a violent and unwarrantable interference with the course of justice. Had he not “with great violence taken Paul out of their hands”, there would have been no need to trouble the noble Felix with the matter at all.

At the close of the speech for the prosecution, we read that the “Jews also assented, saying these things were so” (Acts xxiv. 9). Felix then “beckons” to Paul to speak for himself. The word used suggests that Felix was already impatient, being convinced, as Lysias had informed him, that this was some Jewish squabble about Mosaic minutiae.

Tertullus had complimented Felix to the verge of falsehood. Paul, in beginning his defence, adheres to the truth:

“Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully answer for myself.”

Felix had been governor for six years, and was fully acquainted with the people and their habits.

Answer to the first charge.—There had been no time for stirring up sedition or tumult at Jerusalem, as, even then at the time of the trial, it was only twelve days since he had come for the Feast of Pentecost, and during that brief period he had neither disputed in the Temple nor stirred up the crowd. The twelve days were occupied as follows:

1. Arrival in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 17).
2. Interview with James “the day following”.
3. Commencement of the Nazarite vow “the next day”.
- 4, 5, 6. The observance of the vow.
7. Apprehension in the Temple when the four men had completed their vow (Acts xxi. 27).
8. The hearing before the Sanhedrin “on the morrow” (Acts xxii. 30).
9. Departure from Jerusalem on the next day.
10. Arrival at Caesarea.
12. “After five days” (Acts xxiv. 1). Paul is accused before Felix. He had had only twelve clear days in which anything could have been done, and of these he could give a complete account.

Answer to the second charge.—Paul was not a heretic. He still worshipped the God of his fathers, although in a different way from that which would be acceptable to Israel. He also entertained, in common with Israel, the hope of resurrection. In rebutting the charge of heresy by saying that he still “worshipped the God of his fathers”, the Apostle makes a most successful appeal to Roman law, for this allowed full freedom of worship in the provinces.

Answer to the third charge.—Paul’s presence in the Temple was for worship, not for profanation. His accusers had found him in the Temple, a quiet and legally purified worshipper. King Agrippa, as Felix would know, had himself been purified by similar rites.

Speaking of the “Jews from Asia” (verse 18), Paul objects that they “ought to have been here before thee”. The Apostle was certainly within his rights in demanding the presence of witnesses.

It becomes clear as the account proceeds that Felix is convinced of Paul’s innocence, and the case therefore breaks down. The differences that existed between Paul and his Jewish accusers were of no importance in the eyes of the Roman law, as the doctrine of the Nazarenes had not yet been proscribed as a *religio illicita*. Felix had a “more accurate knowledge of that way” (Acts xxiv. 22) than either the Jews or Tertullus had supposed, and the trial is postponed on the ground that Lysias, a most important witness, was not present.

Felix’s wife at this time was a Jewess, Drusilla, and it is possible also that he may have known Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian cohort. All this, no doubt, helped to mitigate the severity of the Apostle’s remand.

Felix would have laid himself open to severe punishment if he had taken a bribe—the *lex Julia de repetundis* (B.C.59) forbade any magistrate to receive money or articles of value, the penalty being deportation or exile—but these penalties were often evaded, and we read the Felix kept Paul bound for two years, hoping that “money should have been given him”. At the end of this period Felix is replaced by Porcius Festus, and, “willing to show the Jews a pleasure”, he leaves Paul still a prisoner.

Here for the moment we must stop. The concluding part of the trial we shall hope to deal with in our next article.

#19. Paul before Festus and Agrippa. The appeal to Cæsar. pp. 100 - 102

The two years during which Paul had remained in bonds at Cæsarea did not see any abatement in the Jews’ feelings of hatred towards him. Upon the arrival of Festus, the new governor, the Jews, knowing that a new governor was likely to do things that would put him in the good graces of the people, informed him that Paul was till unpunished, and suggested that he should be sent to Jerusalem—“laying wait in the way to kill him” (Acts xxv.3). Festus, however, apparently saw through their scheme and said:

“Let them which among you are able, go down with me and accuse this man, if there by any wickedness in him” (Acts xxv. 5).

The High Priest had asked as a “favour” the handing over of Paul to the Jews. The governor answered that they would get Roman justice instead, and so Paul’s life was saved.

When Festus returned to Cæsarea Paul's trial was re-opened. This time no Tertullus was hired, no attempt was made at a formal charge, and there was no bringing of witnesses. The Jews "which came down from Jerusalem stood round about and laid many and grievous complaints against Paul which they could not prove". Paul, answering for himself, refutes once more the charges made against him, retaining in his answer the threefold form of the original accusation:

"Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the Temple, nor yet against Cæsar, have I offended anything at all" (Acts xxv. 8).

Festus, desiring to find some way out of the difficulty, suggests to Paul that, as it appears to be a matter of Jewish law, perhaps he would be willing to go back to Jerusalem and be tried by the Sanhedrin, in which case he (Festus) would see to it that he had fair treatment. Paul had now experienced two years' imprisonment. All his burning zeal for the spread of the gospel had been pent up within the narrow space allotted to him at Cæsarea. Moreover, the Lord had appeared to him again, and had revealed to him the new message associated with his bondage. As a Roman citizen he had one special privilege, that he had not so far used. He had only to pronounce the word *Appello*, "I appeal", and his trial under provincial governors would come to an end. Replying, therefore, to the suggestion that he should stand before the Sanhedrin, Paul startled the whole court by saying:

"I stand at Cæsar's judgment-seat where I ought to be judged I appealed unto Cæsar" (Acts xxiv. 10, 11).

Festus was not at all pleased with this change of affairs. To have an appeal from his judgment within a few days of his entering the country would not look well, and his reply suggests his annoyance: "Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar thou shalt go" (verse 12). The words suggest that Festus added mentally, "And you little know what an appeal to Cæsar just now will mean".

Paul, however, had not acted on the spur of the moment. For two years he had waited and prayed, and he now knew that the time for his journey to Rome had come. As the Apostle's appeal to Cæsar occupies an important place in the history of the Acts, a few notes on the subject should be helpful.

In republican days the right of appeal had been to the *Populus* or *Comitia*. This was secured by the Valerian law (B.C.508), which conferred upon every citizen the right to appeal to the *Comitia Centuriata* from a sentence of death or scourging by a Magistrate. This privilege has been compared with the Habeas Corpus Act of our own country. Another form of appeal was the *Appellatio ad Tribunos*. The Tribunes were appointed in B.C.494 to protect the plebeians against the possible abuse of his authority by a Consul. In order to afford this protection the doors of the Tribune stood open day and night.

Under the Empire regime the Emperor himself became Tribune for life. In this capacity he could veto the ruling of any Magistrate, and, as the representative of the people, could hear their appeals. In the Apostle's case he did not, of course, make an

appeal against the judgment of the court, for no sentence had been passed; he merely demanded that his case should be transferred from the provincial court to that of Rome itself. He had already been tried four times, and detained for two years, so that no one could deny the rightness of his plea.

About this time Agrippa II and his sister Berenice came to Cæsarea to pay their respects to the new Procurator. Agrippa's royal title depended solely upon the will of the Emperor, and it was therefore good policy to pay respects to his new representative. Agrippa II was not only King, but was also the guardian of the sacred robes of the High Priest, and had the right to nominate the successor to the High Priesthood. Festus seized upon Agrippa's presence as a means of getting a little more information about Paul, for, he said:

“It seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes against him” (Acts xxv. 27).

And Agrippa, as we learn from Acts xxvi. 3, was “an expert”. Festus makes it clear that, so far as he can understand, Paul had committed no offence against Roman law:

“Against whom, when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusations of such things as I supposed; but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, Which was dead, Whom Paul affirmed to be alive” (Acts xxv. 18, 19).

Agrippa agrees to hear the man for himself, and the hearing is arranged for the following day. This was not, of course, a new trial. Agrippa had no judicial authority, and the authority of Festus had become inoperative on account of Paul's appeal. The hearing was arranged partly to humour the royal visitors, and partly to discover something tangible in the way of evidence.

Commenting on the “great pomp” of Agrippa's entry into the court, Farrar writes:

“He would doubtless appear in his scarlet paludamentum, with his full attendance of lectors and body guard, who would stand at arms behind the gilded chairs which had been placed for himself and his distinguished visitors. We are expressly told that Agrippa and Berenice went in state to the Prætorium, she, doubtless, blazing with all her jewels, and he in his purple robes and both with the golden circlets around their foreheads Did Agrippa think of his great grandfather Herod, and the massacre of the innocents? of his great uncle Antipas, and the murder of John the Baptist? of his father Agrippa I, and the execution of James the Elder? Did he realize how closely, but unwittingly, the faith in that “one, Jesus”, had been linked with the destinies of his house? as he glanced with cold curiosity on the poor, worn, shackled prisoner—pale with sickness and long imprisonment—who was led in at his command.”

We pass over the narrative of Acts xxvi., as this belongs to the exposition of the Acts rather than to the present series, which is concerned with Roman laws and customs. Paul was under no obligation to speak before Agrippa, but he gladly seized the opportunity of witnessing for his Lord. As a result of the hearing it was decided that Paul had done nothing worthy of death or bonds, and might have been set at liberty had he not appealed unto Cæsar. Festus could now write up his *relatio*, and we can well believe that the letter sent by the hand of Julian made an acquittal practically certain, for even Nero at that time

would hardly have condemned a Roman citizen whom Felix and Lysias, Festus and Agrippa all deemed innocent of any capital crime.

#20. The Voyage from Caesarea to Rome (Acts xxvii., xxviii.). pp. 135 - 139

We must soon consider the Apostle's trial before Nero, but before we come to this we must say something about the intervening journey from Jerusalem to Rome. The student is strongly advised to have a map open for reference, so that the various incidents in the voyage may be more fully appreciated.

“And when it was determined that we should sail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners unto one named Julius, a centurion of Augustus' band. And entering a ship of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia, one Aristarchus a Macedonian of Thessalonica being with us” (Acts xxvii. 1, 2).

It seems a natural reading of this passage to suppose that Aristarchus purposed accompanying Paul as far as his native city, where Paul would be taken on to Dyrrhachium. As will be seen from the map, Dyrrhachium in Illyricum is divided from Brundisium in Italy by the Adriatic very much as Calais is divided from Dover by the English Channel. This was the route traversed by Ignatius, who refers to his Roman guards as his “ten leopards”, and says of the journey that “he fought with wild beasts all the way”.

We read in verse 3 that at Sidon Julius gave leave to Paul “to go unto his friends and refresh himself”. This indicates that Julius was a kindly man, and wherever he is mentioned throughout the story, Luke associates him with some pleasant incident. There were many things to make the journey unpleasant in the extreme. The fact that the Roman soldiers were responsible with their own lives for the security of their prisoners led to the painful custom of never leaving them unchained to one or other of the guards. The close confinement of the ship and the enforced company of the soldiers would all add to the other unpleasantness of the journey. The words used in Acts xxvii. 3 imply that Julius allowed Paul to visit his friends in Sidon “to be cared for”. His two years' detention may have weakened his health, and the permit would enable him to obtain certain necessary comforts for the voyage.

Two writers who have given exhaustive study to this voyage are James Smith, who published his “Voyage and Shipwreck” in 1848, and Admiral Sir Charles Penrose, whose manuscripts was used by Conybeare and Howson. The standard work on the ships of the ancients is that by James Smith. We learn from this that the Greeks and the Romans were ignorant of the use of the compass. They used instead instruments that resembled the modern quadrant and sextant, but were unassisted by nautical charts. Thus when “neither sun nor stars appeared” and danger threatened, the sailors would hesitate to put to sea.

With regard to the structure of the ships, James Smith writes:

“As both ends were alike, if we suppose a full-built merchant ship of the present day cut in two, and the stern half replaced by one exactly the same as that of the bow, we shall have a pretty accurate notion of what these ships were.”

The steering was accomplished by two paddle rudders, one on each quarter. Hence Acts xxvii. 40 puts the word in the plural, a piece of accuracy lost in the A.V. but restored in the R.V. The rudders were connected by a pole, and worked together in one operation. The sails were arranged with extreme simplicity, an arrangement very different from the wonderful combination achieved in the East Indiaman or modern frigate. Ships in the Apostle's time had one large centre mast, and one large sail fastened to an enormous yard. Topsails and a second mast were only used as accessories. With all the stress concentrated upon one part of the ship, there was naturally a strong tendency for it to spring a leak, and we have the testimony of ancient writers to the vast proportion of losses at sea that resulted from this weakness. To counteract the great strain imposed upon the timbers by the one central mast, the ship carried with it *hupozomata* or “undergirders”. These were ropes which were passed right round the hull to prevent the planks from starting. Excavations made at the Piraeus supply a remarkable confirmation of the truth of the Acts in this particular, as a complete account is given of everything with which the Athenian ships were supplied. Ships that sailed the Adriatic carried several “undergirdings”.

The ship with which we are concerned in Acts xxvii. had 276 souls aboard (Acts xxvii. 37), and the *Castor and Pollux* conveyed them, in addition to her own crew, from Malta to Puteoli (Acts xxviii. 11). Josephus tells us that, on board the ship that was wrecked as he was journeying to Rome, there were 600. Such information as this has led competent authorities to estimate the displacement of many ancient merchant ships as 500 tons or more.

The statement in Acts xxvii. 15 that the ship “could not *look at* the wind” suggests that these vessels could not sail so near the wind as a modern sailing ship. Pliny, however, says it was possible to sail on contrary tacks, *ventis in contrarium navigatur*.

That ships could show a fair rate of sail is evident from Cato's address to the Senate urging the third Punic war. “This fruit”, he said, showing that a fresh fig, “was gathered fresh at Carthage three days ago”. From information supplied by Diodorus, Strabo, Ptolemy and other ancient writers, we can safely conclude that, with a fair wind, a sailing vessel such as that which carried the Apostle could easily do seven knots an hour. This is in complete harmony with the record of Acts xxvii. and xxviii.

Paul's intention to visit Spain after his visit to Rome was quite practicable, for wool was constantly being brought from Cadiz to the harbour of Ostia. Egypt, with its port Alexandria, was a medium of transport for the luxuries of the East which poured into Rome, as well as its own manufactures of linen, paper and glass. Above all, Egypt was the granary of the Roman world, and it is therefore not surprising that there were many “ships of Alexandria” sailing to Italy. There were no “passenger ship” in those days.

Even Roman Emperors had to travel as Paul did. We read in Josephus that Vespasian, when he left Titus at the siege of Jerusalem, “went on board a merchant ship and sailed from Alexandria to Rhodes” (Josephus B. J. vii. ii. 1), and when the Jewish war ended, Titus followed his father, and touched at the same points (Rhegium and Puteoli) as are mentioned in Acts xxviii. 13.

Let us next notice a few outstanding features in this memorable journey.

There are no less than thirteen different expressions for “sailing” in the narrative, a fact that lends great reality to the record. In Acts xxvii. 4 we read that they “sailed under Cyprus”. This would mean sailing “under the lee” of the island, i.e., the North-east and North. We also read that they “sailed through the sea which is over against Cilicia and Pamphylia”. By standing to the North the vessel would fall in with the current that travels West along the coast of Asia Minor.

At Lysia they found a wheat ship which had also been driven North and was about to sail for Italy. The weather was unfavourable from the first. Although Cnidus is only 130 miles distant from Lysia, they were “many days” sailing “slowly” (verse 7). Since the wind did not allow the vessel either to pass North of Crete, or to continue a direct course, they made for Cape Salmone, in order to sail under the lee of the island. The wind becoming more violent there was nothing for it but to put in at Fair Havens and await a change. Luke tells us that “the fast was now already past” (verse 9), which means that it would have been about the end of September, a period regarded as dangerous for ships by both Greek and Roman writers. The Jewish season for navigation was now over, but the Gentiles did not regard the sea as closed until November 11th. Paul ventured to give his advice, but the centurion naturally preferred to take the opinion of the master of the ship.

A soft wind then sprang up from the South and, gladly weighing anchor, the vessel was steered for Phenice. The expression “if by any means” (verse 12) and the fact that Phenice was not in fact attained provides an interesting Scriptural comment on Phil. iii. 11. This passage makes good sense if we keep the “prize” in view, but is disastrous if we think of the “out-resurrection” as the blessed “hope”. This soft wind was, however, but the song of a siren, for suddenly a typhoon seized the vessel, whirling her round (see Greek word), and making it impossible for the helmsmen to keep the course (verse 15). Not a moment was available for the lowering of the mainsail, and nothing could be done but let the ship scud madly before the gale. After a fearful run of twenty-three miles, they neared the island of Clauda, and taking advantage of the temporary lull, they with some difficulty hoisted the boat aboard. The next precaution was to “undergird” the ship, for the strain on the timbers in such a gale would have been tremendous, and a leak had already developed. Furthermore, the wind was driving them straight to the dreaded bay of the Great Syrtis, “the Goodwin Sands of the Mediterranean”.

The expression “strake sail and so were driven” (verse 17) indicates that the vessel lay to, the great yard being lowered, the storm-sail (called the *artemo*) set, and the vessel

allowed to drift broadside-on to leeward, at the mercy of wind and wave. The crew were evidently in considerable fear of the ship foundering, for on the third day the great manyard was heaved overboard. Then came gloom, terror and despair:--

“And when neither sun nor stars in many days appeared, and no small tempest lay on us, all hope that we should be saved was then taken away” (verse 20).

Paul had evidently refrained from blaming the Master or the Centurion for not taking his advice originally, but in verse 21, “after long abstinence”, he gives his advice once more.

After fourteen days drifting on the Adria, the sound of breakers told the listening crew that land was near. The lead was then dropped and gave a reading of twenty fathoms. Again the lead was dropped, giving this time fifteen fathoms. Here, then, was the end. They were drifting on to a coast of some sort and must inevitable be wrecked. To drop the anchor from the bows might have swung the ship against a reef. Four anchors were therefore dropped “out of the stern”, through the hawse holes in which the great paddle-rudders moved, and then all “yearned for the day”. The fact that the anchors held all night, a result that none of the crew could have been sure of, is supported by evidence contained in the book, “English Sailing Directions”, which says that the ground in St. Paul’s Bay is so good that “while the cables hold, there is no danger, as the anchors will never start”.

From this point to the arrival of the Apostle at Rome, nothing more of great interest is added by the narrative. After three months, another wheat ship took the crew and prisoners on board and eventually landed them to Puteoli.

We are now ready to follow the Apostle along the Appian Way and to consider further points of importance in connection with his imprisonment, his trials and his martyrdom.

#21. Paul’s Trial before Nero. pp. 193 - 197

In this article we take up our story with the arrival of the “Castor and Pollux” at Puteoli. We may safely infer from the writings of Seneca that a large crowd would be assembled at the quay to welcome the arrival of the grain ship. Seneca tells us that, upon entering the bay, all vessels were obliged to strike their topsail (*supparum*), except the Alexandrian corn ships, which consequently were easily recognized and welcomed accordingly.

The trade with Alexandria would naturally lead to a settlement of Jews at Puteoli, and in these early days, where the Jews were, we should expect to find a few Christians. For some time the believers in Rome had expected a visit from the Apostle, but they would have had no news of his voyage and shipwreck. They would therefore have met the

corn-ship only on the chance that Paul might be one of the passengers. Julius was able to allow the Apostle a respite of seven days which he spent with the Christians at Puteoli. They evidently took the opportunity of sending a messenger to the Christians of Rome, who responded by sending representatives to meet the Apostle at the Appii-Forum and the Three Taverns. The Appian way, along which the Apostle was conducted, was the oldest of the Roman roads, and called, in comparison with all others, "The Queen of Roads". Eight hundred years after its construction Procopius described it in terms of astonishment. He speaks of the stones that formed it as "so fitted to each other, that they seem to be thus formed by nature, rather than cemented by art".

A few miles beyond Terracina (a map is still desirable in following the route, Puteoli, Capua, Terracina) the traveler had the choice of traveling along the canal made by Augustus for draining the marshes, or along the road itself. Not knowing which of the routes the centurion would take, the representatives from Rome came out as far as the Appii-Forum, and there waited. Horace, in his Satire, has described the place as full of low tavern-keepers, bargees and hucksters. Here these few Christians from Rome welcomed the Apostle, in spite of his chains. Ten miles further on, at *Tres Tabernae*, a place mentioned by Cicero, a second group of believers welcomed him, "whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage" (Acts xxviii. 15). Not many miles further on, Paul would have caught the first view of Rome, a city that he had often planned to visit but never saw until he looked upon it as a prisoner handcuffed to a soldier.

Passing under the Porta Capena, which was perpetually dripping, because of the aqueduct that passed over it, and through which victor and vanquished, prince and beggar, Greek, Roman, Jew and Christian must pass, Paul was conducted to the barracks of the Prætorian cohorts, and handed over to Burrhus, the Prætorian Prefect, one of the best men that ruled under Nero. We learn from Josephus that when Agrippa was cast into prison under the suspicion of Tiberius, that it was from this Prefect that his friends obtained the privilege that the soldier who guarded him should be a humane person and not a brute. It is therefore probable that the words, "but Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him" (Acts xxviii. 16), indicate a similar extension of human kindness on the part of the bluff but good-natured soldier, Burrhus, who perceived that Paul was no criminal but the victim of Jewish spite. These circumstances and the good report of Julius, acting on a man of the character of Burrhus, obtained for Paul that kind of military custody known as *observatio*. Different opinions have been expressed as to the "lodging", *xenia* (verse 23) or "his own hired house", *idion misthoma* (verse 30), but it seems a natural inference to draw from the two expressions used that, upon his arrival, the Apostle was glad to avail himself of the hospitality of his Christian friends, whereas when it became evident that his trial was to await the caprice of Nero, and might lengthen out the period of waiting for months, or even, as it turned out, for two years, the Apostle, using the financial help sent to him by the church at Philippi (Phil. iv.), hired an apartment in which he was able to receive visitors and where he dictated, with a Roman soldier ever beside him, the blessed epistles Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon. We can but hope that through these circumstances many a rough soldier passed from death unto life and became a member of the body of Christ. For more reasons than one it was most important that Paul should consult with the leaders of the

Jews. This he was able to do after three days. The dispensational importance of Acts xxviii. is worthy of all the space we can spare, and is dealt with in the series on the "Acts of the Apostles". But our concern at the moment is the Roman element in the trial, and to this we now address ourselves.

The Roman courts required the personal presence of the prosecutor. The crown was not the prosecutor, as in English law. We learn from Josephus that at about this same time two embassies set out from Jerusalem for Rome; one, to impeach Felix for his conduct while Governor (we remember how, upon his recall, he sought to placate the Jews by leaving Paul bound, Acts xxiv. 27), the other, to intercede with Nero on the subject of Agrippa's palace, which overlooked the temple. As the High Priest himself was included in this latter embassy, he may also have been entrusted with the prosecution of Paul.

"The law's delays" are no modern evil. Josephus tells us of three Jews who had languished in prison for three years without a hearing, and who were finally released upon his appeal to Poppæa. It was Nero's custom to consider separately each charge against a prisoner (*Suet. Nero*, 15), and in the case of Paul we have seen that there were three counts against him. A further source of delay was that proceedings would be adjourned from time to time to suit the Emperor's convenience. Eusebius, in his "Ecclesiastical History", is the only authority that we have for the opinion that Paul was tried on the occasion of this first imprisonment, for the Acts does not record the trial. Eusebius says:

"After defending himself successfully, it is currently reported that the apostle again went forth to preach the gospel, and afterwards came to Rome a second time."

The Apostle's statement in Phil. i. 12-14, 25; and ii. 23, 24 suggests that a trial is nearing its end, and that the result is a foregone certainty. Tiberius and Claudius followed the ancient custom of hearing causes in the Forum, but Nero sat for this purpose in his palace. Standing before the tribunal, the Apostle's bonds would become manifest in the whole Prætorium (Phil. i. 13). The preliminaries of the trial had already taken place under Felix and Festus, the prisoner being therefore already in a state of accusation. The termination of the proceedings was announced by a crier proclaiming "*Dixerunt*" (they have spoken). The jury then voted by depositing in an urn wax tablets bearing the letter A, for *Absolvo*, C, *Condemno*, or N.L., *Non liquet*, A new trial.

The question of the interval between the first imprisonment and the second arrest has already been considered in some detail on pages 159-164, which the reader should consult.

At his second arrest Paul did not receive the humane treatment that characterized the first. He now suffered as an "evil doer". His place of detention is no longer the house of a friend or his own hired house, but a dungeon, so damp and cold that he asks Timothy to bring with him when he comes his cloke that had been left behind at Troas.

The trial fell into two parts, for he speaks of his "first defence" (II Tim. iv. 16). Evidently he had been remanded: the presiding judge having pronounced the word *Amplius*, an adjournment had taken place, and the Apostle seized the opportunity to write his last letter to his beloved son Timothy. Hatred of the Christians now ruled men's minds, and a charge of treason, from which there would be no hope of acquittal, would be laid against the Apostle.

Somewhere outside the city walls, along the Via Ostiensis, where now stands the church of *San Paolo fuori le mura*, the Apostle was led forth from his dungeon to execution. In the days of the Republic this would have been effected by the lictor's axe, but under Nero, it was accomplished by the sword. It is not for us to follow the traditions of men as to what became of Paul's body after his death. He had finished his course, he had kept the faith, he was assured that there awaited him "at that day" a crown. We can rejoice that what seemed most like defeat, was victory. He was "more than conqueror" through Christ Who loved him.

While there are other features that are of interest, we feel that enough has been said for the object in view, and that we have proved the value of knowing something of contemporary history as we study the Acts and Epistles. With the good fight ending with Paul's martyrdom we therefore bring this series of studies to a close.

Where actual quotations have been made, the author's name is given, but in a subject of this character which can be prepared only by consulting authorities, indebtedness to the writings of others for much of the information cannot be formally acknowledged. A list of the works chiefly consulted in the acquisition of most of the historic material used is, however, appended, and the interested reader who is inclined to pursue the subject further will find that this will afford good ground from which to make deeper research than can be attempted here, where we are but writing a series of brief articles.

The Works of Josephus (Witson's translation).
The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (Lewin).
The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (Conybeare and Howson).
The Herods (Farrar).
The Life and Work of St. Paul (Farrar).
Cyclopaedia of Biblical Knowledge (Kitto).
St. Paul and Roman Law (W. E. Ball).
Historical Commentary on Galatians (Sir William Ramsay).
The Church in the Roman Empire (Sir William Ramsay).
Roman Law and History in the New Testament (Septimus Buss).
The Greek New Testament (Alford).
The Greek New Testament (Bloomfield).
The Greek New Testament (Webster and Wilkinson).
The Greek Testament (Wordsworth).
The History of the World (Edited by J. A. Hammerton).
The Biographical Treasury (Samuel Maunders).
The Works of Dr. John Lightfoot.
Light from the Ancient East (Deissmann).
Universal Encyclopedia (Harmsworth's).
Roman History, Literature and Antiquities (A. Petrie).
Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (Gibbon).

The Epistle to the Romans.

#85. Romans xv. 8 - xvi. 23.

Salutation, Warning and Benediction (xvi. 1 - 24).

pp. 1 - 11

We now take up the third and last subdivision (xv. 8 - xvi. 23) of this section dealing with Gentile acceptance. As a sort of tail-piece, we find in chapter xvi. a mingling of the ministries belonging to men and women, and to the circumcision and the uncircumcision. Divisions are categorically condemned, and self-servers are to be shunned. The holy kiss is to be given without consideration of nationality, and the whole passage is coloured by the prophetic forecast in which Satan, the cause of all fleshly religion and carnal divisions, is bruised "under your feet" by the God of Peace.

Beginning at the first verse of the chapter, we read:

"I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cencrea: that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also" (Rom. xvi. 1, 2).

The Apostle's "commendation" of Phebe was no empty conventionality. His own use of the word in other passages makes it clear that it must have implied sterling worth in the person commended.

"Not walking in craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth *commending* ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God" (II Cor. iv. 2).

"In all things *commending* ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distress" (II Cor. vi. 4).

(See also II Cor. vii. 11, x. 18 and xii. 11).

Phebe was a deaconess. Pliny, in his letter to Trajan in which he asks the Emperor whether he is to punish people simply for being Christians, says that, scarcely crediting the account he had received of the innocence of these Christians, he had put two deaconesses (*ex duabus ancillis quae ministrae dicebantur*) to the torture, but had discovered nothing beyond (as it appeared to him) perverted and immoderate superstition. In the East, the ministry of deaconesses would be even more of a necessity than in the modern West, for women did not then mix with men as they do here to-day. In the Apostle's instructions to Timothy, it will be remembered that he told him to treat "the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity" (I Tim. v. 2).

Something of the character of the ministry that was open to women can be seen in such passages as the following in I Tim. v.:

“Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints’ feet, if she have relieved the afflicted” (I Tim. v. 10).

While it was not permissible for a woman to teach in cases where such teaching would carry with it the usurpation of authority over a man (I Tim. ii. 12), women were by no means restricted to domestic duties. In his epistle to Titus, the Apostle writes:

“The aged women teachers of good things teach the young women” (Titus ii. 3, 4).

Moreover, the fact that no man could be a bishop or a deacon who was not the husband of one wife, whose children were not well behaved, and whose home was not fit to show hospitality (I Tim. iii.), reveals how much fellowship was expected in the execution of these offices between husband and wife.

Tradition has it that Phebe was entrusted with this precious letter to the Romans. If this is correct, it was indeed a valuable and exacting service, as any who are acquainted with the hazards of travel in those days will appreciate. The Roman church is exhorted to receive Phebe in the Lord in a manner worthy of saints, and also to assist her in any business in which she may have need.

Phebe is also described as being “a succourer of many”. The word here is *prostatis* which is equivalent to the Latin *patronus*, “a defender of meaner persons” (*Plutarch*). Athenian writers also use the word of such as took care of strangers (*harpocraton*). To this title the Apostle adds the phrase “and of myself also”. We have no knowledge of the actual incidents here, but although we do not know anything of the particular dangers or difficulties out of which Phebe’s “patronage” extricated Paul, the Lord has recorded the fact, and we with the Apostle can feel truly grateful. There are some who consider that the Apostle was rather stern with regard to women, but such are superficial readers of his writings. He who, as a Pharisee, had thanked God that he had “not been born a woman”, is the one who, in his epistle to the Galatians, writes:

“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal. iii. 28).

In Phil. iv. the Apostle specially remembers “the women” that laboured with him in the gospel (Phil. iv. 3). It is a narrow view of ministry that limits it to the platform and public speaking. Anyone who has done much traveling and speaking cannot fail to have been impressed with the fact that, unless others fulfilled their own ministries in other ways, the public speaking would become almost an impossibility. We can be sure that Phebe would feel that there could be no greater honour than to find her name inscribed in the Epistle to the Romans as one who had succoured Paul in the hour of need.

From verse 3 to verse 23 (Chapter xvi.), the Apostle is occupied in sending greetings to various members of the Church, beginning with the Jewish believers. So great is the intimacy between the Apostle and Priscilla and Aquila, that he calls her by the diminutive “Prisca”, even as he does when standing in the shadow of death in II Tim. iv. 19.

Perhaps the fact that the Apostle was to lay down his life for Christ's sake, together with the fact that Priscilla and Aquila had laid down their own necks for his sake, may provide the reason why this more intimate name came to the surface in these two passages. Every reader of these lines should feel indebted to these two faithful believers, for in verse 4 we read:

“Unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles” (Rom. xvi. 4).

The salutation to the “church that is in their house” seems to indicate that this hospitable couple had dedicated their home to the Lord, and this is confirmed in Acts xviii. where we read that both Paul and Apollos profited by their welcome, when they had been forced out of Rome and abode for the time at Corinth (Acts xviii. 1, 2, 26). Moreover, when they lived for a while in Ephesus we again find that there was a church in their house (I Cor. xvi. 19).

From verse 5 onwards a number of believers are mentioned of whom nothing more is known. The Apostle's regard for the good name of a sister in Christ is illustrated by the reserve with which he uses endearing titles. Speaking of a brother in the Lord he says “my beloved” (verse 9), but when giving the same title to a sister he says “the beloved Persis” (verse 12). We get a very homely touch in the following verse where the Apostle writes: “Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine.” No details are added, but one can well imagine the lonely Apostle, without wife, sister or mother, travel-worn and weary, finding a Bethel in the home of Rufus and his mother.

Andronicus and Junia are said to be not only “kinsmen”, but also “of note among the apostles”. There is no difficulty about this phrase, if we remember that the “apostles” were not limited to the “twelve”. Barnabas (Acts xiv. 4, 14), Sylvanus and Timothy (I Thess. i. 1, ii. 6), Apollos (I Cor. iv. 6-9), and Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25) all appear to have held this office, besides others who are not named (II Cor. viii. 23).

It is of great interest to learn that quite recently an Italian market-gardener laid bare a little cemetery, with a number of head stones bearing the names Urbanus, Stachys, Tryphena, Amplias, Philologus, Julius and Hermas. Every one of these appears in Rom. xvi., and there can be no doubt that these were the very people mentioned by the Apostle. Lightfoot, in his note on the reference to the “saints in Cæsar's household” in Philippians, has shown that many of these names were well known at the Roman court. Amplias and Urbanus are mentioned several times. Stachys is rare, but there is a record of a man of this name who held office at about the time when Paul wrote. Apelles (verse 10) was a name belonging to the Imperial household. Aristobulus, mentioned in the same verse, was the grandson of Herod the Great, and slaves belonging to him would be designated *Aristobuliani*, or as Paul puts it, *hoi ek ton Aristoboulon* (Rom. xvi. 10). Herodian, a fellow-countryman of the Apostle, is mentioned immediately after this household of Herod's grandson.

The name Narcissus was a fairly common one, but the close proximity of the household of Narcissus to that of Aristobulus (verses 10 and 11) makes it probable that the Apostle is referring to a powerful freedman Narcissus, whose wealth was proverbial

and who had an immense influence with Claudius. Narcissus was put to death by Agrippina shortly after the accession of Nero, about three or four years before the epistle to the Romans was written.

Tryphena and Tryphosa were probably sisters, and both names occur in the inscriptions. Both names are derived from *truphe*, “luxury”, and there may be an intended contrast here in the Apostle’s use of the word “labour” to describe their service.

Having sent greetings to so many, the Apostle now says: “Salute one another with a holy kiss” (Rom. xvi. 16). Paul sends the same exhortation to two other churches (I Cor. xvi. 20; I Thess. v. 26), and Peter also speaks of “a kiss of charity”. The defining of the kiss each time may be because of the false charges that were made against the believers. The sexes did not intermingle in the Church as they do to-day, and the idea of a brother kissing a sister in Christ in the Church is not in mind. The Rabbis did not permit more than three kinds of kiss: the kiss of reverence, the kiss of reception, and the kiss of dismissal. This form of salutation is not in vogue in the West, and any local custom that expresses Christian love may rightly take its place.

Before the Apostle sends greetings from those who were with him (Rom. xvi. 21-23), he pauses to give a serious word of warning to the Church at Rome. The fact that this warning comes almost at the end of the epistle instead of in the opening chapter as in Galatians and I Corinthians, possibly indicates that the evil had not in this case grown to any extent, but that the Apostle realized that it was there, and that a word of warning was needed. Wherever the Apostle and the truth committed to him penetrated, there, sooner or later, would the Judaizers and their evil teaching follow. In the record of the Acts, we find that the Apostle had scarcely returned from the great evangelistic work recorded in Acts xiii. and xiv., before it became necessary to go to Jerusalem in order to counteract the evil that was being wrought by “certain men which came down from Judæa” (Acts xv. 1). Those who seek to follow in the Apostle’s footsteps are also conscious that there is the same sequence to-day, and, while we do not fill our pages with warnings and exposures, there are times when silence would mean an unfaithful discharge of our stewardship.

The false teachers whom the Apostle had in mind when he wrote to the Roman church are characterized in a twofold way:

- (1) They caused divisions and offences.
- (2) These divisions and offences were contrary to the doctrine that the saints had learned.

There are two words that are translated “division” in the Epistles. The first of these is *schisma*, “a rent”, as in I Cor. i. 10, and, literally, in Matt. ix. 16. Where this word is used it indicates a serious division within the Church. The second word is the one used here in Romans: *dichostasia*, meaning a “dissension”, a symptom of the disease which, if unchecked, will end in schism. The word is used only three times by the Apostle—in Rom. xvi. 17, I Cor. iii. 3 and Gal. v. 20. The context of each reference indicates that this dissension arises not so much from ignorance of the truth but rather from self-seeking and the flesh.

“Ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?” (I Cor. iii. 3).

“Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery seditions” (Gal. v. 19, 20).

“For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly” (Rom. xvi. 18).

Whenever there is a crime committed, and the culprit is not known, one of the first things that the Criminal Investigation Officer asks is, Who will benefit by this crime? and many a time this has opened the way to the detection of the criminal. The same thing often appears to be true, sadly enough, in the perpetration of error, and we find the Apostle associating false teaching with emulation and envy, with “filthy lucre”, and with service that he calls “serving their own belly”. To stand resolutely for the truth, without compromise, is not a “paying proposition” as the world uses the term.

The “offences” that the Apostle associates with the “dissensions” caused by these false teachers may be best understood by referring back to the earlier occurrence of the word *skandalon* in Rom. xiv. 13. Dissensions and stumbling-blocks were both contrary to the teaching that the Apostle had been giving in Rom. xii.-xv., where he enjoins unity, acceptance, reception, and a willingness to forego legitimate liberties for the sake of others. Nevertheless, following the usual method of Biblical instructions, the Apostle does not rest satisfied with the declaration of positive truths, but supplements them by a negative warning. In our own teaching we should do well if we followed the Apostle’s example here more consistently.

Another feature of importance is suggested by the word *para* in Rom. xvi. 17, where it is translated “contrary”. The same word, in a similar context, occurs in Gal. i. 8: “Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel to you *para* that which we have preached to you.” Like all prepositions, the word *para* must be translated in a variety of ways according to the case it governs and the demands of the context, but the underlying and basic idea is “beside”, as in the word “parallel”. Where there is a frank denial of truth, we are not deceived, but where the evil doctrine “comes up alongside” the danger is serious. Often we may have to appear unkind and uncharitable in the eyes of those we serve when we denounce some doctrine that is in many points very like the truth for which we stand. In Rom. i. 25, in connection with the introduction of idolatry, this same word is used. Had the worship of idols been introduced at the beginning as something opposed to the worship of the living God, it would probably have made little progress. It came in, however, as something “beside”.

“They worshipped and served the creature *para* (alongside) the Creator.”

The initial sin of the garden of Eden is also characterized by the same word. The word “offence” (Rom. v. 15, 16, 18, 20) is *paraptoma*, “to fall aside”; “transgression” (Rom. v. 14) is *parabasis*, “to step aside”; while “disobedience” (Rom. v. 19) is *parakoe*, “to hear aside”. There is no frontal attack either in the record of Gen. iii. or in Rom. v. It is all “beside”.

The Apostle calls upon the Roman saints to “mark” and “avoid” those referred to in verse 17. To do anything else would be to act upon our own responsibility and so invite disaster. The avoidance of all such teachers is enjoined with increasing emphasis in the Apostle’s closing ministry. Such words as “avoid”, “flee”, and “shun” are characteristic of the epistles to Timothy. It is a false charity that would plead for fellowship in a case like this. The Lord Himself knows what is best.

Several points are brought before the reader’s notice in connection with these teachers. In the first place their teaching is deceptive (Rom. xvi. 18). This feature recurs in other passages:

“For such are false apostles, deceitful workers Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light” (II Cor. xi. 13, 14).

“Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw yourself” (I Tim. vi. 5).

“There are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake” (Titus i. 10, 11).

The ground upon which these teachers worked is described as “the hearts of the simple” (Rom. xvi. 18). The word “simple” here is *akakos*, from *a*, “not” and *kakos*, “evil” and is used in Heb. vii. 26 to describe the character of the Lord Himself. In the LXX it corresponds to two Hebrew words:

- (a) The Hebrew word *tam*, “perfect” (Job viii. 20).
- (b) The Hebrew word *pethi*, “simple” (Prov. i. 4).

It is in the second of these senses that the Apostle uses the word here.

In Prov. xiv. 15 we read:

“The simple believeth every word, but the prudent looketh well to his going.”

How well we know these “simple” ones. They have only to be met with “good words” and “fair speeches” to be entrapped. The two expressions—“good words” and “fair speeches”—relate to the matter and the form of what was said. These false teachers said admirable things, and they expressed themselves well. *Eulogias* generally means “blessing”, and is the word that gives us the English “eulogy”. Here is evidently indicates “fine phraseology”.

The Apostle follows this warning by a reference to the obedience manifested by the Roman church. Inasmuch as this is introduced by the word *gar* (“for”), it must be regarded as part of the Apostle’s warning. He does not so much intend here to praise their obedience as to say, in effect: Don’t let your commendable obedience prevent you from exercising care before you accept any doctrine preached to you, however well it may be presented, and however acceptable it may appear. That this was in the Apostle’s mind seems evident from what follows:

“I am glad, therefore, on account of you (in this matter of obedience) but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil” (Rom. xvi. 19).

Here the word “simple” is *akeraios* and means literally “unmixed”.

As Eph. ii. 2, 3 reveals, those who fulfil the desires of the flesh and of the mind, are themselves the tools of the “Prince of the power of the air”. So here, the Apostle turns from the false teachers to the prime mover in all deception, Satan himself. He has already spoken of the fall of man in Rom. v., and now he looks forward to the fulfillment of the primeval promise: “The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head”—

“But the God of Peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly” (Rom. xvi. 20).

It is a remarkable fact that the prophecy of Gen. iii. 15 is never specifically referred to by any N.T. writer as being fulfilled by Christ at the cross. This is at first sight very strange; and yet there must be a reason why no reference is made to it. The reason seems to be that the “Seed” of the woman, while referring primarily to Christ Himself, must also include all the true seed of promise. Hence the early promise of victory will not be truly fulfilled until the time of the end, when all the redeemed shall stand with the Redeemer Himself, triumphant because of His victory.

It is clear from verse 20 that, when Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, he could speak of the fulfillment of the promise of Gen. iii. 15 as taking place “shortly”. The same word is found in Rev. i. 1 and xxii. 6, showing that, at the time of writing, the setting aside of Israel at Acts xxviii. and the intervention of the dispensation of the Mystery were not known. The hope entertained was, as we have seen, the fulfillment of Isaiah’s promise in connection with the time when the lion and the kid should lie down together. This synchronizes with the time when the disturber of the peace of Eden shall be put under the feet of the true Seed. It is important to keep in mind that right up to the last chapter of Romans, no hint is found of “the Mystery” revealed in Ephesians. We make no comment here on Rom. xvi. 25-27, but we should like to assure the reader that this passage has not been forgotten.

After the benediction with which the Apostle usually concludes his epistles, he adds a salutation from eight fellow-workers. The second in the list, Lucius, is probably Lucius of Cyrene, who was a teacher at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1). Jason, who immediately follows, may be the same as the Jason mentioned in Acts xvii. 5, while Sosipater may have come from Berea (Acts xx. 4). All this, however, is uncertain and not of essential importance.

The introduction of the name of the amanuensis, Tertius, is particularly interesting. His name suggests that he was a slave, and we know that slaves were trained to write in a kind of shorthand, many specimens of which exist to-day. The fact that Tertius is included among the believers here, while the names of the actual writers do not occur in the other epistles, suggests possibly that the latter were employed in their capacity as writers but were not believers in Christ. We can only hope that the glorious doctrine they transcribed may have subsequently led them to the Christ about Whom they wrote.

The salutation: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all”, or something equivalent, should be looked for as the Apostle’s sign-manual in every epistle. When the Church at Thessalonica had been deceived by “an epistle as from” Paul, the Apostle draws attention to the fact that they could always rely upon the authenticity of an epistle from himself, inasmuch as the Lord would not permit any other writer to use this particular phrase in closing an epistle. This, of course, necessitates inspiration: otherwise there would be nothing to prevent either Peter, innocently, or a deceiver, with intent, from using identically the same phrase.

“The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen” (II Thess. iii. 17, 18).

The reader will find at the end of every one of Paul’s epistles this reference to “grace with you”. It is said by many that Paul did not sign the epistle to the Hebrews. This is certainly true so far as the actual name is concerned, but the authorship is not difficult to determine if we read the benediction with which the epistle closes.

We have already exceeded the space that this article should occupy and we will therefore defer until next time any further remarks regarding the close of this great epistle to the Romans.

#86. Romans xvi. 25 - 27.
The mystery that had been silenced.
pp. 35 - 42

We now come to the closing section of the epistle to the Romans, a section that it is of the utmost importance to understand, and about which a great deal of discussion has arisen.

The genuineness of the doxology has been disputed (1) on the ground that its position is unsuitable either at the end of chapter xiv. 23, where it stands in 190 manuscripts, or at the close of chapter xvi.; (2) on the ground of its “unpauline” lack of simplicity. The doxology is unusually elaborate for Paul’s epistles, but there is of course no rule governing such a matter, and the nature of the subject in the case in point fully accounts for any complexity in its composition. The doxology is found

- (1) After xvi. 24, in MSS B, C, D, E, Aleph, Syr., Copt., Alth., Vulg., Lat., Fathers.
- (2) After xiv. 23 by L, most cursive MSS Chrys., Theod., etc.
- (3) Both after xiv 23 and xvi. 23 by A5, 17, 109 Lat.
- (4) Nowhere D, F, G, Marcion.*

[NOTE: * - For explanation of these symbols see Scrivener or Burgon and Berean Expositor Volume XXI, page 169. They are not important enough to us here to justify time and space in their elucidation.]

When we consider the structure of the epistle as a whole we shall see two things:

- (1) It can stand nowhere else but where it comes in the A.V.
- (2) If it were omitted, the epistle would remain for ever imperfect.

To appreciate the latter of these two statements it is essential that we see the structure of the epistle as a whole, and as this must be given somewhere in this last article of the series, it will be fitting that it appear now.

The Structure of the Epistle to the Romans as a whole.

A	i. 1-17. Gospel. Promised afore. For obedience of faith among all nations.	
B	i. 18 - iii. 20. Jews equally with Gentiles guilty before God.	In the outer portions of Romans we read of sins, law of Sinai, Abraham, Israel, Jew and Gentile.
C	iii. 21-31. The Glory of God. Come short of.	
D	iv. 1-25. His own body now dead.	
E	v. 1-11. Reconciliation. Doctrinal.	

The Mystery of Romans xvi. 25-27.	F v. 12-21. Condemnation in Adam. G vi., vii. Question. Repudiation. Answer. F viii. No condemnation in Christ.	In the inner portions of Romans, we have sin, law of sin, Adam, and Man, but no references to Abraham, Jew and Gentile.
---	---	---

	E ix.-xi. Reconciliation. Dispensational.	
D	xii., xiii. Present your bodies a living sacrifice.	The outer portion, Rom. xi. - xvi. 24, the same feature as Rom. i. - v. 11, but from a dispensational and practical point of view.
C	xiv. - xv. 7. The Glory of God. Received, to.	
B	xv. 8 - xvi. 23. Gentiles equally with Jews acceptable before God.	
A	xvi. 24-27. Mystery silenced afore. For obedience of faith unto all nations.	

From this structure it will at once be seen that Rom. xvi. 25-27 is essential to complete the epistle. The reader who has followed the exposition from the outset in Volume XVI, will be able to fill in the details of every section, so completing the structural analysis of this most wonderful epistle. We must however show the relationship of A | i. 1-17 and A | xvi. 25-27, as that is the subject now before us.

<p style="text-align: center;">The Outer Section. (Rom. i. 1-17). The Gospel of God.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">The Inner Section. (Rom. xvi. 25-27). My Gospel.</p>
<p>Concerning His Son Jesus Christ. Promised afore. Prophets in the holy Scriptures. Unto obedience of faith among all nations. Grace from God our Father.</p> <p>To the end ye may be established. The power of God unto salvation. Righteousness revealed . . . as it is written.</p>	<p>The preaching of Jesus Christ. Kept silence in age times, now manifested. Prophetic writings. For obedience of faith to all nations. Praise to the <i>aionian</i> God, and to the only wise God. To Him Who is able to establish you. To Him Who is of power. Revelation of mystery . . . scriptures, the prophets.</p>

It is evident that there is an intended contrast between these two passages. From the days of Abraham onward the gospel was no secret.

“The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham” (Gal. iii. 8).

“Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad” (John viii. 56).

Here however in Rom. xvi. 25-27 is a mystery, and that mystery something that had been silenced. It cannot therefore possibly be the same thing as the gospel preached in Rom. i.

It is not stated, however, in Rom. i. 1, 2, or in any of the passages that link the gospel with the O.T. Scriptures, that the gospel was fully made known before the coming of Christ. Take for example Rom. i. 17:

“For therein (i.e. the gospel of Christ, i. 16) is the righteousness of God *revealed* from faith to faith, according as it had been written (in Hab. ii. 4) ‘The just shall live by faith’.”

Without the fuller light of the gospel of Christ, it would not be evident from the passage in Habakkuk that the power of the gospel of Christ resided in the provision of a righteousness by faith. This will be evident if we quote the passage:

“For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie; though it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him, *but the just shall live by his faith*” (Hab. ii. 3-4).

But this provision is now “revealed” and in the hands of an inspired apostle can be confirmed by such passages as Hab. ii. 4, although the teaching does not lie on the surface. Again, having quoted many passages from the O.T. Scriptures, the Apostle says:

“But now” (in contrast to the period “then”) “the righteousness of God, apart from law, has been manifested” (perfect tense) “being borne witness to” (present tense) “by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ” (Rom. iii. 21, 22).

Here the “manifestation” takes place before the “witness” can be borne by O.T. prophets. So in Rom. xvi. 26, we read of something that had been kept in silence, but which was then made manifest.

Let us set out this doxology so that we may the better consider it in detail.

Romans xvi. 24-27.

- A | 24. | a | Grace be with you. Amen.
 b | To Him Who is able to establish.
B1 | *Kata.* 25. Gospel proclaimed. According to my gospel.
B2 | *Kata.* 25, 26. Mystery manifested. According to revelation of mystery.
B3 | *Kata.* 26. Make known. According to commandment.
A | 27. | b | To God only wise.
 a | Glory unto the ages. Amen.

We observe that the section begins with “grace” and ends with “glory”, both the statements contained in it being sealed with an Amen. The words “to be able” are a translation of *dunamai* which literally means “to be of power”. This is balanced by the only “wise” God, the two statements revealing “the power of God and the wisdom of God” working together.

Salvation is not in view here in the same sense as in Rom. i. 16. The Apostle now desires that those who are saved shall be *established*. He had desired this at the beginning of the epistle (Rom. i. 11) where however the establishing was connected with “some spiritual gift”. Here in Rom. xvi. the establishing is associated with what the Apostle calls “My gospel”. This expression “My gospel” is used three times by Paul, and if we consider the context of each reference we shall be impressed with the magnitude of its sphere.

The first occurrence is in Rom. ii. 16. Here the Apostle is speaking of the Gentile world, unevangelized and unenlightened by the law: a world left to the voice of conscience and the witness of creation. To argue from Rom. ii. that anyone who patiently continues in well-doing will be saved, whether he believes the gospel or not, is to handle the word of God deceitfully. Obviously, where no gospel message has ever penetrated, it cannot be believed (Rom. x. 14), yet it is wrong to infer that Rom. ii. teaches salvation by works. The truth is that salvation for any is neither by works nor by faith, but by the finished work of Christ. The man who hears the gospel and believes is saved, but that salvation is a secret unknown to anyone, and unconfirmed to himself, apart from those good works that manifest the reality of the faith. The point of the passage is that while the unevangelized heathen cannot believe a message he has never heard, yet if he manifests by his works that he would have believed had he been given the opportunity, God reveals that this will be fully recognized “in that day”.

“For when the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the

meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel” (Rom. ii. 14-16).

The second occurrence of “My gospel” is in Rom. xvi. 25 and the third in II Tim. ii. 8.

“Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel.”

These three occurrences have reference to the unevangelized heathen, to the revelation of a mystery hitherto kept in silence, and to the position of the Lord Jesus Christ in the dispensation of the mystery. Three concentric circles, each narrower than the preceding one, yet each vitally associated with the peculiar ministry of Paul.

It is, then, evident that what Paul calls “My gospel” is a distinctive message, not to be confused with the good news proclaimed by others. Associated with this gospel is the preaching of Jesus Christ “according to the revelation of a secret which hath been silenced in *aionian* times, but is now made manifest, and through prophetic writings.”

The reader will be conscious that there is something missing in the above rendering. He naturally feels that the phrase “and through prophetic writings” should be followed by “as well as” In other words the particle *te* is often followed by *kai*, so that there appears to be an ellipsis here. Elsewhere *te* is passed over in our Version, but to be accurate it should always be translated. Look at the difference the recognition of the particle makes in I Cor. i. 30:

“But of Him, are ye in Christ Jesus, Who of God is made unto us wisdom, *as well as* righteousness, and sanctification and redemption.”

Consequently we read Rom. xvi. 26 as follows:

“But now made manifest both through prophetic writings as well as” (by the Apostle’s preaching) “according to the commandment of the *aionian* God.”

Every commentator speaks of the grammatical “gaps” that appear in this great doxology, as though the Apostle’s thoughts were too great to find expression.

“*According to the revelation of a secret.*”—It is entirely unnecessary to assume that this is the secret, or mystery, revealed in Eph. iii. The dispensational section of Romans had a secret the making known of which illuminated the problem resulting from Israel’s failure (Rom. xi. 25), and this is the theme of another doxology, namely that which closes Rom. xi. at verses 33-36.

When examining Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39, we have seen that it constitutes a unique section of the teaching of the epistle. It goes back to a period before there was a Jew, and before Abraham, to Adam. No one can read Gen. iii. without being conscious that there is much unexplained. Solomon writing in Eccles. iii. says, “To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven”, and in enumerating them he says, “A

time to keep silence, and a time to speak” (Eccles. iii. 1, 7). The word translated in the A.V. “kept secret” is *sigao*, translated elsewhere in the N.T. “keep silence” and “hold one’s peace”.

Much important truth latent in Gen. i.-xi. was “hushed” until the “time to speak” had arrived, when Paul was inspired to write the epistle to the Romans. The study of Gen. i.-xi. in the light of Rom. v. 12 - viii. 39 is therefore of the utmost importance to the believer who would realize the peculiar character of his calling. From Gen. xii. until the end of the Acts one nation holds the pre-eminent place and that part of the O.T. which deals with Israel knows no salvation apart from the chosen race, or the covenants made with Abraham.

If Israel should finally fail and fall, the *prophets* had nothing to tell us of how God would cope with the resulting problem. It is, accordingly, the purpose of the central section of Romans to reveal the relationship of man, as such (i.e., as neither Jew nor Gentile) to Adam and to Christ, irrespective both of promises made to the fathers, and the failure or success of the chosen people. But this is not the theme of the O.T. prophecy in general. The period covered by the Scriptures from Gen. xii. to Matt. i. is as long as that covered by Gen. i. 3 to xi. In that small space of eleven chapters is written all that can be known of the first 2000 years of this present creation. What is written is pregnant with truth, but it must await its appointed time, and just as the gospel itself revealed teaching hidden in O.T. Scriptures (as we have already seen in Hab. ii. 3, 4, etc.) so these early chapters of Genesis hold much basic teaching throwing light on the position of the believer who is saved and justified without reference to the law of Moses. Volumes have been written to associate the obedience of Christ with the law of Moses, whereas this law was but transient, it was “added because of transgressions”, it was “found fault with” and passed away (Heb. viii. 7).

This secret has been hushed in *aionian times*. We read of some part of God’s purpose as being related to a period “before aionian times” (Titus i. 2; II Tim. i. 9), and in I Corinthians we read of “the wisdom of God in a mystery” which has been “hidden” and which God “foreordained before the ages” (I Cor. ii. 7). The mystery of the prison epistles was “hidden from the ages, and from the generations” (Col. i. 26). These hidden subjects had “their own seasons” of manifestation, which manifestations were through the medium of “preaching” and “according to” a “commandment” (Titus i. 3).

The mystery of Rom. xvi. is not said to be related to a period “before age times” but silenced in age times. This secret is the theme of the central section of Romans, and its subject is Adam, not Abraham, man, not Israel or Gentile, the law of sin, not the law of Sinai, the dominion of sin and death, not the domination of Canaanites or Babel.

What are the “prophetic writings” that Paul refers to? The words translated in the A.V. “the scriptures of the prophets” are not exactly the same as those used in Rom. i. 2. In Rom. i. 2 the original reads: *Dia ton propheton auton en graphais hagiais*, where, Rom. xvi. 26 reads: *Dia te graphion prophetikon*. The suggestion is made by some that not only a difference of expression is intended here, but a real difference and that the

reference in Rom. i. 2, is to O.T. prophets, whereas that in Rom. xvi. is to N.T. prophets. It may be so, but the reader should be aware that nothing in the language used constitutes a proof of this. *Prophetikos* is to *prophetes*, what *pneumatikos* is to *pneuma*, simply the adjectival form. As the only other occurrence of the word will show, every one of the O.T. prophecies are “prophetic writings” (II Pet. i. 21).

It was when the Apostle received commandment to make this early truth known that the prophetic writings that had for generations held their secret began to speak.

The fact that what was made known both in Rom. i. and xvi. was “for the obedience of faith to all nations”, establishes the unity of purpose that links the whole of Rom. i. - xvi. 27 together as an indivisible whole. There is no need to adopt the suggestion of *Lightfoot* that the doxology was added some years after.

The ascription of praise is to the only wise God. Wisdom is associated with the unfolding purpose of the ages (Rom. xi. 33; I Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 8, 9; iii. 10). On this high note, the epistle ends.

What a book this is! What a glorious revelation of grace! What terrible depths of sin and failure! What a basis upon which to build, when the time should come, that new revelation of transcendent love, the epistle to the Ephesians! Brethren, hold fast to the doctrine of Romans for it is fundamental. Leave the dispensational points, such as “to the Jew first”, for they have a time limit, but the glorious scheme of justification by faith underlies the whole of God’s subsequent dealings with men, and the departure from the teaching of this book is one of the sure signs of the fast approaching apostacy. We shall, we trust, study other precious portions of the Word together, but never again shall we strike such bed rock truth as we have discovered in this epistle that closes the written testimony of the Acts period.

ERRATA.—Page 5, line 14: “initial” to read “intended”;
Page 6, line 35: “penetration” to read “perpetration”;
Page 10, line 4: “shall” to read “should”;
Page 12, line 8: replace full stop by comma.

The Self-Drawn Portrait of the Apostle Paul.

#1. The Portrait as a Whole. pp. 109, 110

Most students of Scripture have at some time or other used Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul". In the introduction to Vol. I there occurs one of the longest sentences to be met with in ordinary literature—a sentence containing more than 500 words.

The introduction opens as follows:

"The purpose of this work is to give a living picture of St. Paul himself, and of the circumstances by which he was surrounded."

Later on in the Introduction we read:

"We must listen to his words, if we would learn to know him In his case it is not too much to say that his letters are himself—a portrait painted by his own hand, of which every feature may be 'known and read of all men'."

Every reader of *The Berean Expositor* will feel that the better we know the apostle Paul, the better we shall know his Lord, for he is given as an example for us to follow. We propose, therefore, in a series of short and simple studies, to take the long sentence already mentioned and use its separate clauses, point by point, as a means of appreciating the many-sided character of the earthen vessel, to whom, under God, we owe so much.

As many of our readers may not possess a copy of *Conybeare and Howson*, we give below the sentence that will supply us with our clues, and then in subsequent studies we will take feature by feature, so that we may obtain a full-length portrait. Such a study will not lead to any foolish adulation of the man. We shall realize that he was indeed of like infirmity with ourselves; but we shall also see what grace can do—perhaps be the more inclined to look away from ourselves and our limitations, and give a larger place to the glory and grace that made Paul what he was, and can make us more than those who know us would believe possible.

"Here we see that fearless independence with which he 'withstood Peter to the face';—that impetuosity which breaks out in his apostrophe to the 'foolish Galatians';—that earnest indignation which bids his converts 'beware of dogs, beware of the concision', and pours itself forth in the emphatic 'God forbid', which meets every Antinomian suggestion;—that fervid patriotism which makes him 'wish that he were himself accursed from Christ for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites';—that generosity which looked for no other reward than 'to preach the Glad Tidings of Christ without charge', and made him feel that he would rather 'die than that any man should make this glorying void';—that dread of officious interference which led him to shrink from 'building on another man's foundation';—that delicacy which shows itself in his appeal to Philemon, whom he might have commanded, 'yet for love's sake rather beseeching him, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of

Jesus Christ', and which is even more striking in some of his farewell greetings, as (for instance) when he bids the Romans salute Rufus, and '*his mother, who is also mine*';—that scrupulous fear of evil appearance which 'would not eat any man's bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that he might not be chargeable to any of them';—that refined courtesy which cannot bring itself to blame till it has first praised, and which makes him deem it needful almost to apologize for the freedom of giving advice to those who were not personally known to him;—that self-denying love which 'will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest he make his brother to offend';—that impatience of exclusive formalism with which he overwhelms the Judaizers of Galatia, joined with a forbearance so gentle for the innocent weakness of scrupulous consciences;—that grief for the sins of others, which moved him to tears when he spoke of the enemies of the cross of Christ, 'of whom I tell you even weeping';—that noble freedom from jealousy with which he speaks of those who, out of rivalry to himself, preach Christ even of envy and strife, supposing to add affliction to his bonds: 'What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice';—that tender friendship which watches over the health of Timothy, even with a mother's care;—that intense sympathy in the joys and sorrows of his converts, which could say, even to the rebellious Corinthians, 'ye are in our hearts, to die and live with you';—that longing desire for the intercourse of affection, and that sense of loneliness when it was withheld, which perhaps is the most touching feature of all, because it approaches most nearly to a weakness, 'When I had come to Troas to preach the Glad Tidings of Christ, and a door was opened to me in the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but I parted from them, and came from thence into Macedonia'. And 'when I was come into Macedonia, my flesh had no rest, but I was troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears. But God, Who comforts them that are cast down, comforted me by the coming of Titus'. 'Do thy utmost to come to me speedily; for Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed to Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia; only Luke is with me'."

#2. His Independence.

pp. 141 - 143

"Here we see that fearless independence with which he 'withstood Peter to the face'."
(Conybeare and Howson).

The first feature sketched in by Conybeare and Howson is the Apostle's independence, the particular passage quoted being Gal. ii. Like many other things, the quality of independence can be a very fine or a very ugly feature. The kind of independence that sets aside the fear of man, and originates in a consciousness of the sovereignty of God and the sacredness of one's call and commission, is something to be desired and preserved. The kind of independence, on the other hand, that has its roots in pride, self-sufficiency, and lack of Christian charity, can only be deplored. In the Apostle's case we find the true kind of independence that is tempered and softened by graciousness and humility. Peter himself could not but admire the spirit that withstood him to the face before all, and at the same time would not speak against him behind his back or listen to the voice of slander.

Evidence for the Apostle's independence is to be found at the very threshold of his written ministry, in the epistle to the Galatians. The first chapter opens with the challenging statement:

“Paul, an apostle (*not* of men, *neither* by man, *but* by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, Who raised Him from the dead);” (Gal. i. 1).

Later in the same chapter the challenge is carried over from Paul's apostleship to his gospel:

“I certify you brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is *not* after man, for I *neither* received it of man, *neither* was I taught it, *but* by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Gal. i. 11, 12).

The Apostle then passes on from his message to speak, in similar terms, of the commission he received:

“When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me I conferred *not* with flesh and blood, *neither* went I up to Jerusalem, to them which were apostles before me, *but* I went into Arabia” (Gal. i. 15-17).

It will be readily seen that the whole of the first chapter of Galatians is written round these three items which speak of the Apostle's independence. We observe, however, that there is no pride here. Paul's apostleship is from God, and all that he is, all that he has to say, and all the authority he possesses are of the Lord and by His grace. If he sets aside man, he also acknowledges that the gospel was his by the revelation of Jesus Christ. If he speaks of “conferring not with flesh and blood”, we know that it was because it was God Who had separated him, God Who had called him, and it was with God alone, in “Arabia”, that he would spend those opening hours of new life and lofty vision.

So important does the Lord deem this question of the Apostle's independence that the subject is pursued into the second chapter of the epistle. There is the spirit of true independence in almost every line here. In the first verse we read:

“Fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem” (Gal. ii. 1).

Who but an independent minister could stay away from the normal seat of authority for fourteen years without loss or condemnation?

The words: “I went up by revelation” in verse 2 set aside any idea of a command coming either from Jerusalem or Galatia. Moreover, in the first verse we read that the Apostle took Titus with him, although Titus was a Greek.

In the second verse we read:

“I communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles” (Gal. ii. 2).

Every line rings with the note of independence. In verse 5 we read that the Apostle “gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour”, while in verse 6 the pillars of the Church are referred to as those who “seemed to be somewhat”. For the Apostle, standing as he does in the conscious presence of the God Who accepteth no man’s person, intimidation is impossible, and man-pleasing forgotten. And so, when the need arises to preserve the truth of the gospel, he does not hesitate to withstand Peter to the face.

Paul’s independence is seen on various other occasions in Scripture, the particular manifestation varying with the particular circumstances. How touching, for example, is the alternation, in Phil. iv., of gratitude for the Philippians’ fellowship, with the independence that loathes even the appearance of “desiring a gift”.

“I rejoiced that your care of me hath flourished again” (Phil. iv. 10).

Here it is gratitude that speaks. The Apostle, however, is extremely sensitive, and prison bars have not broken his God-given independence. So he immediately follows this remark with the words: “Not that I speak in respect of want” (Phil. iv. 11), and explains how, whether abased or abounding, he is strong for all things through Christ. His courtesy and gentleness now come to the fore. Will this boasting in Christ perhaps sound ungrateful in the ears of the Church? He immediately rectifies any impression of this kind by saying:

“Notwithstanding ye have done well, that ye did communicate with my affliction”
(Phil. iv. 14).

This leads his grateful memory to record that “in the beginning of the gospel” the Philippian Church stood alone in this blessed communication of “giving and receiving”; and then, in verse 17, we have once more the note of independence:

“Not because I desire a gift; but I desire fruit that may abound to your account”
(Phil. iv. 17).

Who would not count it an honour to be permitted to help such a man? He has all, he abounds, he is full—not because of a foolish independence, but because the gifts sent by the Philippians were like “an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God”. Nevertheless, with all his humble gratefulness, independence has the last word, as he exultingly concludes:

“BUT MY GOD shall supply all YOUR need, according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus” (Phil. iv. 19).

The Apostle’s independence is again in evidence in his first epistle to the Corinthians:

“But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you or of man’s judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. For in myself, I am conscious of nothing (wrong): yet am I not hereby justified: but He that judgeth me is the Lord” (I Cor. iv. 3, 4).

To tabulate all the references in Paul's epistles that speak, either directly or indirectly, of his independence, would turn this one article into a series, and would tend to magnify this one feature beyond its true proportion. Paul was very much more than merely independent, and we shall only truly appreciate his independence when we see it in association with the other qualities that go to make up his spiritual character. The Apostle has been given to the Church as an example. With all humility, with true gratitude for all fellowship, and with every acknowledgment of our own frailty and unworthiness, let us, at the same time, reach out after that independence of spirit that should mark the Lord's "free men".

#3. His Impetuosity. pp. 180 - 183

"Here we see that impetuosity which breaks out in his apostrophe to the 'foolish Galatians'." (Conybeare and Howson).

The reader may at first look askance at the subject to be considered in this article. Impetuosity is a trait not usually put forward for emulation, especially in spiritual things. It must, however, be remembered that we are endeavouring to reconstruct the Apostle's self-drawn portrait. It is recorded that in reply to the artist's suggestion that a facial blemish should be omitted from his portrait, Oliver Cromwell said that he wanted his portrait painted "wart and all". It is far too easy to slip into the idea that the saints of the Bible were not as other men. On the contrary, they were only too conscious that in themselves they were but earthen vessels. It may be that if Paul's impetuosity appears at times to outrun discretion; on the other hand the sluggishness and indifference of others bear a great deal of responsibility.

The case in point in this article is the attitude of the Apostle as expressed in the Epistle to the Galatians when he heard of their defection from the truth. Speaking after the manner of men, we should never have seen the Epistle to the Galatians, had Paul not been so moved that, without ceremony and without pause, he wrote out of a burning heart this interesting, personal, Epistle.

"I marvel that ye are so soon removed though an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel let him be accursed Do I now persuade men?" (Gal. i. 6-10).
"I would they were even cut off which trouble you" (Gal. v. 12).

Can we imagine Paul quietly allowing the judaizers from Jerusalem to come down to Galatia and put shackles and fetters upon those who had been set free by his own ministry, and not be roused? "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended, and I burn not?" (II Cor. xi. 29), said the Apostle. And if the word translated "offended" means "made to stumble", is it not a thing to be thankful for, that Paul could burn at the action of these legalisers? In this same chapter of Corinthians we sense that he himself

felt that he had been too impetuous in speaking of his sufferings as compared with the other apostles.

“Ye suffer fools gladly ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face” (II Cor. xi. 19, 20).

These are burning, impetuous words, but who would wish them unwritten and unpublished? Can a man be white-hot for the truth and no one be singed? However, we see the same characteristic coming out that we saw in Phil. iv. (*see* pages 141-143), where, after a long list of unprecedented hardships for Christ’s sake, he suddenly swings away from all this talk about himself and says that if he must needs glory he will glory of the things which concern his infirmities, and proceeds to speak of one of the most humiliating of his experiences, his ignominious exit from Damascus.

“Through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands. It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory” (II Cor. xi. 33, xii. 1).

Yet, who would have a different Paul? That there was ample room for growth in grace, he, of all men, knew best, but would we exchange the burning zeal of the apostle of grace, for the cold reasoning of the doctrinaire? His churches were his children; his doctrine more than life; he “gladly spent himself”; and if this impetuosity sometimes overran discretion—be it so! The Apostle himself has drawn a distinction between “the righteous man” and “the good man” (Rom. v. 7), using the terms after the manner of men. Who can imagine Paul “faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null”, as Tennyson expresses it. Before his conversion he described himself as being “an exceeding zealot” (Gal. i. 14), and Luke speaks of him in those days as “breathing out threatenings and slaughter” (Acts ix. 1).

Salvation does not rob a man of his individuality, but enables him with the self-same members that once served sin, now to serve the Lord. Paul would have ceased to be the same individual had he not burned with zeal in whatever cause he undertook. We are not in the slightest sense attempting to justify the Apostle in all his ways; we are endeavouring to look at his self-drawn portrait, the portrait of a man of flesh and blood like ourselves, a man who, like ourselves, knew what internal conflict was; a man who is beloved, not by reason of some ideal qualities, but for what he was by the grace of God.

What a marked contrast there was between the Apostle and his Lord when they stood before their judges. He, the Lamb of God, opened not his mouth, but Paul flashed out: “God shall smite thee, thou whited wall!” only to follow it immediately by the repentant words, “I wist not brethren, that he was the high priest” (Acts xxiii. 2-5). Can we not hear that impetuous spirit when he said:

“None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy” (Acts xx. 24).

“I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus” (Acts xxi. 13).

No wonder we read, that when they heard this, the disciples ceased, saying, "The will of the Lord be done".

With such an example, who would not be encouraged to endure? See how, had the disciples not restrained him, Paul would have entered into the theatre at Ephesus, where the populace were crying out for about two hours, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" (Acts xix. 30). While, therefore, we can easily see that there was great impetuosity in Paul's character that needed the curb, after all, how much better is this fire and force than the lethargy of so many who profess to follow his steps.

We are not told in the Scriptures to follow Paul's example blindly. Where he followed his Lord, he becomes an example for us to follow; where he was sometimes carried away by an excess of zeal, he becomes a corrective, but in most cases our lamps burn so feebly, and are so easily dowsed, that we have to confess that a little of the spirit of this ardent Apostle would make for clearer and fuller testimony on the part of us all.

The SECOND EPISTLE to TIMOTHY.

#1. The place of the epistle in the outworking of the truth. pp. 90 - 92

The dispensation of the mystery, and its bearing upon life, hope and walk, has been the central theme of this magazine since its inception. Our sole appeal is to the Scriptures “rightly divided”, and consequently, while believing all Scripture to be given by inspiration of God, we perceive that all Scripture does not speak of the church which is the body of Christ. On the contrary, the bulk of it, in both Old and New Testaments, speaks of Israel. But at Acts xxviii. we perceive a dispensational crisis and Israel pass into their present *lo-ammi* condition (*lo-ammi* means: “Not my people”, Hosea i. 9). With Israel’s rejection a new dispensation necessarily follows, and we find Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles, entrusted with the revelation of the mystery. We are not left to infer this mystery and new dispensation from what we see in the Acts, but receive a specific revelation of its truth in the “prison” epistles. There we find all that we can know in this life of the distinctive character of this new and wonderful calling. The prison epistles are easily identified. Each one plainly speaks (e.g., the references quoted below) of prison or bonds in association with the Apostle’s ministry among the Gentiles. They are Ephesians (iii. 1; iv. 1; vi. 20); Philippians (i. 7, 13, 14, 16; iv. 22); Colossians (iv. 3, 18); II Timothy (i. 8; iv. 16), and Philemon (9, 10).

For the doctrinal foundation of our faith, such as justification or forgiveness of sins, we turn to the earlier writings of the Apostle Paul, e.g., the epistle to the Romans. While in such epistles we find foundational truth that remains unchanged by the setting aside of Israel, we shall also find in them, and right through the period of the Acts, a very different *dispensational* setting from that of the prison epistles. In the earlier writings the Jew is first, and the New Covenant is in view. We stand upon the promises to Abraham and to the fathers, while the Gentile believer is reminded that he is a wild olive graft into the tree of Israel. But with the passing of Israel, the olive tree position must pass too, and we find that a new constitution is made known. Equal membership of the body of Christ and a new sphere, heavenly places, is revealed. A new promise is beneath our feet, a promise that antedates the overthrow of the world and age times. The epistle to the Ephesians reveals this new membership, sphere and promise, and its teaching is expanded, together with vital corrections of error, in the epistle to the Colossians. Philippians presents a further phase of truth. In every dispensation there has been something free and unconditional, followed by something in the nature of reward or prize. Abraham received the land of promise as an unconditional gift; he could not forfeit it, for its enjoyment did not rest upon an act of faithfulness or endurance. But over and above this unconditional gift the Lord revealed to Abraham the heavenly city and the heavenly country, and we learn of this for the first time in Hebrews. Because of this heavenly city, Abraham endured, and all they who “overcome” and belong to the same calling also have the heavenly Jerusalem in view. So, too, the epistle to the Philippians occupies much the same place in relation to Ephesians as the epistle to the Hebrews does to the hope of Israel. While Ephesians reveals “what is the *hope* of His calling”,

Philippians speaks of the “prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus”. The setting of Philippians is likened to that of a race course, the terms used suggesting conflict, endurance and reward. Just as Colossians supplements Ephesians, so II Timothy supplements Philippians, the great thought in II Timothy being endurance with a crown in view. Philemon is an epistle that teaches both doctrinal and practical truth, but it does not specifically contribute to our knowledge so far as the distinctive revelation of the mystery is concerned. Consequently it is usual with us to refer to “The Four Prison Epistles”, and the place occupied by II Timothy is best realized by placing these four epistles together as follows:

The Prison Epistles.

Structure showing their Distinctive Doctrine and their Interrelation.

A	EPHESIANS. Seated together.	+The dispensation (iii. 2 and 9 R.V.); +Mystery (iii. 3). +The Church which is His Body (i. 22, 23). +The fullness (i. 23; iv. 10); +Christ the Head (i. 22). +Principality and Power (i. 21).
B	PHILIPPIANS. The Prize.	Try the things that differ (i. 21). Strive (i. 27); Press towards the mark (iii. 14). Prize (iii. 14); * Depart (i. 23); * Offered (ii. 17).
A	COLOSSIANS. Complete in Him.	+Dispensation (i. 25); +Mystery (i. 26). +The Church which is His Body (i. 24). +Fullness (i. 19); +Christ the Head (ii. 19). +Principalities and Power (i. 16; ii. 10).
B	II TIMOTHY. The Crown.	Rightly dividing the word (ii. 15). Strive (ii. 5); Course finished (iv. 7). Crown (iv. 8); * Depart (iv. 6); * Offered (iv. 6).

(NOTE: + - None of these key expressions occur in Philippians or II Timothy.
* - Only occurrences in Paul’s epistles.)

The reader will not fail to see the perfect balance of these four epistles, and that the two pairs are related to one another as is standing and state. II Timothy differs from all the others in one important particular. The opening verse of Philippians shows a church well-organized and governed by bishops and deacons, but in II Timothy we find a different atmosphere. Instead of rule we have ruin. Instead of a church governed by bishops we have insistence upon individual witness. Consequently while we value the earlier epistles of the mystery for the revelation they bring, we value II Timothy rather for a message which fits the sad, apostate, days in which our lot is cast. By itself II Timothy would present an enigma, but as supplementing the earlier epistles and adjusting some of their practical teaching to meet the change in outward things, it is most valuable.

We trust that our readers will be enabled to enter into the teaching of this epistle and thus find the help and guidance so much needed in these difficult times.

**#2. The epistle as a whole,
with brief notes upon the discovery of the structure.
pp. 128 - 131**

We have seen the place that II Timothy occupies in the revelation of the mystery, its relation to the other prison epistles and that its key thought is a crown. Before the teaching of the epistle in detail can be appreciated it is necessary to obtain a view of it as a whole. When the outstanding items in its development have been noted it will be possible to discern the structure, which, in its turn, will throw into prominence those features which are designedly important and thus subdivide the subject-matter into organic sections instead of the arbitrary and limiting division of chapter and verse.

In conformity with the writer's practice, the epistle opens and closes with salutations and personal references. The introductory note extends from verse 1 to verse 7, while the salutation follows the Amen of iv. 18. The subject-matter of the epistle proper is therefore contained between i. 8 and iv. 18. We read through the first chapter, and are struck with the two notes there sounded; a sad note because Paul and his message seem largely to be forsaken; a jubilant note because, even though all in Asia leave him (i. 15) he was not ashamed, for he knew Whom he had believed. The apostle also reaffirms his threefold office: "Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles" (i. 11). We note that the word "preacher" is actually "herald" (Gk. *kerux*).

With these few scattered thoughts in mind, we glance at the close of the epistle. This seems to commence somewhere about iv. 9, where the Apostle leaves the subject of his martyrdom and crown, for more immediate matters. We only read one verse before we find again the same sad theme as in chapter i.: Paul and his message forsaken:

"Demas hath forsaken me" (iv. 10). We remember that two are named in chapter i. as samples of those who turned away from Paul; "of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes" (i. 15).

So, too, we discover a recurrence of the same jubilant note as is struck in chapter i.: "Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me" (iv. 17), and that the word "preaching" in verse 17 is *kerugma*, "heralding". We also notice, that just as the Apostle says concerning Alexander, who did him much evil, "The Lord reward him according to his works" (iv. 14), so in chapter i. he says, concerning Onesiphorus, "The Lord grant him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day" (i. 18). From these facts it is very evident that i. 8-18 balances iv. 9-18.

Let us now turn our attention to the remainder of the epistle. Chapter ii. opens with a strong insistence upon the distinctive teaching of the Apostle: "The things that thou hast heard of me the same commit" (ii. 2). Our minds go instinctively to the parallel in the third chapter: "Thou hast fully followed my doctrine afflictions, which came to me at Antioch" (iii. 10, 11). Moreover, we perceive that the outstanding teaching of chapter ii. has to do with suffering and reigning: a good soldier and a

crown. In chapters iii. and iv. we have the same emphasis. In both passages we have the word *kakopatheo*, suffer evil, (ii. 3, 9; iv. 5). In both the “crown” (ii. 5; iv. 8) and on both either a “good” (*kalos*) soldier, or a “good” (*kalos*) fight (ii. 3; iv. 7). There is enough here to make us suspect another set of correspondencies. This leaves the second half of chapter ii., and the opening half of chapter iii. to complete the epistle. We note in ii. 15 the word “approved” (*dokimos*), which is found in negative form in iii. 8, “reprobate” (*adokimos*). This is encouraging as it forms the first link between these remaining passages. We further note that Hymenaeus and Philetus err concerning the truth, while Jannes and Jambres are given as examples of those who resisted the truth (ii. 17, 18; iii. 8). The rather alarming statement: “They will increase unto more ungodliness” (ii. 16) is tempered by the words “They shall proceed no further (iii. 9).

Again, there is an evident contrast between those captives of the devil who obtain deliverance by “repentance to the acknowledging of the truth” (ii. 25), and those who are “ever learning and never able to come to an acknowledgment of the truth” (iii. 7). Moreover, we see a parallel thought in the injunction of ii. 16, to “shun”, with the injunction of iii. 5, “From such turn away”. With the material now before us, it is difficult to go far wrong in arriving at the structure of the epistle, which we here set out.

The Structure of II Timothy as a whole.

SEE NEXT PAGE.

As indicated in the sub-heading of this article, the reader has now been shown something of the manner of arriving at the structure of a given passage. This has been done in response to the request of readers who have asked: “How do you arrive at the structure of any given passage?” In order to follow the lead given it is of course necessary to become well acquainted with the book or epistle concerned, so that the memory is stored with its contents and thus able to seize upon corresponding features. On no account must headings be used to obtain the structure. Such a course may sidetrack the seeker and result merely in the production of a pretty structure, not the ascertainment of the truth. We build upon the words of inspiration as instanced in the foregoing structure: *kerux*, *dokimos*, *kalos*, *kakopatheo*. Here we are on solid rock, and though he fight against our theories the greatest antagonist must acknowledge the facts we have marshalled. In a sense, the seeking of a structure is the practical putting into effect of the command “rightly to divide the Word of Truth”. In result it places truth in compartments and facilitates discernment of the development of the argument.

We have now seen II Timothy in its relation to the other prison epistles, as well as the relation of its separate parts to one another and to the epistle as a whole. We are now ready to commence the study of details with the assurance that such preparatory study always brings. While no assurance can alter our utter dependence upon the Lord, the Author of the book, we have learned that the most complete dependence goes hand in hand with the utmost diligence, a statement with which every reader of this article will most heartily agree.

The Structure of II Timothy as a whole.

A | i. 1-7. Salutations and Remembrance. Lois, Eunice.

F O R S A K E N.

B | i. 8-19. Paul and his message forsaken.

The Lord his Keeper.

Phygellus and Hermogenes—"Turned away".

Onesiphorus—"The Lord give mercy".

Paul the herald to the Gentiles (*kerux*, verse 11).

C R O W N.

C | ii. 1-13. Teach things heard of me (*Exclusive*).

Suffering and reigning.

The good soldier (*kalos*, verse 3).

The crown.

Suffer evil (*kakopattheo*, verses 3 and 9).

A P P R O V E D.

D | ii. 14-26. Hymenaeus and Philetus err concerning the truth. "Shun."

They will increase.

"Approved" (*dokimos*).

Repentance to acknowledging of truth.

D I S A P P R O V E D.

D | iii. 1-9. Jannes and Jambres resist the truth. "Turn away."

Shall proceed no further.

"Disapproved" (*adokimos*).

Never come to acknowledgment of truth.

C R O W N.

C | iii. 10 - iv. 8. Followed my teaching (*Exclusive*).

Suffering and reigning.

The good fight (*kalos*, verse 7).

The crown.

Suffer evil (*kakopattheo*, verse 5).

F O R S A K E N.

B | iv. 9-18. Paul and his message forsaken.

The Lord his Keeper.

Demas—"hath forsaken me".

Alexander—"The Lord recompense him".

Paul heralding to the Gentiles (*kerugma*, verse 17).

A | iv. 19-22. Salutations. Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, Claudia. Benediction.

#3. A Short Survey of the Period. pp. 159 - 166

It is evident from the statements made at the end of the Acts that the “two whole years” during which the Apostle stayed in his own hired house brought his imprisonment to an end. When these two years had expired, Paul must either have been put to death or set at liberty. In two of the epistles written during these two years at Rome, the Apostle appears to be confident that he will obtain his release, although quite prepared to magnify the Lord whether “by life and by death” (Phil. i. 26, ii. 24). Moreover, if we compare the record of his imprisonment during these two years with the circumstances indicated in II Timothy, we shall find evidence to justify the belief that the Apostle was eventually liberated, and then, after an interval in which he sought to confirm the churches in the truth, was again apprehended and executed. In Philippians and Philemon the Apostle anticipates release, but in II Timothy this is by no means the case, and in chapter iv. the Apostle declares: “The time for my departure is at hand” (II Tim. iv. 6-8).

In the former imprisonment Timothy was with the Apostle (Col. i. 1; Phil. i. 1). In the second imprisonment, however, Timothy is obviously absent, and the Apostle writes to urge him to use all diligence and come before winter. In the first imprisonment Demas is with Paul (Col. iv. 14; Philemon 24), but in II Timothy we read that “Demas hath forsaken me” (II Tim. iv. 10). During his first imprisonment we find Mark in attendance upon the Apostle (Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24); in the second imprisonment, however, Timothy is asked to bring Mark with him (II Tim. iv. 11). Before the Apostle’s apprehension Trophimus had accompanied him to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29); in II Timothy, on the other hand, the Apostle says that he has left Trophimus, at Miletum sick (II Tim. iv. 20). During the Apostle’s first imprisonment, his friends visited him, and brought him gifts, and were themselves encouraged to preach the gospel (Acts xxviii. 30, 31; Phil. i. 13-15; iv. 18), but during the second imprisonment he was forsaken, and we read that at his defence “no man stood with him” (II Tim. iv. 16). In II Tim. i. Paul speaks very feelingly of the persistence shown by Onesiphorus in seeking him out very diligently and finding him (II Tim. i. 17)—which is in strong contrast with the conditions of Acts xxviii. 30 where a very free intercourse is suggested. The earlier imprisonment was comparatively mild—Rome was still the impartial ruler, but in the second imprisonment there is severity and Paul suffers “as an evil doer” (II Tim. ii. 9).

Agrippa’s statement in Acts xxvi.: “This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Cæsar” (Acts xxvi. 31, 32) would have been weighty evidence under the conditions obtaining during the earlier period, and it was only Nero himself that kept the Apostle waiting so long for a decision. No such evidence, however, was of any avail when II Timothy was written. The burning of Rome, and the persecution of the Christians, had already changed the whole aspect of things, and Paul now belonged to a hated sect.

When Paul writes to Titus he says in chapter i.: “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee” (Titus i. 5). There is only one recorded visit to Crete in the Acts, namely in Acts xxvii. 7-13. While it is not altogether impossible for Paul, even as a prisoner, to have founded a church there, yet if one reads the passage in Acts xxvii., with its anxieties about navigation, it seems difficult to believe that those in charge of Paul and the other prisoners would have allowed him enough liberty to have engaged in evangelizing any part of the island. If this be so—and our knowledge of Roman discipline makes it very probable—then the epistle to Titus clearly demands that there should be an interval between the end of the Acts and the second imprisonment.

Further evidence on this point is provided by a passage in I Tim. i. 3: “As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia.” There is no possibility of fitting this into the record of the Acts. Paul was in Ephesus twice (Acts xviii. 19; xix. 1), but he did not leave Timothy at Ephesus on either of these occasions, and in the latter case he sent him to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22).

Again, in II Tim. iv. 20, Erastus is said to have remained at Corinth, and the tenor of the passage suggests that Paul left Erastus behind, just as he had left Trophimus at Miletum. Now there was no possibility of touching Corinth on the Apostle’s first journey to Rome, but on the second journey, going by the land route (which we gather from the testimony of Ignatius was the route the Apostle actually traversed), it would be natural to speak of leaving Erastus behind at Corinth and Trophimus at Miletum (see the map of Paul’s journeys). In verse 13 of the same chapter, the Apostle’s reference to the cloak left at Troas (II Tim. iv. 13) does not seem a very natural one if we are to imagine an interval of five years; it would seem rather to refer to a visit subsequent to the history of the Acts, and so after the two years’ imprisonment.

Whether or not Paul accomplished the desired visit to Spain, we do not know. Clemens Romanus, a contemporary of Paul, on his first epistle to the Corinthians, writes:

“Paul also obtained the prize of endurance, having seven times borne chains, having been exiled, and having been stoned. After he had preached the gospel both in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown of his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the limit of the West and borne witness before rulers.”

Some have interpreted the phrase “the limit of the West” (*To terma tes duseos*) as referring to Spain, and there is also an inscription found in Spain which reads as follows:

NERONI CL. KAIS. AYG. PONT. MAX. OB. PROVINC.
LATRONIBUS ET HIS QYI NOVAM HVM SYPERSTITION INCYLCAB.
PVRGATUM.

Here it is implied that in the year A.D.65 or 66, i.e., a little after Paul’s release at the end of the Acts, the Christian community was of some size, and suffered in the general persecution under Nero. As Lewin pertinently asks: “If Paul did not preach in Spain, who did?” and the more one ponders the question, in the light of the times and the dangers to be faced, the more difficult the question becomes. There is also a passage in a

fragment of the Canon Muratorianus, generally reckoned to date from A.D.170, which reads as follows:

“Luke to the most excellent Theophilus comprises all those things which were enacted under his presence; so that manifestly declares the martyrdom of Peter and departure of Paul when setting out from the city for Spain, to be matters removed from him.”

Eusebius (A.D.296-340) affirms that Paul was released after two years' imprisonment at Rome, that he subsequently preached the Gospel, and that he was later taken as a prisoner to Rome the second time and there suffered martyrdom.

On the evidence available, it seems that we may safely say that Paul was set free in A.D.63 after two years at Rome. On the 19th July A.D. 64 the great fire broke out at Rome, and widespread Christian persecution commenced within a few weeks. Between the Apostle's release in A.D.63 and the outbreak of persecution under Nero in A.D.64 the Apostle would have had time to visit the churches before he was called upon to lay down his life for the Lord he loved.

We see from Titus iii. 12 that Paul intended spending the winter at Nicopolis. When the winter was over, he evidently traversed the district of Dalmatia, for we learn from II Tim. iv. 10 that Titus had gone there. The Apostle lands once more at Troas where he stays for a while with Carpus, but by this time the persecution had spread from Rome into the provinces, and at Troas, where the Apostle had seen the vision of the man of Macedonia, the great messenger to the Gentiles is again apprehended. That Paul was apprehended somewhere in this vicinity is clear from the testimony of Ignatius, a martyr of the first century. Ignatius was taken prisoner in Antioch of Syria, and traveled to Rome via Ephesus. Writing to Ephesus, he says:

“Ye are the thoroughfare (*parodos*) of those that are slain for God's sake, the co-religionists of Paul the holy, the martyr, the blessed, in whose footsteps may it be my lot to be found.”

Though Paul was probably arrested at Troas, and had been obliged to abandon his cloak and books there, the Proconsul's residence was at Ephesus, and he would naturally appear there for the preliminary trial. It looks as though Alexander the coppersmith who had antagonized Paul some years earlier (Acts xix. 33), and who seems to have been among those who bore witness against at Rome (II Tim. iv. 14) seized the opportunity at Ephesus to wipe out old scores, by accusing the Apostle. By an edict issued by Nero, Christianity had now become a crime. The Proconsul at the time was a man of exemplary character, named Soranus, who himself was put to death for his virtues by Nero in A.D.66 (*see Tac. Ann. xvi. 23*). Some even think that he was a convert to the faith. Paul was a Roman citizen, and as such could appeal from the tribunal to a Proconsul. Soranus may himself have felt rather like Pliny on a similar occasion in Bithynia, and have remitted the case to the Emperor. However this may be, Paul eventually stands once more for trial before the Emperor, and from the expression, “I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion” (II Tim. iv. 17) it would appear that, upon one of the counts against him, he was absolved. The jurors in the trial would have been provided with tablets, one marked A for *Absolvo*, another C for *condemno* and a third

N.L. (*non liquet*) for adjournment. It was during this period of remand, while awaiting the issue of the remainder of his trial, that the Apostle wrote this second epistle to Timothy—an epistle written in view of martyrdom, and yet triumphant in view of a finished course. It was often the case that a prisoner would be acquitted on some minor count, only to be condemned upon some other indictment. It was during this time that the Apostle, the prisoner of Jesus Christ and “such an one as Paul the aged”, suffered from the cold and wanted his cloak. He longed with an intense longing for one more look at his son Timothy’s face; he wrote his last instructions for the church on earth, and bequeathed to every member of the one body his blessed example.

As we read through this sacred epistle, and remember the solemn atmosphere in which it was conceived and written, may each of us catch something of its spirit, and be numbered among those of whom it can be said that they “love His appearing” (II Tim. iv. 8).

As every reader will not have easy access to the writings of the ancients, we append one or two extracts from contemporary Latin writers which throw light upon the conditions obtaining during the Apostle’s last days.

Tacitus was a celebrated Roman historian, born about A.D.56. Maunder says of him that “no name stands higher for historical reputation”. The following extract will give some idea of the outbreak of persecution under Nero, consequent upon the great fire at Rome.

“To put an end therefore to this report (that he had fired the city) he (Nero) laid the guilt, and inflicted the most cruel punishments upon a set of people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes, and vulgarly called Christians. The founder of that name was Christ, Who suffered death in the reign of Tiberius, under his Procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, thus checked for a while, broke out again and spread, not only over Judæa, where the evil originated, but through Rome also, whither everything bad upon earth finds its way and is practiced. Some who confessed their sect were first seized, and afterwards, by their information, a vast multitude were apprehended, who were convicted, not so much of the crime of burning Rome, as of hatred to mankind. Their sufferings at their execution were aggravated by insult and mockery, for some were disguised in the skins of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs, some were crucified, and others were wrapped in pitched shirts, and set on fire when the day closed, that they might serve as lights to illuminate the night. Nero lent his own garden for these exhibitions, and exhibited at the same time a mock Circensian (pertaining to the circus) entertainment, being a spectator of the whole in the dress of a charioteer, sometimes mingling with the crowd on foot, and sometimes viewing the spectacle from his car. This conduct made the sufferers pitied, and though they were criminals and deserving the severest punishments, yet they were considered as sacrificed, not so much out of regard to the public good, as to gratify the cruelty of one man” (*Tac. Ann. xv. 44*).

The court favourite at this time was Tigellinus, who was also Prefect of the Praetorium. Juvenal writes of him:

“Paint Tigellinus, and your fate will be,
To burn with brimstone at the martyr’s tree,
While, as the flames consume the living brand,

A crimson rill runs trickling o'er the sand."
(Juv. Sat. 1, v. 155).

Juvenal was born about the beginning of the reign of Claudius and died A.D.128. Maugham says of him that "as the bold and unflinching castigator of vice he stands without rival". Martial, the epigrammatist, who died A.D.104, was at Rome at the time of the persecution of the Christians, and write the following:

"When Mutins dared upon command,
To thrust into the fire his hand,
With shouts the people rent the skies,
To laud the noble sacrifice.
The silly herd! Far braver he,
Who, standing at the martyr's tree,
Can yet defy the rabble's cries,
And say 'I make no sacrifice'."

(Martial Lib. x Ep. 25).

We give below a few notes on the date and place of Paul's death.

Clemens Romanus, the contemporary of Paul, speaks first of Peter's death and then of Paul's, and also alludes to the martyrdom of a multitude of others who died for their faith after the greatest torments. The date indicated here is A.D.66.

Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth (A.D.170), speaking of Peter and Paul, says: "The one as well as the other, having taught as far as Italy, suffered martyrdom at about the same time." *Caius the Presbyter* (A.D.210) records that Peter and Paul were martyrs at Rome and that their tombs still existed. *Tertullian* (A.D.190-214) mentions that Paul suffered at Rome, but gives no date. *Origen* (A.D.210-253) says that Paul died at Rome in the time of Nero. *Eusebius* (A.D.308-340) places the martyrdom of Paul as A.D.67, in the thirteenth year of Nero. Clinton, however, has shown that the years of Nero's reign are postponed by one year, which brings the Apostle's martyrdom to A.D.66. The *Auctor Martyric Pauli*, written about A.D.396, gives the date of Paul's death as the 29th June A.D.66. The writer is very circumstantial on this point, and his testimony is important. *Sulpitius Severus*, who wrote in A.D.400, associates Paul's martyrdom with the year in which the Jewish war broke out (April 19th, A.D.66). Lewin gives the following summary:

"When Paul was set at liberty in the spring of A.D.63, he would fulfil his long-cherished intention of visiting Spain (Rom. xv. 24, 28). But as the Eastern churches, from his long absence, would call loudly for his return, he would spend not more than six months in Spain, and then on the return of Timothy, who had been sent to Philippi, would sail with him to Judæa (Heb. xiii. 23). Paul and Timothy, therefore would start from Judæa in the autumn of A.D.63, and would reach Jerusalem just before winter. Then he would naturally go down to Antioch and there pass the winter of A.D.63-64. In the spring of A.D.64 he visited Ephesus, and leaving Timothy there, passed over himself with Titus to Crete (Titus i. 5), but he did not stay there, but stationing Titus in Crete, and passing to Ephesus, where Timothy was still to remain, sailed to Macedonia (I Tim. i. 3) and fulfilled his promise of visiting Philippi (Phil. ii. 24), and thence, no doubt, went down to Corinth, and then to Nicopolis, where Titus was to join him during the winter of A.D.64-65 (Titus iii. 12). In the spring of

A.D.65 he must have passed through Troas (II Tim. iv. 13), and have proceeded thence, probably as a prisoner, to Ephesus, where he was imprisoned (II Tim. i. 18), and was thence forwarded by way to Miletum (II Tim. iv. 20), and Corinth (II Tim. iv. 20) to Rome, and was consequently late in the year at Rome. The winter was the long vacation of the law; and he was therefore brought to trial and was acquitted on the first count (II Tim. iv. 17) in the spring of A.D.66 when the further hearing was adjourned. The first trial would not in the ordinary course come off immediately on his arrival at Rome. The second trial might very well, therefore, take place in May or June A.D.66, and if so, the martyrdom itself may, as stated by tradition, have occurred on the 29th of June A.D.66.”

While we agree substantially with this summary, the following points should be noted by way of emendation:

- (1) Paul did not write the epistle until *after* his first defence and acquittal on the first count (II Tim. iv. 16, 17).
- (2) After this deliverance, *before winter* he wrote urging Timothy to endeavour to arrive (II Tim. iv. 21) and to bring the *cloak* left at Troas (II Tim. iv. 13).
- (3) With the Romans, winter began on November 9th. As a letter would take about 6 weeks to reach Timothy, and another 6 weeks would be occupied by Timothy’s journey, the Apostle probably arrived in Rome in August A.D.65, instead of “late in the year.

With this small adjustment, the rest is straightforward, and will, we trust, help the reader to follow more clearly the chronology and geography of these critical years. The account should be read in conjunction with a good map of the Apostle’s journeys.

#4. Salutation and Remembrance (i. 1 - 7). pp. 197 - 204

Of the fourteen epistles written by Paul, nine open with a salutation that includes a reference to his apostleship, while five do not. These latter epistles are I and II Thess., Philippians, Philemon and Hebrews. In two of the epistles the title of apostle is joined with that of servant, thus: “Paul a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God” (Rom. i. 1). This opening of the epistle to the Romans also prepares the mind for its contents and the treatment of the theme of the epistle itself. The other epistle is Titus: “Paul a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ” (Titus i. 1).

In Philippians, alone of all his epistles, the Apostle uses the word “servant” without association with apostleship. Moreover, this epistle is addressed not only to the church but to the bishops and deacons, so that we are prepared to find that service, rather than position in the body, is its main theme.

When we reach the epistles to Timothy and Titus, we observe in each features similar to those in the other. This we should expect if both were written at about the same period. Let us notice how these three epistles open.

“Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ, which is our hope; unto Timothy, my own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord” (I Tim. i. 1, 2).

“Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God’s elect, and the acknowledging of God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began, but hath in due times manifested His word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour; to Titus mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour” (Titus i. 1-4).

Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus, to Timothy, my dearly beloved son: Grace, mercy and peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord” (II Tim. i. 1, 2).

Clearly what is uppermost in the Apostle’s mind is “life”. The hope of eternal life which God promised. According to the promise of life. The Lord Jesus Christ which is our hope. Can we not see, that with imprisonment and death so near to him, “the blessed hope” would more and more become a precious reality? The title “God our Saviour”, or “Jesus Christ our Saviour”, is characteristic of these latter epistles. One other noteworthy feature is the Apostle’s introduction of the word “mercy” into his salutations. In this he probably had in view the responsibilities of the ministry that he is passing on to Timothy and Titus.

Paul was an Apostle by the will of God. This he asserts in the opening of five of his epistles, viz., I and II Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians and II Timothy. The consciousness of this will supported the Apostle in his hours of stress, and when all external evidences were against him, he could fall back upon the fact that he had not sought the Lord, but that the Lord had sought and found him, and all that he was and all that he had accomplished was by the grace of God.

Timothy, in a very special sense, was the Apostle’s son in the faith and like father and son they served and suffered together. While they had much in common there were decided differences in their characters. Timothy seems to have been of a very retiring nature, a little inclined to err on the side of asceticism, conscious of his youth, and made continual calls upon the Apostle’s care, counsel and help. There was another particular in which they differed and that was in relation to their upbringing. This will be seen more clearly if we first of all set out the structure of the opening section of the epistle, which we now do.

II Timothy i. 1-7. Salutation and Remembrance.

- A | 1, 2. SALUTATION.
 - a | 1. Paul an apostle.
 - b | 1. Will of God. Promise of life.
 - a | 2. Timothy. Beloved son.
 - b | 2. Grace, mercy and peace.
- A | 3-7. REMEMBRANCE.
 - c | 3. My forefathers.
 - d | 3. Pure conscience.
 - e | 3. Remembrance.
 - 4. Remembrance.
 - 5. Remembrance.
 - d | 5. Unfeigned faith.
 - c | 5. Thy grandmother and mother.
 - e | 6, 7. Remembrance.

It will be observed that Paul places his reference to his “forefathers” in correspondence with that to Timothy’s “grandmother and mother”, and his own “pure conscience” with the “unfeigned faith that was in Timothy, Lois and Eunice”. What is the significance of this? Is it conformity or contrast? We learn that Timothy’s mother and grandmother were Christians, for the same faith that dwelt in Timothy at the time of Paul’s writing to him had dwelt also in his mother and his grandmother. Could Paul say the same of his progenitors? He could not. Were they not Israelites, Hebrews, Pharisees? Did not Paul’s parents send him to the school of Gamaliel? Was he not trained after the “straitest sect” of his religion? What therefore does Paul intend by this reference to his forefathers and to Timothy’s parents? Among other things in this hour of their trial he would remind Timothy of any and every advantage and encouragement that would stand him in good stead; of the careful training in the Scriptures he had received from infancy (II Tim. iii. 15); of the example that had been before him all the intervening years since he first received the call to follow the Apostle (Acts xvi.; II Tim. iii. 10, 11); and of the gift that was in him (II Tim. i. 6); even as he had reminded him of the prophecies that went before the bestowal of that gift (I Tim. iv. 14).

But he would not only remind Timothy of all these things, he would also help him if possible by contrast. The word which the A.V. translated “forefathers” is *progonoi* and is used but once only in the N.T., namely in I Tim. v. 4. To the intelligent and submissive student this fact is enough to settle the Apostle’s meaning in the second passage. Timothy could have no idea that Paul spoke of “ancestors” where he exhorts: “Let them learn first to show piety at home and to requite their parents” (I Tim. v. 4), and there is no necessity to depart from the same meaning in II Tim. i. 3. How could Paul say that he served God from his parents, or even from his forefathers, with a pure conscience? On the contrary, his conversion made the most severe and decisive rupture with his upbringing and former manner of life. In I Tim. i. 13 he recounts that he had been a blasphemer, a persecutor and injurious, acting in ignorance and unbelief. In Gal. i. 13, 14, he says:

“For 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, and profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.”

Did Paul continue in this “Jews’ religion”? Was he still an exceeding zealot for the “traditions of his fathers”? We know he was not. Phil. iii. 1-9 provides a most complete refutation of such an idea. Before Agrippa the Apostle, in answering for himself the charges laid against him, said:

“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, if they would testify, that after the straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee” (Acts xxvi. 4, 5).

A little earlier, before Felix, he had said,

“But this I confess unto thee, that after the way **which they call heresy, so** worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets” (Acts xxiv. 14).

Lastly, in Acts xxiii. 1, Paul opened his defence with the words:

“Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day.”

It is evident that Paul’s point of view was not that of the Pharisee or the traditionalist of his nation. He had most certainly left the religion of his parents, but his contention was that he had not left the God of his fathers; that he still believed all that the law and prophets taught, and that though it was now in a way that his contemporaries called “heresy” it was “so” that he worshipped the God of his fathers.

We must look more closely therefore at II Tim. i. 3, for, on the surface, this fact does not there appear. We note that the Apostle uses the word *apo*, “from”, when he says “from my forefathers”. This preposition, which is usually translated “from”, carries with it the idea of (a) source or (b) severance, that is, either “from” or “away from”. In II Tim. i. 1 we have the word in composition, “apostle”, meaning one sent from another and combining the idea of “source” with “severance”, the apostolic commission having been derived entirely from the Lord, though exercised during the period of the Lord’s absence from the earth. In the second verse *apo* is used in the benediction “Grace, mercy and peace *from* God the Father”. Here “source” is most evidently the meaning of the preposition.

We find *apo* in combination in II Tim. i. 15, where severance is uppermost; “All in Asia be turned *away from* me.” So also in ii. 19 and 21, “depart from” and “purge from”. In iii. 15 the expression “from a child” uses the idea of “distance”, as transferred to time, as we would say “ever since you were a child”. In iv. 4 and 18, we have once more the idea of severance uppermost: “They shall turn *away* their ears *from* the truth”; “The Lord shall deliver me *from* every evil work.”

It is therefore clear from the usage of the word that while “from” may sometimes refer to source, yet its primary meaning is severance, “away from”. We, accordingly, understand the Apostle to say, that although he now worshipped and served God *away from* his parents and all their traditions, and even though such worship was called by his own people “heresy”, he nevertheless had a pure conscience in so doing.

It is possible that Timothy had sometimes bemoaned the fact, that whereas Paul knew the exact spot of earth where he passed from death unto life, he, Timothy, could never remember the time when he did not believe the gospel of grace. If this were so, the Apostle would seek to rob these so-called “experiences” of their usurpation. We remember reading, some years ago, a booklet by Ada Habershon entitled “How a river ought to flow”. It was written to break down this very idea that one person’s experience is either superior to, or is to be envied above, another’s. In this booklet the rivers were supposed to have convened a meeting in order to settle once and for ever the question, “How ought a river to flow?” The first speaker was the Nile, who maintained that no river could be said to be fulfilling its obligation unless it deposited annually a good thick layer of mud on the country along its banks. At this the river Thames rose to object, saying that whenever he had done such a thing there had arisen great protest from the inhabitants of the adjacent land. The Rhine then arose with the air of an aristocrat and put it to the meeting that no river was worthy of the name that did not arise in a glacier. Eventually the meeting came to the conclusion that each river must flow as the great Creator planned, and no river could set up itself as being necessarily ideal or better in its characteristics than another.

The editor of this magazine had no such upbringing as that of Timothy. His early days were lived in ignorance of either God or His Word. In his mind’s eye he can still see the exact spot in the Strand, London, where he passed from death unto life. In all this he can most surely see the hand of the Lord, for while he lost all the gracious influences of a Christian home from childhood, and experienced something of the rough ways of the world, yet he was spared the bondage of traditional orthodoxy, and was therefore perhaps more ready than many to “search and see” when the appointed time arrived. Whichever way a believer has come, he may depend upon it that it is one that can be of great service to him in his after life and work. Said Paul, I had to be wrenched away from all my past, but you, Timothy, had no such drastic treatment. You have just grown up in the truth, and, in the same way, as I have a pure conscience in these matters, so you have an unfeigned faith. Let us pray that both conscience and faith may be kept pure and unfeigned, for the time is at hand, Timothy, when I, Paul, will have to pass through the severest of tests, and you, Timothy, will be called upon to follow in the footsteps of a despised and hated servant of the Lord.

Then comes the human touch that so characterizes the Apostle’s writings (see the series “The self-drawn portrait of the Apostle Paul”). He assures Timothy of his unceasing “remembrance”. He “remembers” his faith. He puts him in “remembrance” of the gift he had received. He was greatly desirous of seeing Timothy once more before the end, and twice urges him to be diligent in his endeavour to reach Rome before he lays

down his life for Christ's sake. He remembers Timothy's tears, evidently at their last parting, and he would rather take with him a remembrance that was "joyous".

Timothy had been saved and equipped during the transitional period of the Acts, and was one of the special ministers given by the ascended Lord to the Church "for the re-adjusting of the saints" (Eph. iv. 11, 12). This gift Timothy must now stir up and use, for the Apostle's work was done, but Timothy was to do the work of an evangelist, and make full proof of his ministry. The words "stir up" bring before us the figure of a low-burning fire which once more bursts into flame after the ashes have been raked and air admitted.

The concluding words of the opening passage of this Epistle to Timothy are solemn in their implication.

"For God hath not given unto us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" (II Tim. i. 7).

God has given us neither the spirit of *doulias* nor *deilias*, neither "bondage" (Rom. viii. 15) nor "fear" (II Tim. i. 7). The word *deilias* means more than timidity; it has the sense of cowardice. In Rev. xxi. 8, the word is used in a dreadful context, and indicates an apostate. It is easy for us to-day to sit in judgment on Timothy, but acquaintance with the terrors of the times, of which a brief note is given on pages 159-166, will turn censure into prayer lest we should be found wanting in far easier circumstances. It does not call for great courage for us to affirm our belief in the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, but under Nero's laws of "impiety", so to believe and teach meant death. The Apostle himself asked for prayer on his own behalf that he might open his mouth "boldly" as he "ought", and Timothy would understand that the note of severity that comes with the use of this word "fear" was uttered by one whose very love caused him the deeper anxiety for his son in the faith. We desire the best for our children, but over and above all things our constant prayer is for their unanswering loyalty to the Lord. So, too, he who, for Christ's sake, had neither wife, nor child, nor home, knew something of a father's heart, in being made all things to all men. God's gift to Timothy is referred to by the Apostle both negatively and positively. Negatively, it is not a spirit of fear. Positively, it is a spirit of power, of love, and of soundness of mind. The power, as Paul has taught in Ephesians, is that power which is associated with the risen Christ (Eph. i. 19, 20; iii. 7; iii. 20). "Soundness of mind" is the translation of *sophronismos*, derived from *sozo*, "to save", and *phren*, "the mind", in the sense of "the bent". God, said Paul, has given us a new "bent" which is the outcome of salvation.

Sophronizo is translated in Titus ii. 4 "teach to be sober", the object being to counteract the dreadful slackness of morals that covered the earth with its darkness, and to influence the minds of the young women to the Christian love of home, husband and family. The word does not mean to "teach" as one does doctrine.

Sophroneo means a sound, sane, mind as opposed to distraction (Mark v. 15). It is evident that the Apostle had the demoniac in mind, for in II Tim. iii. 1 he uses the same word to denote the "perilous" times that Matthew uses to describe the poor maniacs who

were so “fierce” (Matt. viii. 28). The times that are upon us, said the Apostle, are “fierce”, “perilous”, the effect of the “doctrine of demons” (I Tim. iv. 1) just as surely as was manifest in the demon-possessed men who came into contact with the Lord. He uses the same word, *sophroneo* (“be sober”), in II Cor. v. 13 in contrast with “beside ourselves”. The times were such that only the grace of God in abundant measure could prevent the believer from being “beside himself” as he contemplated the fate that Rome reserved for those who believed the truth.

Sophonos occurs in Titus ii. 12, where it is translated “soberly”; the state of mind of one who looks for that blessed hope and the appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. *Sophron*, “sober”, was one of the qualifications for the office of a bishop (I Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 8), and Timothy could not be “an example to the believers” (I Tim. iv. 12) without it.

Throughout all the stress and strain of life and witness, in face of all the deadly perils that threatened and drew ever nearer, the blessed fact of salvation (*so*, the root word) acted as a steadying, reassuring consciousness. It enable Paul to stand unashamed even though forsaken, and Paul greatly desired that his own son and successor in the faith and the ministry should have this holy boldness, this power, this love, this sanity, that flowed from a consciousness of sins forgiven, of a Saviour in glory, of a blessed hope.

Waiting on the Lord

#1. “Blessed”, “good” and “unashamed”.

p. 32

“Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord” (Psa. xxvii. 14).

One of the characteristics of fallen human nature is its impatience, its over-haste, its inability to wait. Perhaps the loss of immortality, and the consciousness of the brevity of life and the enormous amount of work that lies ahead, may account for this trait. Moreover, impatience is not a fault that is limited to the ungodly; it is also a common failing among the redeemed.

Scripture often calls upon the believer to “wait”, and there are nineteen different words thus translated in the Old and New Testaments. We hope to touch upon some of them in these short articles, and trust that our brief studies may be blessed of God and used by Him to provide help and encouragement.

“Blessing” is promised in Isa. xxx. 18 to him that waits for the Lord, while in Isa. xl. 31 we read that “they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength”. We also read in Isa. xlix. 23: “They shall not be ashamed that wait for Me”, and in Lam. iii. 25: “The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeketh Him.”

We close this brief paragraph with the wonderful words of Lam. iii. 26:

“It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord.”

As opportunity occurs, we hope to use some such small space as this paragraph occupies, in showing the many-sidedness of this blessed grace of “waiting”.

**#2. The waiting upon God that is silent,
restful and uncomplaining.
pp. 131, 132**

The passage to which we would draw the reader's attention in the present article is found in Psalm lxii. 1:

"Truly my soul waiteth upon God."

Dumiyyah, the word translated "wait" here, conveys the idea of *silence*. In the fifth verse of the same Psalm we read:

"My soul, wait thou only upon Him."

Here again the word (*damam*) is, literally, "to be silent".

The Psalmist uses this same word in other places, but it is often rendered differently in the A.V. For example, in the well-known words of Psalm xxxvii. 7: "Rest in the Lord and wait patiently for Him", the word for "rest" is again *damam*, "be silent", as in Psalm lxii. The word is also used in Lam. iii. 26, where it is translated "quietly wait".

In Job iv. 16 we read: "There was silence and I heard a voice."

Perhaps we hear so little and receive such scant answers to our prayers, because, in the Lord's presence, we are not sufficiently silent.

This "silence", or "quiet waiting", may imply something more, for in Lam. iii. 27-33, immediately following the verse quoted above, we read:

"It is good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth. He sitteth alone and keepeth silence (*damam*) because he hath borne it upon him. He putteth his mouth in the dust; if so there may be hope. He giveth his cheek to him that smiteth him; he is filled full with reproach. For the Lord will not cast off for ever; but though He cause grief, yet will He have compassion according to the multitude of His mercies. For He does not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men" (Lam. iii. 27-33).

Here the man of God is silent. He is full of "reproach", certainly, but his mouth is not full of reproaches as he enters into the Divine Presence.

In Psalm lxxxiii. we read: "Keep not Thou silence, O God, hold not Thy peace, and be not still" (Psa. lxxxiii. 1).

Let us be ourselves more silent, that He may speak. Let us be silent in patient expectancy. Let us be silent in our resting in the Lord, so that we may be able to say: "Truly my soul is silent to God."

War in Heaven (An Analogy).

#1. The Field Surveyed. pp. 167, 168

In this opening article we must explain the general scope of the series, and the object we have in view.

Behind all the enmity that belongs to the world of human history, lies the greater and deeper enmity that exists in the spiritual world. In these studies we shall attempt to survey this conflict of the ages, and seek to discover the respective goals that the conflicting parties have in view. By examining Israel's history we shall obtain many sidelights on our subject, and we shall discover in the demands made upon the loyal citizens of an earthly kingdom, something analogous to the demands made by the Captain of our salvation. On the negative side, we shall learn a good deal about the character of the great Enemy by studying the careers of such men as Pharaoh, Abimelech, Saul, Nebuchadnezzar and Sennacherib. We shall also receive help by considering the events associated with the Exodus from Egypt, the Jordan, Jericho, the conquest under Joshua, and the overcoming record of Caleb. Furthermore, we shall perceive the relation which the three great callings bear to this conflict of the ages, and particularly that of the dispensation of the Mystery.

It will also be necessary to examine "the weapons of our warfare", both defensive and offensive, and we must also learn with whom we should and should not fight. Moreover, the nature of the final victory must be included in our survey, as well as an understanding of the essential nature of scriptural peace. There will also be many pointed lessons to be learnt from the conditions, limitations and demands imposed upon the world by reason of the present conflict, as compared with the corresponding conditions, limitations and demands that concern "the good soldier of Jesus Christ".

If we can accomplish this purpose, we shall feel that in some degree, however small, we have "redeemed the time" and turned the present distress to our spiritual advantage. We have adopted the words of Rev. xii. 7 as the title of the series, because we feel that this "war in heaven", in which Michael and his angels fought against the Devil and his angels, was reflected in the conflict that raged upon the earth.

In the Book of Kings, when the servant of the man of God saw the host of chariots and horses that encompassed the city, he cried: "Alas, my master! how shall we do?" (II Kings vi. 15). The young man saw nothing beyond the encompassing host of Syrians, but his master, Elisha, saw the heavenly host as well, and he replies: "Fear not: For they that be with us are more than they that are with them" (II Kings vi. 16). Whether this statement would have been received by the young man, without proof or argument we do not know. We read, however, that Elisha "prayed", saying, "Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes that he may see", and as a result: "He saw: and behold the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha" (II Kings vi. 17).

There is an analogy, we believe, between earthly and heavenly warfare, and if the Lord will open our eyes to see, we too shall be able to perceive this most instructive parallel. Before, however, we can appreciate this analogy and draw useful lessons from the conditions imposed upon us by the present conflict, it will be necessary to become acquainted with the teaching of Scripture regarding the spiritual warfare that is going on continuously, whether the conditions at the time are those of “peace” or “war”. This, then, must be our first concern. After we have surveyed the conflict of the ages, and perceived something of its character, we can then make our comparisons profitably. For the moment, the analogy must wait while we acquaint ourselves with the teaching of Scripture. It is clear from Scripture that man was not the originator of the enmity and strife that have invaded his domain, and our first quest must be to discover who are the chief antagonists in that vast conflict in which he is involved.

Let these opening word, then, suffice as an introduction to this great theme, and as an indication of the line of study we shall hope to pursue. We sincerely trust that, as a result of becoming more intimately acquainted with the nature, conditions, and end of this great spiritual conflict, the reader will be the better fitted “to stand in the evil day”, and will be comforted and helped during the days of darkness that have descended upon the warring nations.

#2. “The Enemy.” **pp. 204 - 206**

We meet references to an “enemy” in one form or another in thirty out of the thirty-nine books of the English Old Testament, and in thirteen of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. If we were to widen the scope to include all references to enmity, strife, contentions, war, battle, arms and armour, we should have to include a still larger proportion of the books of both Testament.

There is one enemy however who stands out above all others, and who antedates them all: “The enemy is the devil” (Matt. xiii. 39). He is called: “That old (or ancient) serpent, called the Devil, and Satan” (Rev. xii. 9 and xx. 2). The “Devil” of the New Testament is the “Satan” of the Old Testament, and both are titles of one who is known as “The ancient Serpent”. Now the “serpent” is the one that beguiled Eve in the garden of Eden (II Cor. xi. 3), and consequently must have *come into* the present creation, and have originally belonged to the earlier creation, which, we shall discover, had passed away before the advent of that creation which had been pronounced “very good”.

We learn from the testimony of the Lord Himself, that the devil was “a murderer” from the beginning and that he “abode not in the truth” (John viii. 44). “He is a liar and the father of it” (John viii. 44). Deceit, wiles, craftiness, the subtlety of the serpent,

combined with the ferocity of a roaring lion, and the deceptive semblance of an angel of light, go to make up his fell equipment for the dreadful strife.

Satan is represented as a great dignitary, so much so that even Michael durst not bring against him “a railing accusation” (Jude 9). He is called “The prince of this world”, “the prince of the power of the air”, and “The god of this age”. Beneath his control are his “angels” (Rev. xii. 7), and he is represented as having fallen from heaven, dragging with him “a third part of the stars” (Rev. xii. 4), which in the book of the Revelation, represent “angels” (Rev. i. 20).

At the time of our Lord’s advent, the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them were under the sway of Satan (Luke iv. 6, 7); and the offer to transfer this sovereignty to the Saviour for one act of “worship” reveals the heart of the dread antagonism which runs throughout the scriptural record. Together with other “sons of God”, Satan had access to the throne of God and exercised a terrible and extensive power over man and his affairs, as the record of Job reveals.

As it is unthinkable that God, Who cannot look upon iniquity, and Whose very essence is holiness, could have created the murderer and liar that we know Satan had become “from the beginning”, some explanation must be sought of the existence and presence of such a being acting as the tempter in the garden of Eden. The naming of that garden places in our hands the key, for the prophet Ezekiel reveals a being who was “perfect” from the day in which he was created, yet in whom, at length, “iniquity” had been found. This being is described as having been “full of wisdom and perfect in beauty”, and, what is to the point for our present quest, he had “been in Eden the garden of God” (Ezek. xxviii. 11-15). No other created being beside Adam and Eve and the serpent is recorded as having “been in Eden, the garden of God”. This “servant”, or *nachash*, as the Hebrew word is, means “The shining one”, and the description of Ezek. xxviii. 13 fully bears this out. Moreover, in structural correspondence and directly related to the work of the serpent in Gen. iii., are placed the “Cherubim”, and a glance at Ezek. xxviii. 16 will show that this title once belonged to Satan, for in Ezek. xxviii. 16 he is addressed as the “covering cherub”.

In II Pet. iii. 5 and 6 it is intimated that before the present Adamic world, which was “created and made” in six days, with special reference to mankind, there had been another “world”, which had passed away. This is indicated in Gen. i. 2 where we meet with chaos and darkness over the earth. To this period the Apostle refers in Eph. i. 4, when he speaks of “the foundation” of the world, and the world *katabole* and its cognates, mean an “overthrow”.

Man therefore has never known what it is to live in a world really at peace. A state of war already existed, before Adam was created, and this head of a new race was immediately the subject of attack, temptation and deceit, and overthrown. When we look at a little child, born in a world already at war, we are but looking at a faint picture of all mankind. War goes on around him, intrudes into his home, his heart and his whole being. Sin and death already were holding sway over the earth, before he commenced his brief

career. The unsaved man is often the unconscious tool of the great adversary, and, should he step for a moment outside of his position “in Christ”, the believer, too, is liable to attack. But “we are not ignorant of his devices”, wrote the Apostle, and if these articles open the eyes of any to the nature of both the enemy himself, and of the conflict in which we are engaged, we shall not have laboured in vain.